



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

In the Matter of Patrick Scheffer,
Motor Vehicle Commission

CSC Docket No. 2018-2580

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: NOVEMBER 26, 2018(WR)

Patrick Scheffer appeals the decision of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that his position with the Motor Vehicle Commission (MVC) is properly classified as a Technical Support Specialist 2. The appellant seeks a Technical Support Specialist 1 classification in this proceeding.

By way of background, the appellant requested a review of his Technical Support Specialist 2 position, the title to which he was regularly appointed on March 5, 2013. An audit was conducted with the appellant and his supervisor, and all relevant documentation was reviewed. The appellant's position is located in the MVC, Division of Information Technology and does not have any supervisory responsibilities. Agency Services found that based on the primary duties of the appellant's position, his title is properly classified as a Technical Support Specialist 2.

On appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), the appellant contends that he performs lead worker responsibilities and makes important decisions concerning hardware, software and networking needs for the 12 agencies he covers. He that asserts he performs lead worker duties as he coordinates with vendors to meet the operational needs of the MVC. The appellant additionally notes that he was the third ranked eligible on the Technical Support Specialist 1, MVC (PS5520T) list, which promulgated on December 7, 2017 and expires on December 6, 2020. In support of his appeal, the appellant submits a copy of his resume which details his duties and copies of his Position Classification

Questionnaire (PCQ) and Performance Assessment Review (PAR). It is noted that neither his PCQ nor PAR indicates that he performs lead worker duties.

CONCLUSION

The definition section of the job specification for Technical Support Specialist 2 states:

Under general supervision, in a mainframe environment, provides direct hands on support to a work shift of the Data Processing Operations unit in resolving production problems from a verbal or written problem reports; consults with Technical Support Specialist 1, and/or network management and systems programming staff for problem diagnosis, assistance, and resolution; monitors and allocates space or direct access storage devices; uses productivity aids in implementing and maintaining software, applications, systems libraries; OR in a client/server environment, provides hardware/software support to end users; installs hardware and software on servers and/or workstations; does other related duties.

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 maintain 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 and/or workstations; does other related duties.

Initially, it is noted that the appellant does not dispute the duties Agency Services found he performs. Rather, he maintains that his coordinating, and working with, vendors are appropriate lead worker duties commensurate with the title Technical Support Specialist 1. In making classification determinations, emphasis is placed on the definition section of the job specification to distinguish one class of positions from another. The definition portion of a job specification is a brief statement of the kind and level of work being performed in a title series and is

relied on to distinguish one class from another. The outcome of position classification is not to provide a career path to the incumbent, but rather is to ensure that the position is classified in the most appropriate title available within the State's classification plan. 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. 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. Moreover, unlike an Technical Support Specialist 1, The appellant does not perform lead worker duties. In this regard, a lead worker refers to those 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 a lower level than themselves. 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. Being a lead worker does not mean that the work is performed by only one person, but involves mentoring others in work of the title series. See *In the Matter of Henry Li* (CSC, decided March 26, 2014). Apart from his conclusory statement on appeal, there is no indication in the record that the appellant performs lead worker duties. In this regard, neither his PAR nor his PCQ indicate that he performs such duties.

Additionally, 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. See *In the Matter of Debra DiCello*, (CSC, decided June 24, 2009). Moreover, the appellant's admittance to an examination for Technical Support Specialist 1 is irrelevant in the instant matter, as the issue in the present matter is whether he was performing the duties of an Technical Support Specialist 1 at the time of his classification review. Accordingly, the appellant's position is properly classified as Technical Support Specialist 2, and he has not presented a sufficient basis to establish that his position is improperly classified.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that the appeal be denied and the position of Patrick Scheffer is properly classified as Technical Support Specialist 2.

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 21st DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2018

Deirdre L. Webster Cobb

Deirdre L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

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

c. Patrick Scheffer
Dana Foraker
Kelly Glenn
Records Center