

inspection documentation, training employees to perform inspections, assigning inspections to employees, obtaining and testing approved copies of software, processing release notes in a database, and distributing release note information to various recipients. The appellant states that she incorrectly indicated on the PCQ that her supervisors provide general supervision of her work assignments. Moreover, the appellant maintains that this agency did not contact her supervisor and obtain information from him at the time the classification evaluation was being conducted.

CONCLUSION

The definition section of the job specification for State Investigator 4, Law and Public Safety states:

Under direction of a State Investigator 1 or 2 or other superior officer in the Division of Gaming Enforcement or Criminal Justice or New Jersey Commission, Department of Law and Public Safety, assists in performing specific field and office work relative to financial, compliance, and enforcement functions, applicants for gaming licensure, or criminal or civil violations of other State statutes; may be authorized to exercise all powers and rights of police officers, constables, and special deputy sheriffs in criminal matters, and may be empowered to act as officer for the detection, apprehension, arrest, and conviction of offenders against the law; does 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; evaluate 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 related duties.

The definition section of the job specification for Administrative Analyst 2, Information Systems states:

Under the limited supervision of an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems, or other supervisory officer in a State department or agency, assists in 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; assists in the evaluation of users' needs and recommends IT solutions; does related duties.

In the instant matter, Agency Services properly determined that the appropriate classification of the appellant's position is Administrative Analyst 2, Information Systems. The January 15, 2020 classification determination indicated that the majority of the appellant's duties (over 50%) constituted evaluating release notes submitted by casino gaming licensees; determining whether such information corresponds with applicable regulations; checking if proposed changes require testing and approval; working with lab engineers for technical matters; working with upper management regarding policy issues; determining if licensee requests will be approved; issuing approval letters containing conditions and requirements; recording information into a database; performing field inspections; developing inspection methodology of approved systems; developing batch files and scripts; effectuating automation of software authentication process; ensuring software in the field matches what is approved by the testing lab; using scripts to confirm that installed software matches approved software by the lab; verifying configuration settings; making sure that PCs are sealed with tape; and referring issues to the IT Investigations unit. Such duties are consistent with those performed by an Administrative Analyst 2, Information Systems.

With respect to the appellant's argument on appeal that she completes assignments under general supervision by her supervisors, she did not provide any substantive evidence in her appeal that would overcome the findings of the January 15, 2020 classification determination regarding that issue. Although the appellant argues that Agency Services did not contact her supervisors at the time the classification evaluation was conducted, she did not provide any evidence in support of that claim. Additionally, there is no Civil Service law or rule which stipulates that an interview must be performed. In this regard, it is noted that this agency typically conducts classification reviews either by a paper review, based on the duties questionnaire completed by the employee and supervisor; an on-site audit with the employee and supervisor; or a formal telephone audit to obtain clarifying information. *See In the Matter of Richard Cook* (Commissioner of Personnel, decided August 22, 2006). In this particular case, as previously noted, the January 15, 2020 classification determination clearly indicates that Agency Services contacted the appellant's

supervisor and her Bureau Chief. As such, the appellant has not presented a sufficient basis to disturb Agency Services' decision that the appropriate classification of her position is Administrative Analyst 2, Information Systems.

Additionally, the purpose of a classification evaluation is to conduct a fact-finding session and the classification reviewer's role is strictly limited to an independent review of the current duties and responsibilities of the position at issue. Further, it is longstanding policy that only those duties and responsibilities assigned at the time of the request for a reclassification are to be considered. In this regard, classification appeals are based solely on the duties performed by an employee at the time of the classification review and not on any subsequent duties or organizational changes. 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, the appellant has not established that Agency Services' methodology in this matter was improper or led to an incorrect result. Even assuming, arguendo, the validity of the appellant's claim, the entire record has once again been thoroughly reviewed in this matter in conjunction with the appellant's appeal and the Civil Service Commission is satisfied that the classification determination was proper.

Accordingly, there is no basis to disturb the determination of Agency Services that the appellant's position is properly classified as Administrative Analyst 2, Information Systems. However, if the appellant believes that she is now performing duties that are not consistent with his current title, she may submit a new classification evaluation request to Agency Services.

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 19TH DAY OF AUGUST 2020

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

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

c: Antoinette McCarthy
 Valerie Stutsman
 Kelly Glenn
 Records Center