

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Daniel S. Beaver	:	State Civil Service Commission
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Department of Human Services	:	: Appeal No. 30339

Desanie D. Miller  
Indispensable Party<sup>1</sup>

Daniel S. Beaver  
*Pro Se*

Peter J. Garcia  
Attorney for Appointing Authority

ADJUDICATION

This is an appeal by Daniel S. Beaver challenging his non-selection for promotion to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor employment with the Department of Human Services. A hearing was held on January 30, 2020, at the Strawberry Square Complex in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania before Commissioner Gregory M. Lane.

The Commissioners have reviewed the Notes of Testimony and exhibits introduced at the hearing, as well as the Briefs submitted by the parties.<sup>2</sup> The issue before the Commission is whether appellant established his non-selection for promotion was the result of discrimination by the appointing authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> In recognition of the due process requirements noted in *Jefferson County Assistance Office, Department of Public Welfare v. Wolfe*, 136 Pa. Commw. 115, 582 A. 2d 425 (1990), the individual currently occupying the challenged position was given the opportunity to participate in the proceedings. Comm. Ex. C. The indispensable party was present and participated in the proceedings. Comm. Ex. C-1; N.T. p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> The Indispensable Party did not submit a Brief in this matter.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On August 2, 2019, appellant was notified of his non-selection to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor (hereinafter “HSPSS”) employment with the appointing authority. Comm. Ex. A.
2. The appeal was properly raised before this Commission and was heard under Section 3003(7)(ii) of Act 71 of 2018. Comm. Exs. D, E
3. The first HSPSS job posting was open from June 21, 2019 through July 1, 2019. The job posting permitted eligible candidates to be selected for the position through a promotion, transfer, lateral, or voluntary demotion. N.T. p. 25, AA Ex. 1.
4. Appellant applied for the position during the first HSPSS job posting. N.T. p. 26.
5. Desanie Miller applied during the first HSPSS job posting as well; however, Administrative Officer 2 Karen Stahr did not receive Miller’s application or related documents due to an error in the NEOGOV system. N.T. p. 27.

6. Due to receiving complaints from other candidates about being unable to submit their applications for job positions and to having a small candidate pool for the position, Stahr and the appointing authority's program office decided to repost the HSPSS position for an additional five days. N.T. pp. 28-29; AA Ex. 3.
7. Miller reapplied during the second HSPSS job posting and Miller's application and related documents were accepted. N.T. p. 29.
8. Office of Income Maintenance (hereinafter "OIM") Policy and Program Manager Brian Whorl, Income Maintenance Program Evaluation Manager Norma Hill, and OIM Program Operations Manager Linda Webber participated as interview panelists for the HSPSS position. N.T. pp. 52-53, 78, 79, 81, 90.
9. Webber was responsible for drafting the interview questions for the interviews. N.T. pp. 57, 89.
10. The interview panelists conducted Desanie Miller's interview on July 18, 2019. N.T. pp. 60-68; AA Ex. 5(A).

11. The interview panelists conducted appellant's interview on July 24, 2019. N.T. pp. 60-68; AA Ex. 5(B).
12. After the interviews were conducted, the candidates were ranked according to their interview performance. Miller was ranked first while appellant was ranked second among the four candidates interviewed. N.T. pp. 81-82, 83; AA Ex. 7.

### DISCUSSION

The issue in the present appeal is whether appellant has established his non-selection for promotion to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor (hereinafter "HSPSS") employment with the appointing authority was the result of discrimination. In his appeal, appellant alleged the appointing authority retaliated against him for filing a prior appeal with the State Civil Service Commission in 2008.

In an appeal alleging discrimination, the burden of presenting evidence in support of all allegations of discrimination lies with the appellant. *Nosko v. Somerset State Hospital*, 139 Pa. Commw. 367, 370-371, 590 A.2d. 844, 846 (1991). Accordingly, the sole question for determination by this Commission is whether appellant has presented evidence sufficient to establish his claim of discrimination.

Section 2704 of Act 71 of 2018 provides:

An officer or employee of the Commonwealth may not discriminate against an individual in recruitment, examination, appointment, training, promotion, retention or any other personnel action with respect to the classified service because of race, gender, religion, disability or political, partisan or labor union affiliation or other nonmerit factors.

