

On appeal, the appellant presents that he applied, was determined eligible, and ranked fourth for a Civil Service promotional examination for a position as a Senior Repairer with the University.² Therefore, he does not understand why the University did not reclassify his position to Senior Repairer. He states that he works closely with staff and students daily, and he makes their safety and security his number one priority. The appellant indicates that he has experience as a union carpenter, grounds worker, and building maintenance technician. Therefore, he believes that he is a great candidate to be appointed as a Senior Repairer and such appointment would allow him to grow with the University. He describes his duties as a Repairer in more detail and indicates that he spends his time as a repairer, which includes being a team leader (25 percent), electrical/locksmith (15 percent), carpentry/mason/locksmith (15 percent), plumbing (20 percent), painting (10 percent), and additional responsibilities (15 percent).

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 Repairer (O11) job specification states:

Under direction of a Foreman, M/W or other supervisor in a State Department, institution, or agency, assists the craftsmen and/or independently performs basic maintenance, construction, repair, or mechanical adjustment work involved in varied types of buildings, building facilities and/or building utilities, and highway and bridge construction; does other related duties as required.

The definition section of the Senior Repairer (O14) job specification states:

Under the direction of a Crew Supervisor or other supervisor in a State department, institution or agency, performs the basic maintenance, repair or mechanical adjustment work involved in varied types of buildings, building facilities, building utilities and/or furniture; takes the lead over lower level repairers and helpers; does related work as required.

² Five employees, including the appellant, applied for the Senior Repairer (PS8392J) Stockton University promotional examination. Four employees, including the appellant, were determined eligible, where the appellant was the fourth ranked candidate. Certification PS230187 was issued containing the names of the four eligibles. The first three ranked candidates were appointed, and the appellant was not appointed. The list expires on February 1, 2026.

In this present matter, a review of the job specifications indicates that the key distinguishing characteristic between the two titles is that Senior Repairers are lead workers while Repairers are not. Under Civil Service, a lead worker is defined as a leadership role refers to those persons whose titles are non-supervisory in nature, but are required to act as a leader of a group of employees in titles at the same or a lower level than themselves. Duties and responsibilities would include training, assigning and reviewing work of other employees on a regular and recurring basis, such that the lead worker has contact with other employees in an advisory position. However, such duties are considered non-supervisory since they do not include the responsibility for the preparation of performance evaluations. Being a lead worker does not mean that the work is performed by only one person, but involves mentoring others in work of the title series. *See In the Matter of Henry Li* (CSC, decided March 26, 2014).

In this matter, a review of the appellant's PCQ indicates that although the appellant stated that he was a mentor and team leader in the absence of the supervisor and Senior Repairer, he did not indicate that he assigns or reviews the work of other employees. Further, during Steck's interview, he advised that the appellant takes the lead only when the supervisor and Senior Repairer were not available or out of the office. Additionally, on appeal, the appellant confirms that he acts as a team leader and mentor only in the absence of the supervisor or Senior Repairer. It is also noted that the appellant indicated on his PCQ and on appeal that he spent 25 percent of his time performing repairer duties and his being a team leader was only one of his repairer duties. Therefore, the record indicates that, at most, the appellant spends 25 percent of his time as a team leader. Regardless, the issue is not whether the appellant spends the majority of his time as a team leader. Rather, the issue is whether he acts a team leader on a *regular and recurring basis* and the totality of the record indicates that he does not as occasionally performing the duties of a higher-level employee in his or her absence is not a basis for reclassification of the lower level position. *See In the Matter of Benjamin Ritter* (CSC, decided July 13, 2011). Therefore, as the appellant does not have regular and recurring responsibility of assigning and reviewing the work of specific named employees, the appellant is not a team leader as defined by Civil Service, and the appellant's position is properly classified as a Repairer.

Concerning the Senior Repairer (PS8392J) Stockton University promotional examination, the appellant appears to be confused regarding the difference between eligibility for a promotional examination and a request for reclassification of one's position. An employee's position will only be reclassified when after a request, it is determined that the employee is already performing the duties of the requested title as compared to an eligibility determination for a promotional examination which only signifies that the candidate has met the minimum requirements for that promotional examination and does not indicate that the candidate is currently performing the duties of the promotional title. In this case, the appellant's eligibility determination

for the PS8392J only indicates that he meets the requirements to potentially be appointed of a Senior Repairer, but it does not in any way imply that he is already primarily performing the duties as a Senior Repairer and his position should be reclassified to that title. It is noted that the appellant is the only eligible remaining on the PS8392J promotional list, and the University could potentially appoint him to Senior Repairer prior to that list expiring on February 1, 2026.

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 BY THE
THE 18TH DAY OF JULY, 2023



Allison Chris Myers
Chair/Chief Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

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

c: Paul Butterhof
Elen Manalang
Division of Agency Services
Records Center