

community settings or in case management, analysis, development and implementation of programs for clients with developmental disabilities. Applicants who did not possess the required education could substitute Licensure as a Professional Nurse in the State of New Jersey or a degree as a Doctor of medicine or Doctor of Osteopathy from an accredited school of medicine. The appellant listed five positions on her Application for Qualifying Examination and resume: provisional Habilitation Plan Coordinator; Family Services Specialist 2; Health Educator/HIV Counselor; LIHEAP Director; and Group Home Technician with Elwyn. The appellant received credit for her Bachelor's degree in Behavioral Science and one month of experience as a Habilitation Plan Coordinator. As such, she was found to be lacking eleven months of experience.

On appeal, the appellant maintains that her five years of experience as a Group Home Technician with Elwyn should be applicable, and in her letter and on her resume, she provides a revised set of duties for this position.

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.1(f) states that an application may only be amended prior to the announced closing date.

CONCLUSION

In the matter at hand, the appellant is not eligible for the qualifying examination. At the outset, qualifying experience has the required experience as the primary focus. The appellant's positions as a Family Services Specialist 2, Health Educator/HIV Counselor, and LIHEAP Director, did not involve working with individuals with developmental disabilities. On her original resume, the duties that the appellant listed for her position as Group Home Technician with Elwyn were:

Providing individuals with developmental disabilities assistance with daily life functions (bathing, toileting, repositioning, administering medication, transporting to a program and medical appointments, cooking, cleaning, doing laundry, feeding, etc.).

This clearly did involve case management, analysis, development and implementation of programs for clients, and therefore, the question is whether it involved the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of individuals with developmental disabilities. It was found that this description does not include rehabilitation of individuals with developmental disabilities.

In her appeal, the appellant provided additional information regarding her duties. She copied some of the Examples of Work from the job specification for Habilitation Plan Coordinator as duties. For example, she added:

“Coordinate, monitor and audit IHPs,” which compares to, “Coordinates, monitors and audits the individual’s progress in following the IHP;”

“Communicate with parents regarding their participation in the IHP meetings,” which compares to, “Ensures the part or guardian is notified of the opportunity to participate in the development and review of Individual Habilitation Plans (IHPs) for assigned individuals;”

“Ensured individuals received the necessary medical, dental, psychiatric, and psychological services,” which compares to, “Ensures that each assigned individual receives necessary medical, dental, psychiatric and psychological services available from the department and other agencies as well as those generic services in the community;”

There are other examples as well. Without repeating them all, it is sufficient to say that the appellant has reworded her work to include rehabilitation, in addition to care and treatment, and did so by way of copying the examples of work from the job specification of the title under test. With that in mind, a “Qualifying Examination” requires a candidate to demonstrate that he or she possesses the necessary experience for a particular title in order to effect a lateral or demotional title change transfer to the title with permanent status. Since a determination of eligibility equates to a candidate passing this type of examination, and generally results in the candidate’s appointment, pending a qualifying examination, being changed to a permanent appointment, it is imperative that the candidate unambiguously indicates his or her experience on the application. This information is crucial, because it is essentially equivalent to correct responses on a multiple-choice, or “assembled” examination. Thus, the Commission must primarily focus on the “test papers,” *i.e.*, the original application materials presented for review, and determine if an “error” was made in the “scoring” of the test or other noncompliance with Civil Service law and rule. As of the August 20, 2019 determination date for this qualifying examination, the appellant lacked eleven months of required experience, and the information presented on appeal is not persuasive.

A thorough review of the record indicates that the decision of Agency Services is amply supported by the record, and the appellant provides no basis to disturb that decision. The appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

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 23rd DAY OF OCTOBER, 2019



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: Tara Gould-Willis
Mary Fitzgerald
Kelly Glenn
Records Center