



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Spring Johnson,
Woodbine Developmental Center,
Department of Human Services

CSC Docket No. 2026-766

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE CHAIR/
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: August 28, 2026 (SLK)

Spring Johnson appeals the determination of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that the proper classification of her position with the Woodbine Developmental Center, Department of Human Services, is Staff Clinical Psychologist 3 (SCP3). The appellant seeks a Licensed Clinical Psychologist 2 (LCP2) classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title is SCP3. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a LCP2. In support of her request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that she performs as a SCP3. Agency Services reviewed and analyzed the PCQ,¹ organizational chart, and her Performance Assessment Review (PAR). Additionally, it reviewed statements provided by the appellant, her immediate supervisor, division director, and the appointing authority. In denying the request, Agency Services stated that LCP2s handle the most complex cases and requires a Doctorate degree, as well as licensure as a practicing psychologist issued by the New Jersey Board of Psychological Examiners. Additionally, it noted that the appellant did not meet those specific requirements, and that the requirements could not be substituted with additional experience.

¹ On her PCQ, the appellant indicated that she supervised one Behavioral Support Technician.

On appeal, the appellant presents that she understands that eligibility as a LCP2 requires a Doctorate degree and license. However, she disagrees with the determination's rationale for denying her request by stating that LCP2s handle the most complex cases and that experience could not be substituted for the required degree and license. The appellant also provides examples of work that she claims demonstrate that she has been assigned complex, high-acuity cases. Additionally, she claims that assignments at Woodbine Developmental Center have not been tied to licensure or a written complexity standard. Moreover, the appellant submits that another² LCP2, who she believes performs comparable duties, is not licensed. Additionally, the appellant states that her role encompasses the full scope of psychology, and she describes her independent work within the team as evidence that the assignment of "complex work" is not confined to LCP2s. Accordingly, the appellant requests her appeal be granted.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.9(e) states that in classification appeals, the appellant shall provide 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.

The definition section of the SCP3 (P24, 60310) specification states:

Under direct professional supervision of a clinical psychologist of a higher level in a State institution, community mental health center, or other setting in a State department, has responsibility for supervising programs of psychological services, including program development and evaluation, training psychologists and other professionals and nonprofessionals and monitoring their performance, carrying out psychological programs in accord with professional and administrative standards, representing psychology staff in contacts with other professionals, agencies, and the community, providing direct high level services to residents, and participating in administrative decision making within the psychology department; does related work as required.

The definition section of the LCP2 (R32, 60321) job specification states:

Under the general supervision of an Administrator of Psychological Services, or other supervisory official in a State hospital, developmental center, or other setting in a State department or agency, has responsibility for supervising and providing psychotherapy and

² Agency records indicate that the individual is currently serving as a Clinical Psychologist 2.

psychological services including program development and evaluation, suicide and violence risk assessments, individual and group therapeutic activities, research, supervision of unlicensed psychology counselors and/or psychology trainees, carrying out psychological programs in accord with professional and administrative standards, representing psychology staff in contacts with other professionals, agencies, and the community, providing direct high level services to patients and residents, and participation in overall institutional programming and administration; may provide testimony during civil commitment hearings and/or superior court hearings; supervises psychology services support staff, behavior support technicians, or other staff and their work activities; prepares and signs official performance evaluations for subordinate staff; does other related duties as required.

In this present matter, initially it is noted that one cannot be a “Licensed” Clinical Psychologist, regardless of the duties performed, without the required Doctorate or license. Moreover, the LCP2 job specification definition requires incumbents in this title to supervise unlicensed psychology counselors and/or psychology trainees. However, the appellant supervises a Behavior Support Technician and not any unlicensed psychology counselors. Further, although the appellant states in her PCQ that she “supervises” psychology interns, she does not list any specifically named “psychology trainees” where she signs employee evaluations that demonstrates that she has the authority to recommend the hiring, firing, and disciplining employees. Therefore, the appellant’s oversight of psychology interns is not the supervision of “psychology trainees.” *See In the Matter of Alexander Borovskis, et al.* (MSB, decided July 27, 2005).

Concerning the appellant’s argument that she is performing duties at the complexity level of a LCP2, it is noted that the appellant’s supervisor disagreed. Specifically, her supervisor indicated that her caseload comprises of individuals who do not require the same level of intensive psychology support as required for a LCP2. Regardless, even assuming *arguendo* that some of the appellant’s caseload is comparable to a LCP2 with regard to the level of intensive psychology support needed for the assigned clients, the fact that some of an employee’s assigned duties may compare favorably with some examples of work found in a given job specification is not determinative for classification purposes, since, by nature, examples of work are utilized for illustrative purposes only. Similarly, with respect to the appellant’s claim that she is performing duties at the same level as a specified employee in the requested title, a classification appeal cannot be based solely on a comparison to the duties of another position, especially if that position is misclassified. *See In the Matter of Carol Maita, Department of Labor* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided March 16, 1995); *In the Matter of Dennis Stover, Middletown Township* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided March 28, 1996). *See also, In the Matter of Lorraine Davis, Office of the Public Defender* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided February 20, 1997), *affirmed*, Docket No. A-5011-96T1 (App. Div. October 3, 1998).

Finally, while the determination focused on the appellant's lack of education and licensing as a licensed psychologist, and that the appellant's work did not rise to the complexity level of a LCP2, the appellant should also not have performed supervisory duties while serving in a non-supervisory title. Therefore, the appointing authority is directed to immediately remove the appellant's performance evaluation authority responsibility for the one Behavioral Support Technician that she supervises.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied. Further, the Woodbine Developmental Center, Department of Human Services, shall immediately remove the appellant's performance evaluation authority.

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

DECISION RENDERED ON
THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026



Mary Cruz
Acting Chair/Chief Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

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

c: Spring Johnson
Angela Santandrea
Division of Agency Services
Records Center