

‘not sure’ only once.” However, Dr. Silikovitz noted that the appellant did misunderstand the “full content of the 20 questions he had scored in an apparently erroneous manner,” and in his 2018 test “because he rushed his responses,” he made “62 apparently erroneous/idiosyncratic responses.” Nonetheless, based on his review of the prior evaluation of the appellant and his interview and the test he administered, Dr. Silikovitz found that the appellant was psychologically suitable for a Correctional Police Officer position.

Upon its evaluation, the Panel noted the concerns of the pre-appointment evaluation and discussed the appellant’s work history, including his termination in a prior position, and his driving history which included his arrest for DWI. The appellant informed the Panel that he stopped drinking alcohol in July 2019 and that the DWI had taught him “a lot.” The Panel found the appellant to be forthcoming and cooperative during the Panel meeting. Of most concern was the appellant’s cognitive ability. The Panel stated that the appellant “misunderstood an unusual amount of questions on the objective measures,” which was confirmed by his own evaluator. However, neither evaluator administered a complete cognitive battery of tests. Therefore, based on the evaluations, the test results of the appellant, and his presentation at the meeting, the Panel requested that the appellant undergo an independent evaluation.

CONCLUSION

The Civil Service Commission (Commission) has reviewed the report and recommendation of the Panel. The Commission notes that the Panel conducts an independent review of the raw data presented by the parties as well as the recommendations and conclusions drawn by the various evaluators and that, in addition to the Panel’s own review of the results of the tests administered to the appellant, it also assesses the appellant’s presentation before it prior to rendering its own conclusions and recommendations which are based firmly on the totality of the record presented. The Commission agrees with the Panel’s recommendation and finds it necessary to refer the appellant for an independent evaluation by a New Jersey licensed psychologist which shall include an in-depth cognitive assessment of the appellant for a Correctional Police Officer position.

ORDER

The Commission therefore orders that X.D. be administered an independent psychological evaluation as set forth in this decision. The Commission further orders that the cost incurred for this evaluation be assessed to the appointing authority in the amount of \$530. Prior to the Commission’s consideration of the evaluation, copies of the independent evaluator’s report and recommendation will be sent to all parties with the opportunity to file exceptions and cross exceptions.

X.D. is to contact Dr. Robert Kanen, the Commission's independent evaluator, within 15 days of the issuance date on this determination to schedule an appointment. Dr. Kanen's contact information is as follows:

Dr. Robert Kanen
Kanen Psychological Services



If X.D. does not contact Dr. Kanen within the time period noted above, the entire matter will be referred to the Commission for a final administrative determination and the appellant's lack of pursuit will be noted.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON THE
17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2020

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré 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: X.D.
Randy P. Davenport, Esq.
Veronica Tingle
Dr. Robert Kanen
Division of Agency Services
Divisions of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs