



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 6<sup>TH</sup> 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: Barbara Potts  
Lawrence Fox  
Elen Manalang  
Division of Agency Services  
Records Center