

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

APPEAL OF ROBERT W. MOORE

September 16, 1987

On Tuesday, July 14, 1987, the Personnel Appeals Board, Commissioners Haseltine, Allard and Platt sitting, heard the appeal of Robert W. Moore, Management Systems Administrator I, salary grade 27, of the Division of Human Services. Mr. Moore was appealing the Division of Personnel's decision denying a request to upgrade his position to Data Processing Project Manager, salary grade 30.

In reviewing the documentation submitted by both the appellant and the Division of Personnel, the Board found that the original request to reallocate the appellant's position was made by then Director of Human Services, Richard Chevrefils in an August 13, 1986 letter to the Director of Personnel. The Division of Personnel completed its review of the position and responded on October 22, 1986, denying the requested upgrade. Acting Human Services Director Clifton Stickney, on November 5, 1986, requested reconsideration of that decision, stating that he would forward documentation to support the request. That documentation was then received by the Division of Personnel on January 16, 1987. In a letter dated April 2, 1987, the current Director of Personnel, Virginia Vogel, again denied the requested upgrading. An appeal before the Board was filed on April 16, 1987.

The May 26, 1987 letter outlining Mr. Moore's appeal stated in part, "It was understood at the time [August, 1984] that if Mr. Moore could bring the intended system [Medicaid Management Information System] to a point where it was certified by Federal Review Teams to receive 75% federal funding for ongoing operations, the Division of Human Services would recommend the reallocation of his job description to that of Data Processing Project Manager, such position being more commensurate with Mr. Moore's now demonstrated performance of such responsibilities."

In reviewing this argument, the Board found that "demonstrated performance" or a recommendation from the appointing authority are insufficient to warrant reclassification of a position. When a position is reviewed, and the results of that review appealed, the decision to grant or deny the appeal must rest solely on the duties and responsibilities inherent in the position, not the performance capacity of the incumbent.

Mr. Moore's appeal questioned the evaluation weight given to certain job attributes for the position Management Systems Administrator I, as

the scope of the duties performed. The Board found the following with regard to the requested point factor reallocations.

Supervision

Mr. Moore's position is currently rated at the 5th degree. Upgrading was requested to the 6th or highest degree defined in the Evaluation Manual as, "Responsible for coordinating the programs or groups of various levels, having full responsibility for the results and effectiveness of all operations under his agency and exercising a measure of responsibility for policy determination at a high level of administrative responsibility." In the appellant's Position Classification Questionnaire, he described his supervisory responsibilities as, "Supervision of programming, clerical and operations...exercised through Contractor Managers in Executive Systems, Operations and Provider Relations areas in accordance with the contract." The Board was not persuaded by this description, nor by Mr. Moore's presentation, that his supervisory responsibility determined policy or carried the full responsibility for the program's results and effectiveness. The Board found, rather, that such responsibility was inherent in the contract with EDS and that the appellant's supervisory responsibilities were more programmatic than policy oriented. The Board could find no rationale for upgrading this factor.

Complexity of Duties

The appellant contended that his duty assignments were best defined for this attribute by the 8th degree in the Evaluation Manual, or "Work comprising participation in the formulation of broad policies and long-term programs, involving thorough analysis of all available data and the making of decisions that serve as guides and general directives to the department as a whole." While the appellant claimed to "regularly and actively participate in discussions and correspondence with Federal representatives," and that he "May comment or propose alternatives," nothing in the appellant's oral or written presentation convinced the Board his duties could be so defined. Rather, the information presented would indicate that Mr. Moore is responsible for insuring that decisions made at the departmental level as specified in the contract with EDS are carried out. The Board therefore found that the Complexity of Duties attribute was more than adequately rated at the 7th degree.

In his classification questionnaire, the appellant stated that the principal function of his position is to, "Monitor the performance of the Contractor and the Computer system in the operation of the N. H. Medicaid Management Information System under the \$2.8 million dollar per year Fiscal Agent contract with EDS Federal Corporation." He described the steps taken to accomplish this function as, "Analyze daily claims, input reports, weekly claim adjudication and suspense reports and monthly

APPEAL OF ROBERT W. MOORE
September 16, 1987
page 3

reports of claims throughout recipient and provider participation. Meet regularly with Contractor to review system operations, resolve problems, and provide for changes to programs and procedures to correct errors or implement new Medicaid policies."

The Board found the appellant's written and oral description of his responsibilities inconsistent with the specification for Data Processing Project Manager. Rather, the Board found the appellant's duties better outlined in his current specification for Management Systems Administrator I: "Performs professional duties of an administrative, analytical and technical nature to accurately interpret and define agency functions in order to ascertain and recommend data processing applications to enhance the efficient and economical performance of these functions; represents the agency in the coordination of pertinent data processing matters with the Department of Centralized Data Processing or supporting agencies." While the appellant seemed to argue that his responsibilities were more complex by virtue of dealing with an outside contractor rather than the Department of Centralized Data Processing, the Board found that such circumstances would, on the contrary decrease the level of complexity. The Board found, however, that the magnitude of the Medicaid program supported rating the liaison function performed by the appellant at salary grade 27.

Based upon all the information and testimony presented, the Board voted unanimously to deny the appeal.

FOR THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD



MARY ANN STEELE
Executive Secretary

mas

cc: Mr. Robert W. Moore
Management Systems Administrator

Clifton Stickney, (Acting) Director
Division of Human Services

Virginia A. Vogel
Director of Personnel

Jan D. Beauchesne, Personnel Officer
Division of Human Services