71 Pa.C.S.A § 2704. The provisions of Section 2704 are substantially the same as the provisions in Section 905.1 of Act 286 (71 P.S. § 741.905a), and both sections of the respective acts use virtually the same language.<sup>3</sup> The prohibition set forth in this section encompasses two general types of discrimination. First, “traditional discrimination” encompasses claims of discrimination based on labor union affiliation, race, sex, national origin or other non-merit factors; and second, “technical discrimination” involves a violation of procedures required pursuant to the Act or related Rules. *Price v. Luzerne/Wyoming Counties Area Agency on Aging*, 672 A.2d 409, 411 n. 4 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996), citing *Pronko v. Department of Revenue*, 114 Pa. Commw. 428, 539 A.2d 462 (1988). In the instant matter, this appeal involves a claim of traditional discrimination.

In analyzing claims of discrimination under Section 2704 of the Act, appellant has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of discrimination by producing sufficient evidence, if believed and otherwise unexplained, indicates that more likely than not discrimination has occurred. 71 Pa.C.S.A. § 2704; *Department*

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 905.1 provides:

905.1 Prohibition of Discrimination—No officer or employe[e] of the Commonwealth shall discriminate against any person in recruitment, examination, appointment, training, promotion, retention or any other personnel action with respect to the classified service because of political or religious opinions or affiliations because of labor union affiliations or because of race, national origin or other non-merit factors.

*of Health v. Nwogwugwu*, 141 Pa. Commw. 33, 38, 594 A.2d 847, 850 (1991). The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case cannot be an onerous one. *Henderson v. Office of the Budget*, 126 Pa. Commw. 607, 560 A.2d 859 (1989) *petition for allowance of appeal denied*, 524 Pa. 633, 574 A.2d 73 (1990). In particular, an employee claiming disparate treatment must demonstrate that he or she was treated differently than other similarly situated employees. *Nwogwugwu*, 141 Pa. Commw. at 40, 594 A.2d at 851.

A retaliation claim is a specific subcategory of the broader category of non-merit factor discrimination. In a retaliation case, appellant may establish a *prima facie* case by proving 1) he engaged in a protected activity; 2) the appointing authority was aware of the protected activity; 3) that subsequent to participation in the protected activity, appellant was subjected to an adverse employment action by the appointing authority; and 4) that there is a causal connection between participation in the protected activity and the adverse employment action. *Robert Wholey Co., Inc. v. Pennsylvania Human Rel. Commn.*, 606 A2d 982, 983 (Pa. Commw. 1992) citing *Brown Transport Corp. v. Pennsylvania Human Rel. Commn.*, 578 A.2d 555 (Pa. Commw. 1990). When participation in a protected activity and the occurrence of an adverse employment action occurs within close proximity in time, causation is inferred. *Id.* at 984.

Once a *prima facie* case of discrimination has been established, the burden of production then shifts to the appointing authority to advance a legitimate non-discriminatory reason for the personnel action. If it does, the burden returns to appellant, who always retains the ultimate burden of persuasion, to demonstrate that the proffered merit reason for the personnel action is merely pretextual. *Henderson*, 126 Pa. Commw. at 614-615.

At the hearing, appellant testified on his own behalf and presented the testimony of Administrative Officer 2 Karen Stahr,<sup>4</sup> Office of Income Maintenance (hereinafter “OIM”) Policy and Program Manager Brian Whorl,<sup>5</sup> Income Maintenance Program Evaluation Manager Norma Hill,<sup>6</sup> OIM Program Operations Manager Linda Webber.<sup>7</sup> In response, the appointing authority did not present any testimony.

According to Stahr, the first Human Services Program Specialists job posting only permitted employees within the Bureau of Policy to apply internally. The first internal job posting was open for ten days from June 21, 2019, through July 1, 2019. N.T. p. 25; AA Ex. 1. Stahr explained pursuant to the Bureau of Policy’s Organizational Chart and the job posting, eligible candidates would be able to be selected for the position through a promotion, transfer, lateral, or voluntary demotion. N.T. p. 25; AA Exs. 1, 2. Within the Bureau of Policy, there are at least forty-one Human Services Program Specialists that could have applied for the position as a promotion. N.T. pp. 23-24. Of the forty-one Human Services Program Specialists, only three candidates, including appellant, applied for the position. N.T. p. 26.

---

<sup>4</sup> Karen Stahr is employed by the appointing authority as an Administrative Officer 2 in the Office of Income Maintenance. N.T. p. 18. As an Administrative Officer, Stahr coordinates the hiring process for over 450 positions. N.T. p. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Brian Whorl is employed by the appointing authority as an Office of Income Maintenance Policy and Program Manager for the Division of Federal Programs and Program Management within the Bureau of Policy. N.T. p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Norma Hill is employed as an Income Maintenance Program Evaluation Manager within the appointing authority’s Office of Income Maintenance. N.T. p. 76.

<sup>7</sup> Linda Webber is employed by the appointing authority as an Office of Income Management Program Operations Manager. N.T. p. 87.

Stahr testified the selected candidate, Desanie Miller, applied for the HSPSS position through the first internal posting. However, Stahr did not initially receive Miller's application through NEOGOV. Stahr explained although she discovered Miller applied during the ten-day period, Miller was not notified that her documents did not upload onto the NEOGOV system. Stahr recalled receiving multiple calls from candidates complaining how they were unable to upload documents in the relatively new NEOGOV system. N.T. p. 27. In response, Stahr contacted the program office and they decided since there was such a small candidate pool for the position, they would repost the position for an additional five days for new candidates to apply. N.T. pp. 28-29; AA Ex. 3. During the time period of the second HSPSS job posting, Miller applied for the position and her application and related documents were accepted. N.T. p. 29. Miller explained there have been several times the appointing authority has reposted a position through NEOGOV when candidates experienced difficulties with uploading their applications and documents. N.T. p. 30.

Whorl, Hill, and Webber participated as interview panelists for the HSPSS position. N.T. pp. 52-53, 78, 79, 81, 90. Webber was responsible for drafting the interview questions. N.T. pp. 57, 89. Whorl explained how he completed each candidate's interview scoring sheets throughout the interview process. Whorl, Hill, and Webber filled out the interview scoring sheets immediately after the candidate completed his or her interview. N.T. pp. 52-53. Each candidate was asked five questions during his or her interview. N.T. p. 58; AA Exs. 5(A), 5(B).

Whorl described the interview questions, evaluated skill sets, and rating scores for appellant’s interview on July 24, 2019, and Miller’s interview on July 18, 2019. For each interview question, there are the following ratings: excellent, above average, average, below average, and unsatisfactory. AA Exs. 5(A), 5(B).

Whorl testified the first question “was designed to gather both their experience with researching and other policy matters and also experience in leadership positions . . . because we were interviewing for a supervisory role.” N.T. p. 55. The first question’s evaluated skill sets were job related experience, communications, analytical, organizational skills, research experience, and attention to detail. Whorl’s ratings for both appellant and Miller are summarized below.

<b>First Interview Question’s Evaluated Skill Set Ratings - Whorl</b>		
<b><u>Skill Sets</u></b>	<b><u>Appellant (AA. Ex. 5(B))</u></b>	<b><u>Miller (AA Ex. 5(A))</u></b>
Job Related Experience	Excellent	Excellent
Communication	Above Average	Above Average
Analytical	<b>(BLANK)</b>	Average
Organizational Skills	Average	Average
Research Experience	Excellent	Above Average
Attention to Detail	Average	Average

The second question “was seeking to assess the person’s knowledge of these topics and also their ability to work and manage and interact with a team of individuals.” N.T. p. 55. When asked by appellant, Webber read the second interview question as follows:

As the planning unit supervisor, you will be responsible for some specialized programs, including the family estate planning annual reports, homeless assistance programs, statewide instant drug testing, et cetera. You may be supervising and working with people who have more experience and knowledge in these programs than you do

or who worked in the division longer. What challenges do you perceive, and what steps would you take to overcome these challenges?

N.T. p. 91. The second interview question's evaluated skill sets were communications, teamwork, leadership skills, problem solving/decision making, initiative, flexibility, and dedication. Whorl's ratings for appellant and Miller are summarized below. N.T. pp. 61-62; AA Ex. 5(A).

<b>Second Interview Question's Evaluated Skill Set Ratings - Whorl</b>		
<b><u>Skill Sets</u></b>	<b><u>Appellant (AA. Ex. 5(B))</u></b>	<b><u>Miller (AA Ex. 5(A))</u></b>
Communication	Above Average	Above Average
Teamwork	Above Average	Above Average
Leadership skills	Above Average	Above Average
Problem Solving/Decision Making Skills	Above Average	Average
Initiative	Average	Average
Flexibility	Average	Average
Dedication	Average	Average

The third question "was designed to assess an individual's knowledge and ability of working with a particularly troubled situation with an --- with an employee." N.T. p. 56. The third interview question's evaluated skill sets were communication, analytical, teamwork, leadership skills, problem solving/decision making, organizational skills, and flexibility. Whorl's ratings for appellant and Miller are summarized below. N.T. pp. 62-63; AA Ex. 5(A).

<b>Third Interview Question's Evaluated Skill Set Ratings – Whorl</b>		
<b><u>Skill Sets</u></b>	<b><u>Appellant (AA. Ex. 5(B))</u></b>	<b><u>Miller (AA Ex. 5(A))</u></b>
Communication	Above Average	Above Average
Analytical	Above Average	Above Average
Teamwork	Above Average	Above Average
Leadership Skills	Above Average	Above Average

Problem Solving/Decision Making Skills	Average	Above Average
Organizational Skills	Average	Average
Flexibility	Below Average	Average

The fourth question “was designed to capture what character traits each candidate valued in a leadership position.” N.T. p. 56. The evaluated skill sets for the fourth question were job related experience, communications, analytical, teamwork, leadership skills, problem solving/decision making, time management and organizational skills. Whorl’s ratings for appellant and Miller are summarized below. N.T. pp. 64-66; AA Ex. 5(A).

<b>Fourth Interview Question’s Evaluated Skill Set Ratings - Whorl</b>		
<b><u>Skill Sets</u></b>	<b><u>Appellant (AA. Ex. 5(B))</u></b>	<b><u>Miller (AA Ex. 5(A))</u></b>
Job Related Experience	Above Average	Above Average
Communication	Above Average	Above Average
Analytical	Average	Average
Teamwork	Average	Above Average
Leadership Skills	Average	Above Average
Problem Solving/Decision Making Skills	Average	Average
Time Management	Below Average	Average
Organizational Skills	Below Average	Above Average

The fifth question “was to see critical thinking, like, what sort of ideas the person could come up with and then assess their knowledge of the steps that are needed to implement their proposal and then also how they would use their staff to implement said proposal.” N.T. p. 57. The evaluated skill sets for the fifth question were job related experience, communications, analytical, teamwork, leadership skills, problem solving/decision making, time management, organizational skills,

research experience, attention to detail, initiative, flexibility, and dedication. Whorl's ratings for appellant and Miller are summarized below. N.T. pp. 66-68; AA Ex. 5(A).

<b>Fifth Interview Question's Evaluated Skill Set Ratings - Whorl</b>		
<b><u>Skill Sets</u></b>	<b><u>Appellant (AA. Ex. 5(B))</u></b>	<b><u>Miller (AA Ex. 5(A))</u></b>
Job Related Experience	Above Average	Above Average
Communication	Above Average	Above Average
Analytical	Average	Average
Teamwork	Average	Average
Leadership Skills	Average	Average
Problem Solving/Decision Making Skills	Average	Average
Time Management	Average	Average
Organizational Skills	Average	Average
Research Experience	Below Average	Average
Attention to Detail	Below Average	Average
Initiative	Average	Average
Flexibility	Below Average	Average
Dedication	Average	Average

When asked how he rated appellant's and Miller's interview performance overall, Whorl testified he rated both candidates as above average. N.T. p. 68; AA Exs. 5(A), 5(B). Whorl felt that although appellant and Miller provided good interviews, Miller provided a stronger interview than appellant. N.T. p. 68. Specifically, Whorl compared:

[appellant's] questions versus [Miller's] questions, hers were very, you know, satisfactory, above satisfactory, or excellent throughout the entire scoring process, whereas with your questions, as I said, you had some very strong answers for the first, second, and third questions. And then the fourth question was okay. And then the fifth question was where I felt that there was some

inconsistency ---no inconsistencies, lack of foundational knowledge there that was worrisome as part of that interview.

