



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Britny Dileo,
Stockton University

CSC Docket No. 2024-2081

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

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: December 31, 2024 **(EG)**

Britny Dileo appeals the determination of Stockton University (the University)¹ that the proper classification of her position with the University is Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The appellant seeks a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title is Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The appellant sought reclassification of her position, alleging that her duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services. The appellant reports to Amber Gihorski, Associate Director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. In support of her request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that she performed as a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The University reviewed and analyzed the PCQ and all information and documentation submitted. It also interviewed the appellant and her supervisors. In its decision, the University determined that the duties performed by the appellant were consistent

¹ Pursuant to a Delegation Order, Memorandum of Understanding (Delegation Order), 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.

with the definition and examples of work included in the job specification for Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services.

On appeal, the appellant argues that she disagrees with the determination that her work does not require the constant exercise of independent judgment and ability to act on her own initiative. The appellant explains that the level of autonomy and expertise she exhibits exceeds the expectations outlined for a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services position. She adds that in the documentation of her reclassification request was a copy of policies and procedures related to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) that did not exist until she assisted in the authorship of the document and ensured its alignment with federal, State, and local policies, and best practices. The appellant also indicates that the following tasks demonstrate her consistent exercise of independent judgement and initiative and highlight the complexity and critical nature of her contributions. The tasks are: determining level of review; review process oversight; conflict of interest assessment; reviewing protocol amendments; informed consent evaluation; protocol monitoring; participant privacy protections; reviewing unanticipated problems; protocol suspension or termination; education and training; policy development and implementation; communication with researchers and sponsors; quality assurance; handling non-compliance; and interpretation of regulations. Further, the appellant asserts that the examples of work indicated in her rejection letter underscore her involvement in tasks that require a higher level of skill, judgement, and initiative, qualities that are more indicative of a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services classification. These tasks included active attendance in meetings or college events, contributions to training and development, organizing and scheduling program events, preparing clear and accurate reports, and monitoring the work of students, staff, and faculty. Finally, she argues that her consistent performance of tasks associated with the Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services title warrants a reconsideration of her current job title.

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 Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services (P18) 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 Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services (P21) 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 main differentiation between the two titles is the level of work. Specifically, a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services performs basic professional functions while a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services independently performs professional work of greater difficulty. A review of the appellant's PCQ indicates that her two main duties are applying federal and State laws when reviewing IRB protocols to ensure compliance and human rights protections along with self-educating and maintaining knowledge on established laws, regulations, procedures, precedents and guidelines (35 percent); and preparing correspondence on IRB findings, corresponding with students, faculty, and staff regarding decision determinations made by IRB, revisions required by the IRB Administrator, and recommendations to rectify issues that may currently violate internal, federal, and/or state policy (15 percent). While these tasks may have some technical complexity to them, they are still considered basic professional functions and they do not rise to the level of professional work of greater difficulty. For illustrative purposes from the Examples of Work from the Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services job specification, monitoring the fiscal affairs of the area and providing information for inclusion in the budget would be an example of a primary duty that would rise to the level of a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services. However, the appellant's primary duties are clearly not at that level. Moreover, the appointing authority indicated that the appellant predominately performs duties that require her to follow pre-determined guidelines and precedents previously established by federal and University guidelines which leave little room for interpretation. Accordingly, the appellant has not presented sufficient evidence to determine that she should be reclassified as a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services and her appeal is therefore denied.

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
THE 30TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2024



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: Britny Dileo
Craig Bickley
Division of Agency Services
Records Center