



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of Maxine Giordano,  
Architect (S0133C), Statewide

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION  
OF THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

CSC Docket No. 2022-960

Examination Appeal

**ISSUED: MARCH 4, 2022 (JET)**

Maxine Giordano appeals the determination of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that she did not meet the experience requirement for the open competitive examination for Architect (S0133C), Statewide.

The open competitive examination was announced with specific requirements which had to be satisfied by the May 21, 2021 closing date. Specifically, applicants were required to possess three years of architectural experience in the design of large and varied types of buildings and the preparation of architectural plans, drawings, and specifications, and a valid license or certificate as a Registered Architect issued by the New Jersey State Board of Architects. It is noted that the examination was cancelled on August 19, 2021, as the appellant, the only applicant, was found ineligible for the examination.

Upon review of the appellant's application, Agency Services credited her for her license as a Registered Architect. Agency Services did not credit her with any other experience. Accordingly, Agency Services determined that the appellant was ineligible for the examination, as she lacked three years of experience as noted above.

On appeal, the appellant maintains that she is qualified for the examination. In support, she provides a copy of her resume where she provides a further description of her duties. On her resume, the appellant clarifies that she worked at

Miseo and Associates from 1991 to 1994, and she describes her duties as performing all phases of architectural services for individuals, corporations, and small businesses.<sup>1</sup> In addition, she worked at Shive, Spinelli and Perantoni from 1994 to 1996 where she performed all phases of architectural services for educational facilities from 1994 to 1996.<sup>2</sup> Finally, she indicates that since 1996, she has been the principal in her own architectural firm where she performs all types of architectural services.

## CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.3(b) provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the open competitive announcement by the closing date. Under *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(g), the Commission can accept clarifying information in eligibility appeals. However, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(f) provides that an application may only be amended prior to the announced closing date. For example, information submitted on appeal pertaining to duties in a given position that expands or enlarges information previously submitted is considered clarifying and is accepted. However, any documentation indicating work in a setting that was not previously listed on an application or resume cannot be considered after the closing date. Thus, the Commission can only consider information provided on appeal regarding the positions listed in the appellants' original applications. *See In the Matter of Diana Begley* (MSB, decided November 17, 2004).

In this matter, the appellant provides clarifying documentation confirming that she was employed at Miseo and Associates from 1991 to 1994. She also clarifies that she performed all phases of architectural services while employed at Shive, Spinelli and Perantoni from 1994 to 1996. Based on the clarification provided, the Commission finds the appellant's experience from 1991 to 1996 is applicable and accepts that experience.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the record reflects that the subject examination was cancelled as the appellant was the only applicant. Under these circumstances, the Commission accepts the appellant's clarification of her experience on appeal, for eligibility purposes only, and admits her to the examination. However, the appellant is warned to ensure that any future applications should contain a full description of duties and are fully completed.

---

<sup>1</sup> On her application, the appellant listed that she performed an internship that was not related to her college curriculum where she worked 40 hours a week from August 1991 to August 1994. She did not describe her duties in that position, however, she listed that Christine Miseo was her supervisor. On her resume, she clarifies that she was employed by Miseo and Associates during that same timeframe, and as such, she did not work in an internship while employed in that position.

<sup>2</sup> On her application, the appellant did not fully describe the architectural duties that she performed while working in that position.

<sup>3</sup> The Commission notes that it does not credit the appellant's architectural experience from 1996 forward since, pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(f), that experience is considered amended information presented after the closing date.

**ORDER**

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be granted, the cancellation of the examination be rescinded, and the appellant's application be processed for prospective employment opportunities only.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
THE 2<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2022



---

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries	Allison Chris Myers
and	Director
Correspondence	Division of Appeals & Regulatory Affairs Civil Service Commission Written Record Appeals Unit PO Box 312 Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Maxine Giordano  
Division of Agency Services