



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION  
OF THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of Kenneth Hyland,  
Office of Information Technology

CSC Docket No. 2022-859

Classification Appeal

**ISSUED: FEBRUARY 7, 2022 (RE)**

Kenneth Hyland appeals the decision of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that the proper classification of his position with the Office of Information Technology (OIT) is Technical Support Specialist 1. He seeks a classification as Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems.

The appellant requested a classification review of his position as a Technical Support Specialist 1, the title to which he was regularly appointed on December 23, 2017. The position is located in the Office of Information Technology, Division of Managed Hosting. The position reports to a Supervisor IT and has no assigned supervisory responsibility. In support of his request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) and all other documentation. Based on its review of the information provided, Agency Services concluded that the appellant's position was properly classified as Technical Support Specialist 1. Specifically, Agency Services staff who found that the major responsibilities of the position include: investigating and resolving network system errors; managing IT service requests from other agencies; providing recommendations to, and liaising with, other teams and agencies; providing over the phone assistance to end users; preparing correspondence and reports; and, participating in project reviews and providing ongoing support. Based on the foregoing, Agency Services determined that the have assigned duties and responsibilities of the position were commensurate with the title of Technical Support Specialist 1, the title the appellant currently holds.

On appeal, the appellant states that he does not work in the Network Operations Department, does not have access to their tools to provide network support, and does not work on routers, switches, or firewalls directly. Rather, the appellant works in Managed Hosting and Systems Administration, and not directly with desktop users or hardware/software users required direct support. The troubleshooting that he performs aids in the analysis and evaluation of internal operations using various system monitoring tools, in an ongoing process of tweaking and monitoring highly complex physical, virtual and cloud-based systems. He states that the part of this process involves the review and evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness of existing systems, and all offers agencies the option of migrating to new systems where their service offering would be enhanced. He states that he currently works with vendors, agencies and OIT employees to see how business practices, methods and techniques can be changed enhanced or discarded, and to evaluate new offerings and see how they might enhance and approve State operations. He states that once a new approach is approved, it is his responsibility to plan and implement it. He argues that he is a lead worker in collaborative efforts involving a lot of planning, developing solutions and plans, and implementing. He states that he has been involved in the planning, development and implementation both the new Azure based systems to migrate existing internal legacy-based programs, databases and applications to the cloud. He determines the feasibility of this for automation, production improvement and enhancement, and this has involved working with Microsoft and other parties to plan and roll it out.

The appellant provides a letter of support from the Assistant Divisional Director OIT (a Government Representative 1), who supervises the appellant's supervisor. He states that the appellant's routine duties include analysis of working procedures; review of new technologies for automation and migration possibilities; proffering ideas on improving systems, apps and/or services; production job problem analysis and resolution; CPU load remediation analysis; external threat and bad actor evaluation and defense evaluation; AV planning, development and implementation; communication with others on evaluations of their products, systems and practices to allow suggestions for improvements, or to make recommendations on remediation and prevention; development and roll out of information systems and programs; business rule design, roll out and implementation; and he averages 14 tickets per diam and ensures system up-time throughout the managed hosting environment. He also provides the appellant's qualifications, which are not germane to the classification of a position.

## 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 job specification for Technical Support Specialist 1 states:

Under general supervision, as a lead worker in a mainframe environment, provides guidance and direct hands on support to a work shift of the Data Processing Operations unit in resolving complex production problems from verbal or written problem reports; consults with, and assists network management and systems programming staff in the diagnosis, and resolution of complex problems; monitors and allocates space on direct access storage devices; uses and guides the use of productivity aids in implementing and maintaining software, applications, and system libraries; OR, as a lead worker in a client/server environment, provides direct support to end users and/or guidance to help desk and/or desktop technical personnel in the provision of direct support; installs and guides the installation of hardware and software on servers and/or workstations; does other related duties.

The definition section of the job specification for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems states:

Under general supervision of an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems, or other supervisory officer in a state department or agency, performs the analysis and evaluation of internal operations, business practices, methods and techniques of the organization to determine optimal solutions and/or approaches to satisfy agency information technology (IT) business needs/initiatives; evaluates users' needs and recommends (IT) solutions; provides recommendations in support of the agency's business needs and IT goals and objectives; formulates and/or recommends IT policies and procedures; may function as project leader; does other related duties as required.

It is long-standing policy that upon review of a request for position classification, when it is found that the primary focus of the position most closely matches the job definition, and a majority of an incumbent's duties and responsibilities are related to the examples of work found in a particular job specification, that title is deemed the appropriate title for the position. Further, how well or efficiently an employee does his or her job, length of service, and qualifications have no effect on the classification of a position currently occupied, as *positions*, not employees, are classified.

It is noted that the PCQ instructs appellants to, “Describe in detail the work required of this position. Make descriptions so clear that persons unfamiliar with the work can understand exactly what is done. You MUST explain how the duties at issue are more appropriate to the requested title than your current title.” In other, words, the appellant was given clear instructions to provide in detail on his PCQ the duties that he performs. In this regard, Agency Services properly evaluated his position based on the information he provided. Classification determinations list only those duties which are considered to be the primary focus of appellant’s duties and responsibilities that are performed on a regular, recurring basis. *See In the Matter of David Baldasari* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided August 22, 2006). The primary focus is determined partly by the order of importance of the duties and the percentage of time spent doing them. In this case, the appellant spends 35% of his time on his most important duty, investigating and resolving network system errors, and managing IT service requests from other agencies. He spends at least 20% of his time on his second most important duty and other duties providing recommendations to, and liaising with, other teams and agencies; providing over the phone assistance to end users; and preparing correspondence and reports.

The primary focus of this position is not that of an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. This title, which is a variant, performs the analysis and evaluation of internal operations, business practices, methods and techniques of the organization to determine optimal solutions and/or approaches and a significant portion of duties of the position pertaining to evaluating users’ needs and recommending (IT) solutions, providing recommendations in support of needs and IT goals and objectives, and formulating and/or recommending IT policies and procedures. The primary focus is proactive, in that the analysis precedes the selection and implementation of a solution. On the other hand, the appellant’s duties are reactive, in that he responds to requests for assistance or support, and solves problems that are presented to him. While in the course of these duties he may need to analyze working procedures or review of new technologies for automation and migration possibilities, this is ancillary to his primary duties. The appellant performs analysis and evaluation of practices and procedures during his primary work of providing direct support to end users.

Accordingly, the record establishes that the proper classification of the appellant’s title is Technical Support Specialist 1 at the time of the audit.

### **ORDER**

Therefore, it is ordered this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review is to be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
THE 2<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY 2022

*Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb*

---

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

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

c: Kenneth Hyland  
Lisa Blauer  
Division of Agency Services  
Records Center