

multiple titles for persons performing substantially identical work. This is not a circumstance where one Mechanic is intended to regularly delegate duties to the other or is expected to do so in practice, a duty to be fulfilled by the Supervisor. It explains that in the absence of the supervisor Mr. Centi does delegate work by nature of the fact that he has more experience as a Mechanic but he does not do so regularly. It argues that Mr. Centi does not distribute and balance the workload among employees according to established work flow or job specialization; provide guidance to lower level mechanics and helpers regarding procedures, policies, regulations, and instructions; or take the lead and gives assignment to those assigned as helpers and mechanics.

In response, Mr. Centi argues that the PCQ, the supervisor, the Assistant Superintendent for Public Works and the appointing authority all agreed to the duties, except for the fact that he did not supervise two other individuals listed on the PCQ who are not mechanics. He argues that there is no dispute that, at the current time, there is one other mechanic and he never indicated that he supervised multiple mechanics. On his PCQ, he referred to his delegation of work to the "other mechanic." Mr. Centi claims that the appointing authority's argument misses the point and elevates form over substance. The issue is not whether he delegates work to one mechanic or multiple mechanics, but if he delegates work even to one mechanic, he is still performing the duties and responsibilities of a Senior Mechanic. He argues that a position is not based on "intent," and notes that the appointing authority acknowledged that he delegated work in the absence of his supervisor.

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 if 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 job specification for Senior Mechanic states:

Under direction, takes the lead over staff engaged in performing skilled mechanical work involving the maintenance, repair and servicing of various types of motor vehicles and/or motorized construction equipment; does other related work as required.

The definition section of the job specification for Mechanic states:

Under direction, performs skilled mechanical work involving the maintenance, repair and servicing of various types of motor vehicles

and/or motorized construction equipment; does other related work as required.

At the outset, the classification of a position is determined based the duties and responsibilities assigned to a position at the time the request for reclassification is received as verified by audit or other formal study. The outcome of position classification is not to provide a career path to the incumbents, but rather is to ensure that the position is classified in the most appropriate title available within the State's classification plan. How well or efficiently an employee does his or her job, length of service, volume of work and qualifications have 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). In its decision, Agency Services indicated that the appellant's duties involve lead worker duties. Thus, Agency Services indicated that the appellant was serving as a Senior Mechanic.

On his PCQ, the appellant indicated that for 30% of the time he "dictates work while the supervisor isn't present; receives conditions from driver while supervision isn't present, repair or delegate to other mechanic, order parts for vehicles when supervisor isn't present, check in orders and maintain shop, lube and antifreeze report to supervisor when reordered and checked in, give daily updates to supervisor about vehicles and work progress, makes parts inventory list for seasonal workload...and helps scheduling and logs preventative maintenance of the fleet." For another 70% of the time, the appellant performs daily preventative maintenance and vehicle breakdowns, and he states he is been doing this for two plus years. Mr. Centi indicated that he regularly supervised three individuals, a Mechanic, a Department of Public Works Repairman, and a Truck Driver, including assigning work and reviewing their work, but not preparing performance evaluations.

The supervisor of the position stated that the most important duty of the position was daily repairs on vehicles, keeping inventory for seasonal items, and daily updates on projects or jobs. The appointing authority disagreed with the statements, but provided no comments. The Division Director and appointing authority agreed with the duties, but not the employees supervised.

Taking the lead is the distinguishing characteristic in considering whether a position should be classified at the requested title. Leadership roles refer to persons whose titles are non-supervisory in nature, but are required to act as a leader of a group of employees in titles at the same or lower level than themselves and perform the same kind of work as that performed by the group being led. See *In the Matter of Catherine Santangelo* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided December 5, 2005). Duties and responsibilities would include training, assigning and reviewing work of other employees on a regular and recurring basis, such that the lead worker has

contact with other employees in an advisory position. However, such duties are considered non-supervisory since they do not include the responsibility for the preparation of performance evaluations. In *In the Matter of Elizabeth Dowd, et al.* (MSB, decided February 9, 2005), it was noted that lead worker duties are akin to those of a supervisor in many respects, absent the responsibility for formal performance evaluations that can lead to the effective hiring, firing, or demotion of a subordinate. Intermittently taking charge in the absence of the regular supervisor, instructing staff, training, and ensuring performance of assigned tasks, without the responsibility for employee performance evaluations would be considered duties of a lead worker. See *In the Matter of Diane Epps and Lisa Sallad* (MSB, decided May 15, 2002) and *In the Matter of Martha Grimm* (MSB, decided August 14, 2001).

Based on the duties presented on the PCQ, Mr. Centi's position involves leadership over another Mechanic on a consistent basis, and he clearly does not supervise. While Mr. Centi indicated that he took charge in the absence of the regular supervisor, he indicated that this was for 30% of the time. The appointing authority agreed with this at the time, has not disagreed with this percentage, and has not provided an explanation for the supervisor's extended absences. It is noted that the supervisor is a General Supervisor, Trees, and may have duties outside of the garage. As such, the duties are not consistent with Mechanic, and Senior Mechanic is a better fit with the description of duties.

Accordingly, a thorough review of the entire record fails to establish that the appointing authority has presented a sufficient basis to warrant a Mechanic classification of Mr. Centi's position.

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
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 22 DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdre L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Steven Centi
Paul Kleinbaum, Esq.
Robert Smith
Kyle Trenton, Esq.
Division of Agency Services
Records Center