



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Donna Meredith and Kerry Hallman, Office of Information Technology	:	FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CSC Docket Nos. 2026-159 and 2026- 160	:	
	:	Reconsideration
	:	
	:	
	:	

ISSUED: October 15, 2025 (SLK)

Donna Meredith and Kerry Hallman, represented by Richard A. Dann, Staff Representative, Communication Workers of America, request reconsideration of *In the Matter of Donna Meredith and Kerry Hallman* (Chair/CEO, decided June 17, 2025) (Decision) which determined that the proper classification of their positions with the Office of Information Technology is Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems (53096, A13). The appellants seek a Technical Support Specialist 1 (53061, P20) classification.¹ These appeals have been consolidated due to common issues presented.

By way of background, the appellants previously submitted position classification reviews requesting Technical Support Specialist 1 classifications. The Division of Agency Services determined that their positions should be classified as Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems. On appeal, in *In the Matter of Donna Meredith and Kerry Hallman* (CSC, decided December 15, 2021),² the Civil Service Commission (Commission) noted that there were multiple Civil Service titles with little discernable difference in help desk activities. Consequently, the Commission ordered that the matter of the job specifications which indicate help desk

¹ At the time of the initial classification review requests, the requested title was Technical Support Specialist 2, which has now been renumbered to Technical Support Specialist 1.

² On September 13, 2023, the Commission issued a corrected decision to indicate that "both appellants state that, after three months, they worked a solo shift without a lead worker or supervisor, including weekends."

duties be referred to Agency Services for review and any revisions it deemed appropriate. It further ordered that the appeals be remanded to Agency Services to determine the positions' applicable titles after a review of the job specifications which require help desk duties. Thereafter, Agency Services revised the job specifications and issued new determination letters finding that, based on the revised job specifications, the proper classification of the appellants' positions was Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems. On appeal, the Decision upheld Agency Services' determinations.

On reconsideration, the appellants present that the primarily record consists of their PCQs, which included statements from their supervisors, and job specifications. They believe that in the absence of any rebuttal to their PCQs, their descriptions of duties must be credited. The appellants state that they work under limited supervision and were even assigned solo shifts. They provide that their primary duties, as indicated on their PCQs are "assist all State agencies with hardware/software support," handle "inquiries, incidents, problems and requests from systems users," provide "technical assistance to resolve the issues effectively and efficiently," "identify and resolve network problems," and "troubleshoot and verify circuit connections with Verizon and AT&T." The appellants also reset passwords, tracked service tickets, logged information about incidents, and prepared technical reports, among various other tasks.

The appellants argue that the Decision erred because it concluded that the appellants' duties lacked complexity despite the absence of support for this conclusion by the proffered findings. They note that the Decision indicated that based on the job specification definitions, incumbents in the Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems title "perform the more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities" while Technical Support Specialist 1s "handle assigned problems which may include moderately complex and/or critical issues short of the highest level." The appellants present that the Decision concluded that "other than the appellants' mere assertion, there is nothing in the record that indicates that their primary duties at that time were to perform help desk duties that rose to the level of moderately complex and/or critical [short] of the highest level."

The appellants contend that the Decision misread their PCQs when it found that their statements that stated that they "performed first-level help desk support" implied that their duties were at the lowest level of complexity. However, they provide that their statement that they "[p]rovide first level support and guidance for new and lesser experience team members, so that daily tasks are met and completed" simply meant that they helped less experience team members with daily tasks and not that their work lacked complexity. Regarding the Decision finding that they acknowledged that they "perform more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities at least some of the time" does not signify that they predominantly performed basic and repetitive duties. The appellants assert that they have

maintained that the bulk of their duties were more complex. Moreover, while the Decision relied on their immediate supervisor's statements claiming that their work is consistent with a Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems, that opinion is not determinative and conclusory without support. Therefore, they believe that their immediate supervisor's statement cannot be used to support the determination.

The appellants assert that the Decision erred because it failed to consider relevant evidence of the work performed. Specifically, the appellants present that they work under limited supervision which is consistent with the Technical Support Specialist 1 job specification definition. They note that their PCQs identify that they work under limited supervision, including solo shifts with no supervisor or lead employee present. However, the appellants emphasize that the Decision made no determination regarding the level of supervision and contend that if it had, that determination would have supported their claim that they performed higher-level work.

The appellants argue that their duties plainly exceeded those of a Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems. They assert that the Technical Assistant, Management Information System Examples of Work indicate that incumbents in this title mainly assist other help desk employees. For example, the Examples of Work state that an incumbent "assists in providing end users with remote operations, applications and technical support," which makes sense for this adjunct role for an employee who performs tasks that are "basic" and "repetitive." On the other hand, the appellant present that the Technical Support Specialist 1 Examples of Work indicate that an incumbent "provides hardware/software support to end users" and receive calls, emails, and tickets at the help desk and handle assigned problems. In short, they state that Technical Support Specialist 1s are directly responsible for providing technical support and are not mere assistants.

