



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

:
 :
FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
 :
OF THE
 :
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
 :

In the Matter of Manju Goel,
 Office of Information Technology

CSC Docket No. 2018-1597

Classification Appeal

:
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :

ISSUED: April 10, 2018 (RE)

Manju Goel appeals the decision of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that her former position with the Office of Information Technology is properly classified as Software Development Specialist 1. The appellant seeks a Software Development Specialist 2 classification in this proceeding.

Goel requested a review of her position as a Software Development Specialist 1 in October 2016, when she was working in the Application Development Division of the New Jersey Office of Information Technology. The appellant is currently working for the Motor Vehicle Commission in the same title. When she filed her appeal, she reported to a Software Development Specialist 3 and did not have supervisory responsibility.

Agency Services found that based on the primary duties of Goel’s position, her title was properly classified as Software Development Specialist 1. Specifically, it found that her primary responsibilities included: designing, coding, testing and implementing new programs; reviewing and monitoring test procedures; troubleshooting program errors; and interfacing with clients to analyze, developing and documenting business requirements for new software or modifications. The Motor Vehicle Commission confirmed with Agency Services that Goel’s current primary duties remain consistent that those performed prior to her transfer. Agency services found that the required developing and coding skills necessary to perform typical duties and responsibilities of did not require high level coding skills.

On appeal, Goel argues that most of her work is performed under very limited supervision, and that she has been independently writing new programs, enhancing existing programs, writing JCLs, creating test data, designing test plans, doing integrated testing, and tackling production problems as they arise. She states that she has been interacting with others regarding issues that arise regarding systems that she has been handling for several years.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.9(e) states that appeals from the decision of the Commission representative to the Civil Service Commission ... may be made by an employee, authorized employee representative, or local appointing authority. The appeal shall be submitted in writing within 20 days of receipt of the decision letter and include copies of all materials submitted, the determination received from the lower level, statements as to which portions of the determination are being disputed, and the basis for appeal. Information and/or argument which was not presented at the prior level of appeal shall not be considered. When new information and/or argument is presented, the appeal may be remanded to the prior level.

The definition section of the job specification for Software Development Specialist 1 states:

Under close supervision and monitoring in a State or local government agency, performs analysis, maintenance, programming and support work on modules of existing systems; may develop web applications and web sites; does other related work.

The definition section of the job specification for Software Development Specialist 2 States:

Under limited supervision in a State or local government agency, performs analysis, consulting, design, programming, maintenance, and/or support work on software for information technology services; participates in the resolution of complex problems through consultation with higher-level technical staff; may coordinate projects and serve as a technical mentor/coach to lower level staff; may develop web applications or websites; does other related duties.

The appellant does not dispute the tasks listed by Agency Services and, in fact, reiterates on appeal the duties listed on her Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) in more general terminology. A review of the documentation indicates that her supervisor stated that she embellished descriptions of her responsibilities. For example, Goel indicated that for 20% over time she wrote an on-line program ARRS102 using a master menu screen, and wrote a JCL to test

and see the screen before and after the change was made. She states that she wrote this program with no supervision and tested the program independently. Her supervisor indicated that ARRSL102 is the most complex COBOL program Goel wrote under his supervision, but she was provided with detailed program specifications written by another programmer, and required extensive assistance. He does not agree that she wrote ARRSL102 with no supervision or assistance.

On her PCQ, Goel indicated that for 15% of her time she wrote five new programs to create URTs to be used to null load or selectively remove old data. She states that she created test plans and files to test all the programs, and wrote them with minimal supervision and independently. Her supervisor indicates that the five programs were clones of existing production programs originally written by a higher-level programmer, and that her role was to replace database names and key information and provide test data. He indicates that the vast majority of the program logic was already written, but that Goel did work with the database group to resolve an issue during testing.

Goel indicated that, for 5% of her time, she writes Dyl280s whenever a program is changed, or a new program is written, to test the change or new program. Her supervisor considers this a simple task which is not above the level of her current title. For another 5% of the time, Goel stated that she monitors the program in GFD Run Control. The supervisor indicates that this is a relatively simple task which the appellant has failed to do on multiple occasions, causing production problems. For 15% of the time, the appellant indicated that she initiated or updated users in the production Oracle table. Again, the supervisor indicates that this is a simple task involving resetting user passwords and adding new user names as requested.

Goel indicated that for 5% of the time she regularly supports and monitors two JCL job streams. The supervisor indicated that the last change that she made to these jobs streams failed in production due to lack of sufficient testing, and he was notified along with another programmer to fix and correct the problem. Goel indicated that for 10% of the time she handles many production jobs with minimum supervision. Her supervisor indicated that she handles a limited number of production jobs and often requires assistance from her supervisor. Thus, the record does not support that Goel performs some work at the level of the higher title.

A thorough review of the information presented in the record establishes that Goel's position is properly classified as Software Development Specialist 1, and she has not presented a sufficient basis to establish that her position is improperly classified.

ORDER

Therefore, the position of Manju Goel was properly classified as Software Development Specialist 1.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 4TH DAY OF APRIL, 2018



Deirdre L. Webster Cobb
Acting Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c. Manju Goel
Dave Weinstein
Jackie Passarelli
Kelly Glenn
Records Center