N.T. p. 44. Whorl recalled informing appellant that he performed strongly on the first couple of interview questions. But, when the interview continued, Whorl considered appellant's answers "trailed off" in comparison to Miller's interview responses. N.T. pp. 43, 71.

Whorl emphasized each assessment of a candidate's skills were done solely based on what the candidate presented during the interview. Whorl denied comparing candidates while assessing a candidate's interview score. N.T. pp. 53, 69. Hill also testified she evaluated each of appellant's responses individually and independently. N.T. pp. 78, 79. Hill emphasized her evaluation of appellant's interview performance was not influenced by anything outside of how appellant responded during the interview. N.T. p. 80. When asked by appellant if Whorl submitted an incomplete record, Whorl agreed that the record is incomplete but could not provide an explanation for how no one noticed the record incomplete until appellant reviewed it. N.T. p. 49.<sup>8</sup>

After the interviews were complete and the interview panelists completed their evaluations of each candidate's performance, Hill explained the interview panelists' assessments were compiled to rank the most qualifying candidate. N.T. pp. 81-82. According to the HSPSS Ranking Sheet, Miller ranked first and appellant ranked second in comparison to the remaining candidates. N.T. p. 83; AA Ex. 7.

---

<sup>8</sup> Specifically, for appellant's first interview question, the analytical skill set does not have a rating. AA Ex. 5(B).

Appellant testified his claim of retaliation is based on the appointing authority retaliating against him for filing an appeal challenging his non-selection for promotion to HSPSS employment in 2008.<sup>9</sup> N.T. p. 105. Appellant further alleged his non-selection for promotion occurred because Webber, who was responsible for creating the interview questions and participated as an interview panelist, was the Indispensable Party in relation to his appeal many years ago. N.T. p. 102. As part of his retaliation claim, appellant asserts the appointing authority reposted the HSPSS position under the same “favoritism” appellant alleged against the appointing authority in his appeal in 2008. N.T. p. 102.

Stahr recalled appellant submitting an appeal to the State Civil Service Commission. N.T. pp. 35, 36. Hill was not aware of appellant’s prior appeal with the State Civil Service Commission many years ago. Hill also did not hear Whorl or Webber discuss anything regarding appellant’s prior appeal throughout the interview process. N.T. p. 84. Webber recalled appellant submitting an appeal to the State Civil Service Commission. Webber confirmed she was the Indispensable Party since she was selected for a challenged position instead of appellant. N.T. p. 90. Whorl emphasized appellant’s prior appeal with the State Civil Service Commission was not taken into consideration when rating appellant’s responses. N.T. p. 70.

Appellant also argued the second interview question provided an unfair advantage to other candidates because there was no other employee within the Bureau of Policy that had worked there longer than appellant. N.T. pp. 100, 104.

---

<sup>9</sup> The Commission takes administrative notice of our decision in the matter of *Daniel S. Beaver v. Department of Public Welfare* Appeal No. 25689, where we concluded that Mr. Beaver had failed to present evidence establishing discrimination violative of § 905.1 of the Civil Service Act and dismissed his appeal on June 27, 2008. *Daniel S. Beaver v. Department of Public Welfare* Appeal No. 25689.

Appellant explained he previously applied for the HSPSS position but the second interview question was never asked before. N.T. p. 99. Appellant felt that “psychologically this question threw me off from the time I read it fifteen minutes before I went in, because I kept looking at it trying to figure out how I was going to answer this, because nobody who was in my unit had been there longer than me.” N.T. p. 101. Appellant alleged the second interview question presents the appointing authority’s bias specifically towards him. After the second interview question, appellant states he believed there was no way he was going to be selected.

In response, Webber believed appellant misinterpreted the question after he asked how the question was fair to him. Webber explained all of the candidates for the HSPSS position would have had to cooperate with individuals who were either employed with the appointing authority longer than they were or had more experience in their assigned programs. N.T. pp. 93-94. Appellant acknowledged he was aware that the interview process for the HSPSS position would be competitive. N.T. p. 103. Appellant understood it was his responsibility to present his knowledge and relevant experience throughout his interview. N.T. p. 104.

