

In the Matter of Barbara Potts, Stockton University

CSC Docket No. 2023-2822

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

Classification Appeal

:

ISSUED: July 10, 2023 (SLK)

Barbara Potts appeals the determination of Stockton University (the University)¹ that the proper classification of her position with the University is Program Assistant, Administrative Services (Program Assistant). The appellant seeks a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services (PSS4) classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's prior permanent title was Principal Clerk Typist. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a PSS4. The appellant reports to Rochelle Iannuzzi, a Professional Services Specialist 2, Administrative Services (PSS2). In support of her request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that she performed as a Principal Clerk Typist. The University reviewed and analyzed the PCQ and all information and documentation submitted. Further, the University interviewed the appellant and Iannuzzi. Additionally, there were conversations regarding the appellant's request with the Vice President of Enrollment Management and the Director of Financial Aid. The University found that the appellant's primary duties

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 (Commission) for final determination.

and responsibilities entailed, among other things: work performing various duties related to the Federal Work Study Program (55 percent), financial aid customer service (35 percent), overseeing and maintaining office technology (five percent), and maintaining and monitoring the office calendar and other duties that may be assigned (five percent). Specifically, the University found that the appellant supports the Assistant Director of Financial Aid and that the Assistant Director of Financial Aid directly oversees all aspects and manages the Federal Work Study Program. Further, the appellant is tasked with maintaining essential records and files, organizing work, analyzing problems, and developing work methods. 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 Program Assistant. Personnel records indicate that the appellant's position was reclassified to Program Assistant, effective December 3, 2022.

On appeal, the appellant presents, through her PCQ, that she is responsible for all aspects of the Federal Work Study Program (55 percent of her time), ensuring compliance with all applicable federal laws and regulation. She indicates that she is the central point of contact for federal work study students, campus departments, and off-campus community participants for the work study program. Further, the appellant indicates that she maintains relationships with upper management in various campus departments, and she provides information, guidance, training and assistance concerning the work study program. She also describes numerous other duties that she performs regarding the Federal Work Study Program. The appellant also describes how she performs financial aid customer service (35 percent of her time), office technology duties (five percent of her time), and office calendar and other duties as assigned (five 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 Program Assistant (P16) job specification states:

Under general supervision of a Professional Services Specialist 2 or other supervisory officer in the Administrative Services area at a State college, is responsible for performing basic professional functions using established policies, procedures, precedents, and guidelines; does related work as required.

The definition section of the PSS4 (P18) job specification states:

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

In this present matter, a review of the job specification definition sections indicates that the distinguishing characteristic between the two titles is that Program Assistants work under **general supervision** of a PSS2 or other supervisory officer while PSS4s work under the **coordination** of a PSS2 or higher supervisory officer. Further, while the Examples of Work are illustrative only, the job specification for Program Assistant indicates that an incumbent in this title consults with the supervisor on a regular basis to discuss progress, identify problems, and effect resolutions while the job specification for PSS4 indicates that an incumbent in this title consults with the supervisor regarding issues and concerns in the course of duties. Therefore, an incumbent that regularly consults with their supervisor is considered to be under general supervision. During the appellant's interview, she indicated that she worked under general supervision, and Iannuzzi also concurred during her interview. Therefore, the record indicates that the appellant works under general supervision of a PSS2, and her position is appropriately classified as a Program Assistant.

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 6TH DAY OF JULY, 2023

Allison Chris Myers Chair/Chief Executive Officer Civil Service Commission

allison Chin Myers

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

Barbara Potts c: Lawrence Fox Elen Manalang Division of Agency Services Records Center