

of the Art Requisitioning Technology to approve expense budgets and makes appropriate corrections to transactions. In its decision, Agency Services determined that the duties performed by the appellant were consistent with the definition and examples of work included in the job specification for Senior Buyer.

On appeal, the appellant asserts that there are only subtle differences between the Senior Buyer and the AA3, Procurement title. She presents two examples of her work that she contends falls under the AA3, Procurement job specification. Specifically, she describes in detail her duties to obtain grocery store vendors that have the ability to supply food to the Youth Justice Commission's Independent Living Homes that will accept State Purchase Orders for payment, which are Treasury Mandated forms of Procurement, instead of P-Card purchase which are Youth Justice Commission Credit Card purchases that are only authorized to be used in emergencies due to their lack of accountability. She explains that she reviewed State and federal contracts and conducted internet searches to locate vendors registered with the State Procurement System. Additionally, she indicates that she contacted vendors to have them file applications to be registered with the State. She notes that she discussed with the Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Fiscal Officer to ensure prospective purchases met Youth Justice Commission needs and federal nutritional guidelines. Moreover, she presents that she worked on a large-scale purchase to supply approved footwear, which also involved similar duties. She states that she believes that the projects demonstrate that she has been performing the duties of an AA3, Procurement. Finally, the appellant submits a letter of support from the Youth Justice Commission's Chief Fiscal Officer. The Chief Fiscal Officer explains how the appellant performs analytical, strategic, and planning focused duties; has expanded her role in vendor relations; uses data and analysis to support procurement decisions; uses technology to prepare detailed reports with conclusions and recommendations; and closely collaborates with internal departments to support cross-department functionality.

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 Senior Buyer job specification states:

Under supervision, takes the lead over assigned employees and performs technical work involved in preparing proposals, orders, and reports, arranges for the purchase of equipment, materials, and supplies

used by various departments, and may perform the work involved in term contracts; does other related duties as required.

The definition section of the AA3, Procurement job specification states:

Under general supervision of an Administrative Analyst 4, Procurement or other supervisory official in a [S]tate department, institution, or agency, assists in the review and analysis of procurement transactions, proposals, goods, commodities or services, in order to ensure efficient and effective procurement; does related work as required.

In this matter, a review of the job specification definitions indicates that Senior Buyers primarily act as a lead worker and perform technical duties regarding purchasing and contracts while AA3s, Procurement primarily perform the review and analysis of the procurement process. In its determination, Agency Services found primary duties for the appellant which squarely fit within the Senior Buyer job specification definition. On appeal, the appellant has not disputed that she performs the duties as indicated by Agency Services nor has she provided any evidence to demonstrate that she does not perform these duties. Rather, she presents examples of work and a statement from the Youth Justice Commission's Chief Fiscal Officer which assert that the appellant performs additional duties, some of which may be considered the review and analysis of the procurement process. However, the mere 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. Therefore, the record indicates that while the appellant may perform some review and analysis duties of the procurement process, she primarily performs Senior Buyer duties.

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 24TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2025

Allison Chris Myers

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: Nancy Garcia
Tiffany Johnson
Division of Agency Services
Records Center