

Management, Industrial Engineering, Industrial Psychology, Political Science, or Government could be substituted for one year of experience. The appellant was found to be ineligible based on a lack of applicable experience per the substitution clause for education. A total of four applicants applied for the subject examination that resulted in a list of one eligible with an expiration date of February 22, 2020. The list was certified and one appointment was made.

On her application, the appellant indicated no college credits, and therefore, she needed to possess six years of qualifying information. She listed five positions on her application: provisional Senior Administrative Analyst from April 2008 to October 2016, Principal Payroll Clerk, Senior Clerk Typist, Senior Clerk Typist and Clerk Typist. Official records indicate a different employment history. These records indicate that she was a provisional Senior Administrative Analyst from May 2016 to the October 2017 closing date; and a Principal Payroll Clerk from November 2001 to May 2016. None of her experience was accepted, and she was found to be lacking six years of applicable experience.

On appeal, the appellant argues that she possesses the required experience and she provided examples of her work over the past eight years with the Trenton Public Works Department. Additionally, she states that she was working out-of-title as a Senior Administrative Analyst while in the title Principal Payroll Clerk from April 2008 to May 2016.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a) provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the promotional examination announcement by the closing date. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.6(c) provides in pertinent part that applicants for promotional examinations with open competitive requirements may not use experience gained as a result of out-of-title work to satisfy the requirements for admittance to the examination or for credit in the examination process, unless good cause is shown for an exception. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(f) provides that an application may be amended prior to the announced closing date.

The appellant was correctly denied admittance to the subject examination since she lacked the required amount of qualifying experience. Specifically, the majority of duties indicated by the appellant for her provisional position do not match the announced experience requirement. On her application, the appellant indicates that she confers with the General Superintendent and Office Heads concerning problems and makes recommendations for resolutions. She states that she assists with the preparation of operating and capital budgets; assists with the preparation of a mandatory water quality contract and report; performs the analysis, preparation and supervision of the annual security guard service contract, and annual cleaning service contract; prepares water utility emergency resolutions

and water utility emergency ordinances; prepares correspondence for the General Superintendent; investigates, analyzes and processes all liability claims; and prepares quarterly commission reports. While some of this may have the objective of improving managerial effectiveness, much of it involves assisting the General Superintendent in the work of the unit and office administration. While the appellant may have been working out-of-title, it does not appear as though that work was of Senior Administrative Analyst. The appellant indicates that she supervises five support staff, but she does not indicate taking the lead over one or more administrative analysts. Thus, the appellant's position appears to be misclassified. Accordingly, a classification review of the appellant's position is necessary to determine its proper classification. Therefore, the appellant lacks six years of applicable experience by the October 2017 closing date.

The appellant was denied admittance to the subject examination since she lacked the minimum requirements in experience was for education. An independent review of all material presented indicates that the decision of the Agency Services, that the appellant did not meet the announced requirements for eligibility by the closing date, is amply supported by the record. The appellant provides no basis to disturb this decision. Thus, the appellant has failed to support her burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied, and that the matter of the appellant's classification be referred to Agency Services for review.

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 18TH DAY OF APRIL, 2018



Deirdre L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Danielle London
Terry McEwen
Kelly Glenn
Records Center