Having carefully reviewed the record, we now address whether appellant established a *prima facie* case of traditional discrimination under the basis of retaliation. Appellant engaged in the protected activity of filing an appeal of his non-selection for promotion to the HSPSS position in 2008. The appointing authority and two of the interview panelists, Whorl and Webber, were aware of appellant’s protected activity. Although the time elapsed between appellant’s appeal in 2008 and his subsequent non-selection for promotion in 2019 are eleven years apart, the non-selection for promotion for the current HSPSS position is a

subsequent, adverse employment action by the appointing authority. Considering Webber was the Indispensable Party in appellant's appeal in 2008 and the indisputable fact that she served as an interview panelist for the current HSPSS position, there is a causal connection, in the instant matter, between appellant's appeal in 2008 and the appointing authority's subsequent action of the non-selection for promotion. *Robert Wholey Co., Inc., supra.* As such, we find appellant successfully established a *prima facie* case of retaliation.<sup>10</sup>

Nevertheless, the Commission finds the appointing authority has presented legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons to support appellant's non-selection for promotion to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor employment. In support of our conclusion we find the testimony of Stahr, Whorl, Hill, and Webber to be credible.<sup>11</sup>

Appellant's argument is that his non-selection was a result of retaliation by Webber and the appointing authority for filing an appeal in 2008. Specifically, appellant asserted since Webber was an Indispensable Party in his prior appeal and Webber was responsible for selecting the interview questions for the HSPSS hiring process, Webber and the interview panelists did not select him. Additionally, as part

---

<sup>10</sup> At the close of appellant's presentation, the appointing authority entered a motion to dismiss for failure of appellant to establish a *prima facie* case of discrimination. N.T. pp. 107-108. Ruling on the motion was deferred at the hearing. N.T. p. 108. Appellant initially claimed in his Appeal Request Form that his non-selection for promotion to the HSPSS position was due to his physical disabilities. Comm. Ex. B. However, appellant did not present any testimony or evidence to support his initial claim of disability discrimination. As such, the Commission hereby grants in part the appointing authority's motion to dismiss regarding appellant's disability discrimination claim, and denies in part regarding appellant's retaliation claim.

<sup>11</sup> It is within the purview of the Commission to determine the credibility of the witnesses. *State Correctional Institution at Graterford, Department of Corrections v. Jordan*, 95 Pa. Commw. 475, 478, 505 A.2d 339, 341 (1986).

of his retaliation claim, appellant asserted the reposting of the HSPSS position shows how the appointing authority continued the same favoritism he alleged against the appointing authority in his appeal in 2008. In response to appellant's argument, Stahr credibly explained the reposting of the HSPSS position was a result of the small candidate pool for the position and the multiple complaints from candidates being unable to upload their application through NEOGOV. Furthermore, Whorl, and Webber credibly explained appellant's appeal was not taken into consideration when evaluating appellant's interview performance. Hill credibly testified she was not even aware of appellant's appeal in 2008. Notably, appellant did not rebut the testimony supporting the conclusion that his appeal in 2008 was not considered or mentioned as factors during the interview process.

Appellant also argued the second interview question provided an unfair advantage to other candidates because there was no other employee within the Bureau of Policy that worked there longer than him. Yet, Webber credibly explained the second question applied to all candidates equally because a HSPSS would have to supervise employees who had more experience in their assigned programs or were employed with the appointing authority longer than the selected candidate. The interview panelists credibly established appellant's non-selection was solely due to his interview performance and that Miller provided a stronger interview than appellant. As such, Whorl, Hill, and Webber presented credible, legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for not selecting appellant to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor employment, and appellant has failed to persuade us that these reasons are merely pretextual. *Henderson, supra*. Accordingly, we enter the following:

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Appellant has failed to present evidence establishing discrimination violative of Section 2704 of Act 71 of 2018.

ORDER

AND NOW, the State Civil Service Commission, by agreement of its members, dismisses the appeal of Daniel S. Beaver challenging his non-selection for promotion to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor employment with the Department of Human Services, and sustains the action of the Department of Human Services in the non-selection for promotion of Daniel S. Beaver to Human Services Program Specialist Supervisor employment.

State Civil Service Commission

---

Gregory M. Lane  
Commissioner

---

Bryan R. Lentz  
Commissioner

Mailed: November 20, 2020