

education. There are 80 candidates on the eligible list, which has not yet been certified.

On her application, appellant indicated that she possessed a Bachelor's in Science from India. The announcement clearly states, "Foreign degree/transcripts must be evaluated by a recognized evaluation service." The appellant did not provide a foreign degree evaluation, even after being emailed for that information. As such, she could not be credited for her education. Based on the substitution clause, she was required to have four years of experience.

For her experience, the appellant listed one position on her application and provided a resume with four additional positions. For her position as a Human Services Specialist 1, she copied the examples of work from the job specification for that title word for word. This is unacceptable. *See In the Matter of Margaret S. Chann* (MSB, decided November 4, 2004). She was emailed and asked to provide a job description in her own words and did not respond. Her remaining positions, certified Patient Care Technician, Laser Operator and Matcher, and two positions as Soldering Technician, did not have the announced experience requirement as the primary focus. In any event, they could not be accepted as the appellant did not provide all requested information for those positions, such as employer contact information, and number of hours worked per week. As such, the appellant was found to be lacking 60 college credits and two years of applicable experience based on her application.

On appeal, the appellant provides a foreign degree evaluation which indicates that her education in India is equivalent to three years of undergraduate study, and one semester of post-secondary study at a *non-accredited* institution. However, she did not provide a job description in her own words. When contacted about this issue, she stated that she has seven years of experience as a Human Services Specialist 1, and the duties that she performs must have the same requirements as the Human Services Specialist 3 title. She submits the same resume that she submitted originally, with the notation "In my own words of job description 5/29/19 S.P." She states that she was eligible for the examination for Human Services Specialist 3 (PC1359S).

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 that except when permitted for good cause, applicants for promotional examinations may not use experience gained as a result of out-of-title work to satisfy eligibility requirements.

At the outset, it is noted that the application is utilized to screen the candidate pool to ensure that all applicants, including provisional appointees, meet the minimum experience requirements for each position. Those applicants who meet the minimum eligibility requirements are then evaluated through the testing process in order to determine their relative merit and fitness. The appellant she copied her duties as a Human Services Specialist 1 directly from the job specification for Human Services Specialist. The Commission notes that the duties listed on the appellant's application mimic the examples of work listed on the job specification. Simply quoting the duties contained in the job specification on an application is not a sufficient basis on which to determine if a candidate's *specific* duties would meet the requirements for an examination. Candidates must demonstrate that the duties they perform qualify them for admission to the examination. *See In the Matter of Maxsine Allen and Vivian Stevenson* (MSB, decided March 10, 2004).

In her appeal, the appellant does not reword her duties, but merely makes a notation beside them that these were her own words. The duties are word for word copies of the examples of work from the job specification, and stating that they are her own words is clearly a falsehood. