

further ordered that these appeals be remanded to Agency Services to determine the positions' applicable titles after a review of the job specifications which require help desk duties. Thereafter, Agency Services revised the job specifications and issued new determination letters based on the revised job specifications, which the appellants are now appealing.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellants' permanent title at the time of the initial classification review was Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems.³ The appellants sought reclassification of their positions, alleging that their duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a Technical Support Specialist 1. In support of their requests, the appellants submitted Position Classification Questionnaires (PCQ) detailing the duties that they performed as a Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems. Agency Services reviewed and analyzed the PCQs and other submitted information and documentation.

Agency Services found that the appellants' primary duties and responsibilities entailed, among other things, providing first-level support for end user connectivity, application and communication issues; receiving tickets, emails, and phone calls regarding technical issues and forwarding unresolved issues for further assistance; troubleshooting hardware, and remotely resetting printers, as necessary; providing desktop support for users, including resetting user passwords; monitoring network outages, and reporting unresolved user passwords; monitoring network outages, and reporting unresolved outages to vendors; preparing reports and logs and incidents and solutions; and monitoring help desk tickets for service request status and completion. In its decision, Agency Services determined that the duties performed by the appellants were consistent with the definition and examples of work included in the job specification for Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems.

On appeal, the appellants present that they were both employed at OIT's Enterprise Service Desk, a 24/7 help desk that services virtually all State government. The appellants argue that the determinations have reduced their duties to broad descriptions that fail to capture the level of difficulty and responsibility which their positions require. Moreover, they assert that the determinations make no effort to compare specific help desk duties in the job descriptions with their actual duties.

The appellants contend that these alleged failures are problematic given that the original appeals were remanded by the Commission because it could not differentiate the levels of work among the various job descriptions for help desk titles, which led to revised job specifications adding more detailed descriptions of the relevant duties to set forth the work levels. However, the appellants believe that the

³ Meredith is now an unclassified Ombudsperson Health 1 with the Department of Labor and Workforce Development. Hallman is now a provisional Technical Support Specialist 2 for OIT.

determinations overlooked these changes by reaching the same conclusions that were made initially.

The appellants highlight that incumbents in the Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems title work “under supervision of a supervisory official” while incumbents in the Technical Support Specialist 1 title work “under limited supervision.” The appellants note that they indicated on their PCQs that they were “under limited supervision,” which they state is not disputed, and present that their position included working solo shifts without a lead worker or supervisor present. Additionally, the appellants contrast the Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems title, which provides that an incumbent “performs the more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities,” with the Technical Support Specialist 1 title which indicates that an incumbent “receives calls, emails, and tickets at the help desk and handles assigned problems which may include moderately complex and/or critical issues short of the highest level.” The appellants acknowledge that it is often necessary for employees to perform duties relevant to their work that are “basic” and “repetitive,” even when working in a higher title and they do not claim that none of their daily tasks are basic or repetitive. However, the appellants assert that the evidence demonstrates that their duties are not limited to low-level tasks. They state that a review of their PCQs indicates that identifying and resolving network problems for all State departments or troubleshooting connections with Verizon and AT&T, among other duties, are not “basic” in nature. Further, the appellants emphasize that many of the issues handled by them, including the resolution of service outages, are surely “critical” as referenced in the Technical Support Specialist 1 job specification definition.

The appellants present the examples of work from the job specifications to distinguish work levels. They explain that when you examine the duties relevant to the Enterprise Service Desk, the job specifications indicate that Technical Assistant, Management Information incumbents “assist” while Technical Support Specialist 1s provide direct hands-on support to end users in a client/server environment. The appellants reiterate that they do not simply assist other help desk staff and, therefore, they believe that their duties are aligned with a Technical Support Specialist 1 classification. Further, the appellants present that their PCQs list that they “provide first level support and guidance,” answer inquiries, incidents, problems and requests from system users,” “identify and resolve network problems,” “troubleshoot and verify circuit connection with Verizon and AT&T,” “ensure that daily checks are done during each shift,” “monitor change and communicate[] with all 24/7 essential Enterprise Service Desk (ESD) team members about GroupLink and ServiceNow tickets,” and “test software and disaster recovery site equipment.” The appellants assert that these duties correspond to Technical Support Specialist 1 duties including, “Provides direct hands on support . . . to end users,” “Receives calls, emails, and tickets at the help desk and handles assigned problems,” “Reviews call record, requests for un-transferred call records and unassigned records/tickets in the

ESD Queue,” “Troubleshoots application errors,” “Identifies and resolves network problems,” “Contacts service provides for outages and circuit testing,” and “Tests disaster recovery software and equipment.” The appellants argue that their duties match well with Technical Support Specialist 1 examples of work while none of the above examples of work from the Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems specifically state these duties. Therefore, the appellants conclude that their positions should be reclassified to Technical Support Specialist 1, retroactive to 2020, when they first filed their position classification review requests.

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 Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems job specification states:

Under supervision of a supervisory official assigned to a program or operational unit having responsibility for a specific, existing information processing system operation, performs technical functions in support of management information systems used to process varied types of financial, program, or other information unique to the unit; operates computer terminal or PC for information processing; installs, utilizes, maintains, and troubleshoots information processing systems and system software; organizes, inputs, processes, and outputs source materials, raw data, and processed data; sets up and maintains data bases and software files; performs file maintenance; provides technical information/assistance to other system users; OR, under supervision of a supervisory official in a client-server environment, performs the more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities; performs other related duties as required.

The definition section of the Technical Support Specialist 1 job specification states:

Under limited supervision, provides direct hands on support for an information technology unit in resolving moderately complex production problems from verbal or written problem reports; consults with Technical Support Specialist 2, and/or network management and systems programming staff for problem diagnosis, assistance, and resolution; monitors and allocates space or direct access storage devices;

uses productivity aids in implementing and maintaining software, applications, and systems libraries; OR under limited supervision in a client/server environment, provides hardware/software support to end users; installs hardware and software on servers and/or workstations; receives calls, emails, and tickets at the help desk and handles assigned problems which may include moderately complex and/or critical issues short of the highest level; performs other related duties as required.

In this matter, a review of the definition sections for the job specifications for Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems and Technical Support Specialist 1 indicates that the difference between the two titles, which are germane to the appellants' appeals, is that Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems incumbents perform the more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities while Technical Support Specialist 1s handle assigned problems which may include moderately complex and/or critical issues short of the highest level. The record indicates that the appellants performed first-level help desk support. Further, the appellants acknowledge that they did perform more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities at least some of the time. Moreover, a review of the statements from the appellants' immediate supervisor at that time indicated that their work was consistent with what was expected of a Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems. In other words, other than the appellants' mere assertions, there is nothing in the record that indicates that their primary duties at that time were to perform help desk duties that rose to the level of moderately complex and/or critical issues of the highest level.

Additionally, to the extent that the appellants are claiming that they spent some of their time performing duties that were moderately complex and/or worked on critical issues of the highest level and that some of their duties compared favorably to the Technical Support Specialist 1 examples of work, 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. 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.

Regarding the appellants' claim that the determinations overlooked the changes in the revised job specifications because the descriptions of their duties were too broad and the same conclusion was reached as in the original appeal, it is noted that the Commission did not find that Agency Services' initial determination regarding the appellants' primary duties or the classification of their positions was incorrect. Instead, the Commission found issue with the job specifications in that they could not be differentiated and, therefore, it referred the matter to revise the job


specifications and to issue new determinations based on these revisions. Now, there is a clear differentiation between the two titles as incumbents in Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems primarily perform basic and repetitive help desk duties while Technical Support Specialist 1s primarily perform moderately complex duties. However, for the reasons stated above, the record supports the conclusion that the appellants, at the time of the classification review, primarily performed duties that did not rise to the level required for a Technical Support Specialist 1 classification and, therefore, their positions were appropriately classified as Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals 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 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2025



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: Donna Meredith (2025-2415)
Kerry Hallman (2025-2416)
Richard A. Dann, Staff Representative
Division of Agency Services
Records Center