

# State of New Hampshire

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD  
Edward J. Haseltine, Chairman  
Gerald Allard  
Loretta Platt



EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
Mary Ann Steele

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD  
State House Annex  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
Telephone (603) 271-3261

86-C-100

## APPEAL OF RICHARD ANTONIA

August 3, 1988

On Tuesday, June 14, 1988, the Personnel Appeals Board, Commissioners Cushman and Platt sitting, heard the classification appeal of Richard Antonia, Public Works Engineer V, salary grade 29, Department of Resources and Economic Development. Mr. Antonia, who was represented by SEA Field Representative Stephen McCormack, had appealed the Division of Personnel's June 5, 1986 decision denying a request to upgrade his position to Civil Engineer VII, salary grade 33. Edward J. McCann, Classification and Compensation Administrator, represented the Division of Personnel. Both parties submitted materials for the Board's review prior to the hearing.

In his presentation, the appellant argued that comparison between his present classification and requested reclassification is difficult because classifications allocated at salary grade 30 and above have no points assigned to the nine evaluation attributes. The appellant also compared the Civil Engineer class series, which ranges from salary grade 17 to salary grade 33, to the Public Works Engineer series which ranges from salary grade 17 to salary grade 29. The appellant argued that the one identifiable difference between those two class series is that the Civil Engineer VI and VII positions entail "directing a major engineering division of the Department of Transportation." (SEA submission, February 11, 1988, page 2.) The appellant argued that he is responsible for the Design, Development and Maintenance Section, including quality and quantity of work performed by that section, and that this section actually is a major engineering Division of the Department of Resources and Economic Development. He contended that Resources and Economic Development "is divided into five separate areas: Business Office, Design-Development and Maintenance, Parks and Recreation, Forest and Lands, and Economic Development." He further indicated that three of those sections are headed by unclassified employees, with classified employees heading the Business Office and Design-Development and Maintenance sections, at salary grades 31 and 29 respectively. The appellant then described the scope of his responsibilities.

After considering oral argument by both parties, and reviewing the materials submitted, the Board compared the specifications for Civil Engineer VII and Public Works Engineer V. The Board weighed the responsibilities described by the appellant, finding his position responsibilities at the time of the June 5, 1986 position review decision to be accurately evaluated at Salary grade 29. The Board did not believe the duties described exceeded those contained in the class specification for Public Works Engineer V. Further, the Board found that the appellant's work was not equivalent to that of a major engineering division for, the Department of Transportation.

Finally, the Board reviewed the degree allocation of evaluation attributes for the appellant's position classification at the time of the review decision in June, 1986. The appellant's position is rated at 150 points for Complexity of Duties, requiring "thorough analysis of all available data and the making of decisions that serve as guides and general directions to the department as a whole." The Board found this degree assignment appropriate for the duties described by the appellant. For the attributes of Education and Experience, the Board also found the appellant's position accurately rated at the 5th and 8th degree respectively, requiring a bachelor's degree and seven to eight years of experience. For the attributes of Initiative, the appellant's position is currently rated at the 5th degree, or "work of a high professional level... with responsibility for all planning of work limited only by departmental policy and statute. Makes major decision without consulting superior unless major changes or new long term programs are involved." The Board found this definition accurately described the appellant's work.

The appellant's position is already rated at the highest degree for the Errors attribute, "Reserved for top executives having full and final responsibility for the successful operation of a department..." Given that the appellant actually bears responsibility for a section of a department, the Board found this attribute more than adequate for the level of responsibility of the appellant's position. The appellant's position is rated at the highest degree for Personal Relationships, involving "important contacts of such qualitative nature as to secure acceptance or support of major departmental policies."

For the attribute of Supervision, the appellant's position is currently rated at the 5th, or next to highest, degree. Again, upon consideration of that definition, the Board found this attribute properly evaluated. Both the attributes of Physical Effort and Working Conditions are rated at the second degree for the classification of Public Works Engineer V. Given the nature of the work described by the appellant, the Board found that the weighting of these attributes was also appropriate.

Based upon the foregoing, the Board voted unanimously to deny this appeal, find the appellant's position properly classified as a Public Works Engineer V, salary grade 29.

Appeal of Richard Antonia  
August 3, 1988

page 3

FOR THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD



MARY ANN STEELE

Executive Secretary

cc: Stephen McCormack  
SEA Field Representative  
George C. Jones, Commissioner  
Resources and Economic Development  
Virginia A. Vogel, Director of Personnel