

State of New Hampshire

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD



EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Mary Ann Steele

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

APPEAL OF LESLIE WILLIAMS February 27, 1989

On Wednesday, October 12, 1988, the Personnel Appeals Board consisting of Commissioners Cushman and Platt, heard the classification appeal of Leslie Williams, an employee of the Division of Human Services, Department of Health and Human Services. Ms. Williams, who was represented at the hearing by Human Resource Coordinator Jan D. Beauchesne, was appealing the Division of Personnel's November 19, 1987 decision and June 22, 1988 reconsideration response recommending reclassification of the appellant's position from Management Information Systems Analyst/Programmer I, salary grade 25, to Technical Support Specialist II, salary grade 26. The appellant had requested that her position be reallocated to Technical Support Specialist, salary grade 28.

Edward J. McCann, Classification and Compensation Administrator, represented the Division of Personnel. Both the appellant and the Division of Personnel submitted written material for the Board's consideration prior to the hearing.

The appellant argued that, "A comparison of the Division of Personnel's recommended classification of Technical Support Specialist II, salary grade 26, and this Division's [Human Services'] request for Technical Support Specialist, Salary Grade 28, results in many similar duties. However, the key differentiation between the two is responsibility. The definition of the Technical Support Specialist II includes 'performing highly complex technical duties in assisting...'. 'Assisting' implies that this position aids another in performing specified job duties. The Technical Support Specialist II performs (i.e., diagnoses, prepares, generates, performs, etc.) stated job duties while the Technical Support Specialist, Salary Grade 28, position performs and is also 'responsible' for stated job duties. The position occupied by Leslie Williams does, in fact, perform and have the responsibility for all specified duties."

The appellant contended that the Division of Information Services had provided information to the Division of Personnel during the review of her position based upon data processing expertise. She argued, however, that DIS did not have sufficient knowledge of her actual position responsibilities to make an objective assessment of the job tasks involving a variety of equipment and

software, and the small size of the support group requiring proficiency and responsibility on the part of the technical staff at Human Services. The appellant also argued that the Division of Personnel had not compared her duties and responsibilities to another Technical Support Specialist position located in the Information Center and Technical Support group located in Human Services. The appellant concluded that a detailed review of the original request for reclassification would support classifying her position at the level of Technical Support Specialist, salary grade 28.

In its review of the documentation provided by the appellant, the Board found that the level of supervision exercised by the Technical Support Specialist position and the Technical Support Specialist II position to be one of the clearest differentiations between the two classifications. In the specification for Technical Support Specialist, the definition includes "highly complex specialized technical and supervisory duties..." while the Specialist II level does not.

Under Distinguishing Characteristics, the specification for Technical Support Specialist includes, "Exercises supervision over a staff of professional and technical subordinate personnel with responsibility for organizing and establishing procedures, developing methods, determining flow of work and assigning duties to accomplish level of quality and quantity of computer operating systems and/or related components." The Specialist II specification defines supervision as "Exercises direct supervision over other Technical Support Specialists and other employees within the computer section determining the flow of work and assigning duties so as to accomplish and insure the quality and quantity of work performed is at a high level of technical competence." While these definitions are remarkably similar, the Board found the degree of supervision to be a key distinguishing factor. In the organizational chart provided by the appellant, it appears that she exercises no direct supervision over professional or technical support staff. That conclusion is supported by her classification questionnaire.

In the case of the position to which the appellant has compared her responsibilities, appears that Mr. Fraser is responsible for supervision of another Analyst Programmer I, and an EDP Peripheral Equipment Operator. Neither the written nor oral presentation by the appellant addressed this issue. Based upon the evidence submitted, the Board concluded that the Technical Support Specialist position to which the appellant compared her duties has a broader and more comprehensive range of supervisory responsibilities.

Upon consideration of the record in this appeal, the Board found that the appellant had provided insufficient evidence to support a finding that her position should have been reallocated to Technical Support Specialist, salary grade 28, at the time of the review decision on November 19, 1987. The

APPEAL OF LESLIE WILLIAMS

February 27, 1989
page 3

Board therefore voted to deny the appeal, finding the appellant's position at the time of the review properly allocated at salary grade 26, Technical Support specialist II.

FOR THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD



MARY ANN STEELE
Executive Secretary

mas

cc: Jan D. Beauchesne, Human Resource Coordinator
Division of Human Services

Virginia Vogel
Director of Personnel