The appellants highlight that their PCQs indicate that they performed a full range of help desk duties including hardware and software support, handling inquiries and requests from systems users, identifying problems, and providing technical assistance to resolve issues. They reiterate that there is nothing in their PCQs to suggest that they were limited to an assistant role; yet the Decision did not recognize this distinguishing characteristic. The appellants list certain duties as described on their PCQs and how those duties match the Technical Support Specialist 1 Examples of Work. They state that these duties represent the bulk of their time and cannot be written off as occasional departures from a basic, repetitive routine. Also, the appellants highlight that these duties are not in the Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems Examples of Work. They argue that the Decision ignores these duties by explaining that Examples of Work are not determinative as job specification definition is used to determine position classification and it is not uncommon for an employee to perform some higher-level work. The appellants

contend that Examples of Work are a valuable guide in determining the correct title. In summary, the appellants argue that since their duties match the Technical Support Specialist 1 Examples of Work, this illustrates that they performed moderately complex duties at the level to warrant a classification to that title.³

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.6(a) provides that within 45 days of receipt of a decision, a party to the appeal may petition the Civil Service Commission for reconsideration. *N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.6(b)* sets forth the standards by which a prior decision may be reconsidered. This rule provides that a party must show that a clear material error has occurred or present new evidence or additional information not presented at the original proceeding which would change the outcome of the case and the reasons that such evidence was not presented at the original proceeding. *N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.4(c)* provides that the appellant has the burden of proof on appeal.

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 Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems job specification states:

Under supervision of a supervisory official assigned to a program or operational unit having responsibility for a specific, existing information processing system operation, performs technical functions in support of management information systems used to process varied types of financial, program, or other information unique to the unit; operates computer terminal or PC for information processing; installs, utilizes, maintains, and troubleshoots information processing systems and system software; organizes, inputs, processes, and outputs source materials, raw data, and processed data; sets up and maintains data bases and software files; performs file maintenance; provides technical information/assistance to other system users; OR, under supervision of a supervisory official in a client-server environment, performs the more basic and repetitive levels of help desk responsibilities; performs other related duties as required.

The definition section of the Technical Support Specialist 1 job specification states:

³ The appellants also request that the reconsideration be referred to the Commission for a decision. As this matter is being decided by the Commission, that request is moot.

Under limited supervision, provides direct hands on support for an information technology unit in resolving moderately complex production problems from verbal or written problem reports; consults with Technical Support Specialist 2, 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, and systems libraries; OR under limited supervision in a client/server environment, provides hardware/software support to end users; installs hardware and software on servers and/or workstations; receives calls, emails, and tickets at the help desk and handles assigned problems which may include moderately complex and/or critical issues short of the highest level; performs other related duties as required.

In this matter, the record indicates that in *In the Matter of Donna Meredith and Kerry Hallman* (CSC, decided December 15, 2021), the Commission presented Agency Services' findings of the appellants' primary duties. Further, in that decision it noted that at least five other titles had these help desk duties as part of their definitions. Therefore, the Commission remanded the matter to review the job specifications to further distinguish their definitions if necessary. However, the Commission did not remand or find any issue with Agency Services' determination of the appellants' primary duties. Further, the record does not indicate that the appellants filed for reconsideration at that time regarding Agency Services' findings of their primary duties. Thereafter, on September 13, 2023, the Commission issued a corrected decision only to indicate that "both the appellants state that, after the first three months, they worked solo shifts without a lead worker or supervisor, including weekends." It is noted that this was not a Commission finding, but simply an inclusion of the appellants' statement. The record does not indicate that the appellants filed for reconsideration of their job duties at that time. After Agency Services re-evaluated the appellants' credentials based on a review of the revised job specifications, it issued determinations based on its findings of the appellants' primary duties from their PCQs and the revised job specifications. These determinations found that the appellants' positions at the time of the classification reviews, based on the revised job specification definitions, were consistent with a Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems classification. Subsequently, the appellants' appealed arguing that Agency Services' determination of their primary duties did not capture the level of difficulty and responsibility which their positions require.

Therefore, the Commission finds that the appellants' argument regarding the complexity of their duties is not timely as it well over 45 days from when the Commission issued its December 15, 2021, decision which only found issue with subject job specification definitions and not with Agency Services' findings of their

primary duties. This was reiterated in the June 17, 2025, Decision where it was stated that “it is noted that the Commission did not find that Agency Services’ initial determination regarding the appellants’ primary duties or the classification of their positions was incorrect. Instead, the Commission found issue with the job specifications in that they could not be differentiated and, therefore it referred the matter to revise the job specifications and to issue new determinations based on these revisions.” Consequently, the appellants have not met the standard for reconsideration as it was not error for the Decision to use Agency Services’ determination of their primary duties in making the determination that the appellants’ positions were properly classified as Technical Assistant, Management Information Systems based on their duties. Moreover, the appellants’ argument that it was error for the Decision not to consider the Examples of Work in the subject job specification is unpersuasive as it is well established under the State’ Classification Plan that Examples of Work are only to be used for illustrative purposes and position classification is based on the job specification definitions section.

Concerning the appellants’ comments about limited supervision, the Decision indicated that the **key** differentiator between the subject titles was based on the level of complexity of the work performed. Therefore, it was not error for the Decision to not comment on every difference between the two titles. Regarding the appellants’ claim that the duties on their PCQs should be considered not rebutted and their immediate supervisors’ comments should be excluded as unsupported and conclusionary, while it is true that the appellants’ supervisor’s comments are not determinative, their supervisors’ comments are validly considered as are the appellants’ own descriptions of their duties. In this regard, Agency Services and subsequently, the Chairperson in the Decision, properly reviewed and considered the entire record in making the prior determinations.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these requests 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 15TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025



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: Donna Meredith (2026-159)
 Kerry Hallman (2026-160)
 Richard A. Dann, Staff Representative
 Division of Agency Services
 Records Center