



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Stephanie Moore-
Rebolledo, Stockton University

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

CSC Docket No. 2026-975

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: August 28, 2026 (SLK)

Stephanie Moore-Rebolledo appeals the determination of Stockton University (University)¹ that the proper classification of her position with the University is Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services (PSS3). The appellant seeks a Professional Services Specialist 2, Administrative Services (PSS2) classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title is PSS3. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a PSS2. The appellant reports to Dr. Gerry Lorentz, Associates Provost for Academic Affairs.² In support of her request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that she performed as a PSS3. The University reviewed and analyzed the PCQ and all information and documentation submitted. It also interviewed the appellant and her supervisor. In its decision, the University determined that the duties performed by the appellant were consistent with the definition and examples of work included in the job specification for PSS3.

¹ Pursuant to a Delegation Order, Memorandum of Understanding, signed May 25, 2023, the parties agreed that the University would initially review the position reclassification requests of its employees, and then the determinations would be referred to the Civil Service Commission for final determination.

² Dr. Lorentz's personnel record is not in the Personnel and Management Information System.

On appeal, the appellant asserts that she disagrees with the University's determination. Additionally, she submits the University's determination, her PCQ, the University's Job Description Template for her PSS3 position, the job specification for PSS2, and an organizational chart of the University's Office of the Provost.

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 PSS3 (P21, 81257) job specification states:

Under the direction of a Professional Services Specialist 2 or higher supervisory officer in the Administrative Services area at a State college, is responsible for independently performing professional work of greater difficulty using established policies, procedures, precedents, and guidelines; does related work as required.

The definition section of the PSS2 (P24, 81264) job specification states:

Under the supervision of a higher administrative officer in the Administrative Services area at a State college, is responsible for independently performing professional work of considerable difficulty using established policies, procedures, precedents, and guidelines; takes the lead over lower-level staff; does related work as required.

In the present matter, a review of the job specifications indicates that the distinguishing factors between the two titles is that PSS3s perform "greater difficulty" professional functions while PSS2s perform "considerable difficulty" professional work and are lead workers.

Concerning the level of difficulty, the appointing authority's determination explained that the appellant indicated that her most time-consuming and difficult task related to personnel matters and her second most time-consuming and difficult task is related to position control followed by the oversight of all searches within Academic Affairs.³ However, the appointing authority noted that these duties were part of her initial job description when she was appointed as a PSS3. Additionally, the appellant presented during her interview that she has taken on the role of informally supervising a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services (PSS4) within the Office of the Provost and has a larger role in the supervision and

³ This is consistent with the appellant's PCQ.

coordination of work of student workers within the office. The appointing authority found that these duties related to assigning and monitoring the work of students and/or staff, acting as a liaison with other departments on campus, compiling and analyzing data and generating reports, maintaining essential files and records, and serving on standing committees were within the scope of duties of a PSS3. Additionally, while the definition section of a job specification is what used to determine position classification, the terms “considerable difficulty” and “greater difficulty” are undefined. Thus, it is useful to review the Examples of Work for the titles in question to help define these terms. Moreover, the Examples of Work do illustrate that these duties are performed by PSS3s. Finally, the appellant has not submitted any specific argument on appeal to contradict the appointing authority’s determination in this regard. Therefore, the appellant is performing duties that are of “greater difficulty” as defined in a PSS3 classification.

Additionally, a PSS2 classification also requires that PSS2s be lead workers while PSS3s are not. A review of the appellant’s PCQ indicates that she spends five percent of her time performing lead worker duties.⁴ Specifically, within that five percent of time, she indicates that she leads a specific PSS4 and she “co-leads” four student workers. Further, in reviewing the appellant’s supervisor’s statements on her PCQ, when asked what her most important duties are, her supervisor does not indicate that the lead worker duties are the most important. Moreover, during the appellant’s interview when asked how her duties have changed since she has been in the position, she lists 16 duties, with only two duties being related to lead worker duties, “informally supervises [a] [PSS4] – has weekly meetings, assigning tasks, [and] checks work” and “Student workers – schedule, training, providing work, [and] checking work.” In other words, while the record indicates that the appellant occasionally performs lead workers duties, these duties are not a primary responsibility. Moreover, it is not uncommon for an employee to perform some duties which are above or below the level of work which is ordinarily performed. For purposes of determining the appropriate level within a given class, and for overall job specification purposes, the definition portion of the job specification is appropriately utilized.

Accordingly, there is not a sufficient basis to disturb the determination that the appellant is properly classified as a PSS3.

⁴ The appellant’s PCQ labels these duties as “supervisor” duties. However, the appellant does not represent that she signs the performance evaluation of any subordinate, which is what makes a supervisor a supervisor. Performance evaluation of subordinates, and its myriad of potential consequences to the organization, is the key function of a supervisor which distinguishes the employee from a “lead worker”). See *In the Matter of Alexander Borovskis, et al.* (MSB, decided July 27, 2005).

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

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: Stephanie Moore-Rebolledo
Craig Bickley
Division of Agency Services
Records Center