



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Kerry Senica,
Borough of Seaside Park

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

CSC Docket No. 2026-1426

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: October 2, 2026 (SLK)

Kerry Senica appeals the determination of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that the proper classification of her position with the Borough of Seaside Park (Seaside Park) is Account Clerk. The appellant seeks an Account Clerk/Clerk 2 classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title at the time she submitted her classification review was Clerk 1. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were not commensurate with her then title and that the title of Account Clerk/Clerk 2 more appropriately reflected the duties she performed. The appellant's position is in the Seaside Park Administrative and Executive Development's Finance Unit. She is under the supervision of Jamie Colson, Chief Financial Officer. The appellant does not prepare any performance evaluations and has no supervisory responsibility. Agency Services reviewed the information provided by the appellant and appointing authority, including an organizational chart, and a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) with signatures and comments (if any) provided by the appellant, her immediate supervisor, the Borough Administrator, and the appointing authority.

Agency Services found that the appellant's duties consisted mostly of receiving and processing payments, posting deposits, and maintaining revenue files, which reflected a role that was more specialized than Clerk 1. However, Agency Services

indicated that the appellant does not provide guidance and assistance to other employees, nor does her duties encompass the broader scope of clerical complexity implied by the Clerk 2 title. Therefore, it determined that the appellant's duties were to be classified by the title of Account Clerk, and the change in the classification of her position was to be processed as a lateral title change, effective September 24, 2025.

On appeal, the appellant asserts that she performs every Clerk 2 duty listed on the job specification for that title and more, although she acknowledges that she does not disburse payments, which is a payroll clerk duty. She disagrees with the finding that her clerical duties are not at the complexity level of a Clerk 2 classification. Additionally, although the appellant acknowledges that during the classification review, she indicated that she did not provide guidance and support for other employees, she asserts that she does guide a Clerk 1 co-worker on processing payments and applications. Further, she highlights that this duty is not a requirement for a Clerk 2 as the job specification only indicates that incumbents in that title "may" provide guidance.

The appellant states that she is the primary point of contact for tax billing inquiries. She provides that while she forwards requests for direct communication with the Tax Collector who works remotely, she answers most of the complex questions without escalating them. Further, she indicates that she manages updates to tax billing information for existing and new property owners, which involves guiding new owners through the initial process when a deed is pending county filing, and she issues change of address forms and transmits this information to the Tax Assessor. She asserts that she frequently corrects errors from prior clerks who failed to complete this critical, interconnected procedural step. Additionally, the appellant provides that she handles incoming check payments with errors, where she contacts the payor within two business days. She explains that if she needs to return the payment, she provides notice of the error and generates an invoice with the correct amount due, including interest. The appellant also states that she manages delinquent tax payments which require her to accurately calculate interest. Moreover, the appellant provides that she processes tax sale payments, where she must strictly adhere to specific payment methods. Finally, she indicates that she processes tax lien payments, which require specific coding and careful documentation of the payor's information, as the lien payor is distinct from the property owners. She emphasizes how her duties are time sensitive.

In reply, the appointing authority asserts that there are many Clerk 2 duties that the appellant does not perform. It highlights the appellant's acknowledgement that she does not prepare disbursements nor post disbursements, deductions and remittances paid and due. Further, the appointing authority states that while the appellant is helpful to co-workers, she does not provide "guidance" as she has no direct reports. The appointing authority outlines that the appellant's duties consist of

receiving payment for tax and utility bills for various applications; processing a receipt for the payment and inputs the payment into the financial software; depositing funds within 48 hours per statute; keeping files for the monthly receipts; answering the phone and helping residents; helping residents with tax and utility bill questions except that overly complex questions are referred to the Tax Collector, Tax Assessor, Water Superintendent or Chief Financial Officer; processing change of address forms; and assisting in temporary water shut-offs for the Water Department.

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 Account Clerk job specification states:

Under direction, performs a variety of routine, repetitive, noncomplex clerical tasks which involve computing, classifying, verifying, and recording numerical data and the reconciliation of accounts, records, and documents to keep sets of financial records complete; does other related duties as required.

The definition section of the Account Clerk/Clerk 2 job specification states:

Under direction performs a variety of routine, repetitive, noncomplex clerical tasks which involve computing, classifying, verifying, and recording numerical data and the reconciliation of accounts, records, and documents to keep sets of financial records complete; does other related duties.

And

Under limited supervision, performs clerical work involving the processing of documents in a variety of functions; performs moderately complex and non-routine clerical work; may provide guidance and assistance to other staff; does other related duties as required.

The definition section of the Senior Account Clerk job specification states:

Under direction, performs a variety of responsible and difficult clerical tasks which involve computing, classifying, verifying, and recording

numerical data and the reconciliation of accounts, records, and documents to keep sets of financial records complete and/or takes the lead over other employees in the maintenance of accounting records; does other related duties as required.

In the present matter, it is noted that the Account Clerk/Clerk 2 title is a dual title. To be classified in this title, an incumbent must primarily perform both Account Clerk duties and Clerk 2 duties. However, a review of the appellant's PCQ indicates that she only spends 10 percent of her time on Clerk duties. Further, the appellant's immediate supervisor's statement agreed that the appellant's description of her duties was "an accurate percentage of time since most of the day consists of the receiving, posting, and depositing payment." Therefore, as the appellant only spends approximately 10 percent of her time performing non-Account Clerk clerical duties, she is not primarily performing clerical duties, whether it be Clerk 1 or Clerk 2.

Further, even if the appellant's non-Account Clerk clerical duties are considered a primary duty for the appellant, Agency Services found that her clerical duties consisted of:

Opens the doors of the Municipal Building when first to arrive in the morning. Collects mail from the overnight mailbox and retrieves the money bag from the previous day. Greets, assists, and directs patrons and visitors. Answers calls related tax, water, and sewer. Responds to residential inquiries, take messages, and/or send emails to appropriate department for resolution.

Therefore, the record indicates that the appellant's non-Account Clerk duties are routine in nature and do not rise to the level of "moderately complex" as required for a Clerk 2 classification.

Consequently, the issue in this matter is whether the appellant's Account Clerk duties rise to the level of Senior Account Clerk. The differences between the Account Clerk title and the Senior Account Clerk title are that Account Clerks perform routine, repetitive, noncomplex clerical tasks while Senior Account Clerks perform difficult clerical tasks and/or are lead workers. Initially, it is noted that the appellant is not a lead worker as she does not assign and review the work of a specific named employee on a regular and recurring basis. *See In the Matter of Henry Li* (CSC, decided March 26, 2014). Concerning the level of difficulty of the appellant's duties, Agency Services found that the appellant's primary Account Clerk duties were as follows:

Receives payments (cash, checks, and credit card) for the Borough of Seaside Park. Process payments ensuring payments are posted accurately to the proper account using appropriate codes and for the

correct amount in the accounting software system. Deposits checks to the bank via remote deposit. Ensures money bag is collected by Special Law Enforcement Officer within 2 days for cash deposit. Prepare cash deposit receipts. Maintain records of payments, deposits and receipts.

It is noted that Agency Services did not make any finding that these duties would be considered “difficult.” Further, a review of these duties indicates that they are best characterized as “routine, repetitive, noncomplex clerical tasks.” As such, the appellant’s primary duties do not rise to the level of a Senior Account Clerk classification. Moreover, to the extent that the appellant is claiming that she sometimes performs “difficult” clerical duties, 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. Further, 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 of Agency Services.

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 28TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mary Cruz", is written over a horizontal line.

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: Kerry Senica
Karen Kroon
Division of Agency Services
Records Center