



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Sunbal Yousef,
Stockton University

CSC Docket No. 2026-708

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

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: June 17, 2026 (SLK)

Sunbal Yousaf appeals the determination of Stockton University (University)¹ that the proper classification of her position with the University is Professional Services Specialist 4 Administrative Services (PSS4). The appellant seeks a Professional Services Specialist 3 Administrative Services (PSS3) classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title is PSS4. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a PSS3. The appellant previously reported to Dr. Robert Heinrich, former Vice President for Enrollment Management (supervisor). In support of her request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that she performed as a PSS4. 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 PSS4.

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.

On appeal, the appellant explains in detail how she believes that the determination letter mischaracterized her training and fiscal responsibilities. Additionally, she lists the examples of work from the PSS3 job specification and indicates how she performs those duties. Moreover, the appellant asserts that the determination mischaracterized her duties as “basic professional functions” while she gives examples to illustrate how she performs duties that are of “greater difficulty.” Further, she states that while the determination found that she had no “budgetary oversight,” she presents how her work impacts institutional financial resources while noting that the PSS4 job specification has no mention of fiscal responsibilities. Concerning training, the appellant asserts that the determination misapplied the standard as she uses independence, takes ownership, develops and implements training which are PSS3 job duties while PSS4s only assist in training. The appellant also claims that she uses independent judgment which is required for a PSS3 classification while PSS4s consult with their supervisors.

Additionally, the appellant presents that the determination’s reliance on her December 2024 position classification review is misplaced as her current duties must be evaluated. Since that determination, the appellant indicates that her new responsibilities include scholarship administration/allocation responsibilities; consortium leadership strengthening (13 partner colleges), which she has 100 percent ownership over and independently manages; building analytics dashboards for leadership; and implementing new workflows (NMAT audits, status change documentation).

Further, the appellant highlights her duties from her Performance Assessment Review to show that she does more than assist in training. Rather, she develops and implements training/onboarding programs. Additionally, she presents responsibilities to illustrate that she performs advanced, independent analytical work that has direct fiscal impact. She also lists certain duties to show that she uses independent judgment to perform tasks of greater difficulty. Moreover, she reports duties to demonstrate multi-institutional leadership and liaison work across 13 colleges. In addition, she highlights how she performs independent system-level problem-solving that affects compliance and enrollment decisions which she contends clearly show her performing duties of “greater difficulty.” She asserts that her supervisor’s own words confirm that she is performing PSS3 duties which counter the determination. Furthermore, the appellant describes certain projects which she maintains involved PSS3 duties.

Finally, the appellant submits a list of international admission issues that were provided by the Internal Admissions Services Counselor in preparation for the upcoming cycle. She explains, in detail, how she took the lead on this initiative by conducting in-depth research, cross-referencing, and systematically organizing the data to ensure accurate resolution process.

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 PSS4 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.

The definition section of the PSS3 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.

In this present matter, a review of the job specifications indicates that the distinguishing factor between the two titles is that PSS4s perform “basic” professional functions while PSS3s “independently” perform professional work of “greater difficulty.” Initially, it is noted that the record indicates that the appellant had been a Program Assistant Administrative Services. Then, in November 2024, she submitted a PCQ requesting that her position be reclassified to PSS4. In reviewing that PCQ, when her supervisor was asked what he considers the most important duties of the position, he indicated, “Managing and maintaining the Slate CRM system supporting the [O]ffice of Undergraduate Admissions.” Further, when he was asked to list those knowledges and abilities necessary for standard performance of the job to be done by an incumbent of this position, he stated, “High attention to detail and keeps tasks organized. Strong expertise of Slate CRM and Banner. Creating documentation to ensure processes are properly documented.” Thereafter, effective January 25, 2025, the appellant was appointed as a PSS4. Now, the appellant is again requesting reclassification, and this time she is requesting a PSS3 classification. In her request, she submits a PCQ dated June 12, 2025. When asked the same two questions, her supervisor provided similar responses. In the June 2025 PCQ, regarding what he considers the most important duties of the appellant’s position, he indicated, “Managing and maintaining the Slate CRM system and integrated technical solutions supporting the [O]ffice of Undergraduate Admissions.

Further, when he was asked to list those knowledges and abilities necessary for standard performance of the job to be done by an incumbent of this position, the supervisor stated, “High attention to detail while keeping both projects and tasks organized. Strong expertise of Slate CRM and Banner. Creating documentation to ensure processes are properly documented.” As such, the characterization of the appellant’s duties on both PCQs, as described by her supervisor, demonstrates that the appellant is performing basic professional functions. In other words, while the appellant’s duties may have expanded, her supervisor indicated that her most important duties and the knowledge and abilities to perform those duties had not changed significantly, *i.e.*, there is no indication that the expanded duties are of a greater difficulty or performed independently. Therefore, while the appellant may have new duties, there is no basis to determine that the appellant’s duties primarily changed from performing basic professional functions. Furthermore, volume of work has no effect on the classification of a position currently occupied, as positions, not employees are classified. *See In the Matter of Debra DiCello* (CSC, decided June 24, 2009).

Additionally, 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.

Accordingly, there is not a sufficient basis to disturb the determination that the appellant is properly classified as a PSS4.

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 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mary Cruz", is written over a light gray rectangular background.

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: Sunbal Yousaf
Craig Bickley
Division of Agency Services
Records Center