State of New Hampshire

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
Edward J. Haseltine, Chairman
Gerald Allard
Loretta Platt

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Mary Ann Steele

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
State House Annex
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Telephone (603) 271-3261

1987-C-000

APPEAL OF BRUCE DREW

September 21, 1987

On Tuesday, July 14, 1987, the Personnel Appeals Board, Commissioners Haseltine, Allard and Platt sitting, heard the appeal of Bruce Drew, Stock Control Supervisor, Salary Grade 11, of the Department of Employment Security. The appellant's request for upgrading to a new title of Stock Control Supervisor, Salary Grade 14, had been denied by the Division of Personnel.

The appellant requested that the job attributes of Complexity of Duties, Experience, Initiative, Supervision, Physical Effort and Working Conditions be upgraded to a level which would support a total point allocation resulting in upgrading to Salary Grade 14. With regard to those requests, the Board found the following:

Complexity of Duties

The appellant's position is currently rated at the 3rd dgreee, or 45 points, which is described in part by the Evaluation Manual as "Work generally routine or standardized, but involving choice of action within limits defined by standard practice and instructions." Despite the appellant's description of his work, the Board was not convinced that upgrading to the 4th degree was warranted in that it did not appear to entail "...application of broader aspects of established practices and procedures to problems and situations not falling clearly or concisely within the limitations of accepted standards or modifying methods and standards to meet variations in controlling conditions." The Board found that the work described by the appellant in his written submissions is adequately defined by the 3rd degree.

Experience

The appellant requested that this attribute be upgraded from the 6th to the 7th degree, or from 65 to 80 points. The Board was not convinced that an incumbent at entry level in this position would need more than 4 years experience to perform the work satisfactorily. Therefore, the Board found this attribute correctly evaluated at the 6th degree.

Initiative

The appellant's position is currently rated at the 3rd degree under Initiative. The appellant did not indicate in his written or oral presentation what degree allocation he felt to be appropriate for this attribute. The Board, therefore, reviewed the requirements of the 4th degree for this attribute and did not find that Mr. Drew's position required, "...planning and performing unusual or difficult work where general instructions only are available," and found this factor to be properly rated at the 3rd degree.

Supervision

For Supervision, the appellant requested upgrading from the 2nd to the 3rd degree. The Board found that the appellant's position does supervise other state employees, and could best be described by the 2nd degree, or work which, "Involves about 25% to 50% of time supervising other employees doing related work while performing similar work part of the time..."

Physical Effort

The appellant requested that the Board approve an increase in points for Physical Effort from the 2nd to the 3rd degree. The 3rd degree for the attribute of Physical Effort is described in the Evaluation Manual as work which, "Requires the continuous lifting [50% or more of the time] of material up to 5 lbs., or frequent lifting [10% ---50% of the time] of material weighing up to 25 lbs., or occasional lifting [2%---10% of the time] of material up to 60 lbs. Also work requiring continuous standing or walking, or occasional strenuous positions." In describing his work, the appellant stated he, "tests incoming equipment...follow[s] through with phone calls to have repair service in...completes a receiving report on a computer input ready format..." He further stated that he sets up files, assigns inventory numbers, trains new employees on the use of copying equipment, and consults in preliminary discussions for procedures such as the use of "Zip plus 4" and presorting of mail. Finally, the appellant stated he interviews applicants, assigns work, handles employee complaints and problems, and supervises contracted services. The Board, therefore, was not persuaded that appellant spends a considerable amount of his time lifting materials as outlined in the 3rd degree, or in continuous standing or walking or occasional strenuous positions.

Working Conditions

The Board was not convinced that the working conditions described by the appellant warranted upgrading this attribute. The current rating at the 2nd degree adequately addresses those conditions described by the appellant such as the use of equipment and weather conditions sometimes

experienced when unloading trucks.

Based upon the above findings, the Board voted unanimously to deny the appeal, finding the appellant's position properly classified as Stock Control Supervisor, Salary Grade 11.

FOR THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Mary Ann Steele

MARY ANN STEELE
Executive Secretary

mas
cc: Joan Day, Personnel Officer
Dept. of Employment Security

Commissioner John Ratoff
Department of Employment Security

Virginia A. Vogel
Director of Personnel