

# 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 ALICE PILOTTE

March 30, 1988

On Tuesday, February 9, 1988, the Personnel Appeals Board, Commissioners Cushman and Platt sitting heard the classification appeal of Alice Pilotte, an employee of the Division of Human Services. The appellant, represented at the hearing by Rosemary Faretra and Beverly Huckins,, was appealing the Division of Personnel's decision denying a request to reallocate her position from Administrative Assistant ■, Salary Grade 15 to Supervisor ■, Salary Grade 18.

Both the appellant and the Division of Personnel submitted written arguments for review by the Appeals Board. Edward J. McCann, Classification and Compensation Administrator, represented the Division of Personnel.

Ms. Faretra described the appellant's position, arguing that the scope of her responsibilities exceeded those outlined in the Administrative Assistant I specification. In testimony before the Board, she expanded upon then (Acting) Director Clifton Stickney's August 14, 1987 argument that the review decision and denial of reclassification did not take "into consideration the overall complexity of the operation and the importance of the functions performed in this position."

Upon review of the testimony and evidence submitted, the Board made the following findings.

### Complexity of Duties

The appellant, whose position is currently rated at the 4th degree for this attribute, has requested an increase to the 5th degree, or 80 points. The Board did not find the duties described by the appellant supported increasing this attribute. Rather, the Board found the scope of work outlined by the appellant is adequately defined at its current degree definition as it required "... application of broader aspects of established practices and procedures to problems and situations not falling clearly or concisely within the limitations of accepted standards or modifying methods and standards to meet variations in controlling conditions."

The appellant argued that a combination of nine years of experience and education would be required for an incumbent to satisfactorily complete the work. The current specification and degree allocations for the position Administrative Assistant I require an employee at entry level to possess an Associate's degree with a major study in business administration, accounting or a related field, plus three years' experience in responsible office or business management activities. The specification will allow for equivalent combinations of education and experience. The evaluation manual points out that experience and education are considered only as they relate to the position responsibilities. The Board found these attributes correctly evaluated at the sixth and fourth degree respectively.

Personal Relationships

The appellant suggested that the Personal Relationships attribute warranted an increase from the fourth to the fifth degree, because of the appellant's contact "with staff at all levels in the department, State and Federal agencies, vendors and artists. They are made to obtain or give information, discuss problems, obtain or give cooperation and assistance." This description is adequately reflected in the appellant's current evaluation at the fourth degree for this attribute.

Supervision

The appellant requested that the Board increase the Supervision attribute from the fourth to the fifth degree. The Board found this request unsupported by either the testimony or evidence received at the hearing. The Board did not find that the appellant exercised supervisory responsibility for "a group of subordinates.. .. at a high level of technical, professional or scientific competence.

Physical Effort and Working Conditions

While neither of these attributes was addressed in the appellants' presentation, reallocation from Administrative Assistant I to Supervisor I would result in a one degree increase for each attribute. Neither increase can be supported by the description of the work performed by Ms. Pilotte.

The Board, in consideration of the foregoing, therefore voted unanimously to deny the appeal.

FOR THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD



Mary Ann Steele  
Executive Secretary

cc: Jan D. Beauchesne, Human Resources Coordinator  
Division of Human Services  
Ms. Alice Pilotte, Administrative Assistant  
Division of Human Services  
Virginia A. Vogel  
Director of Personnel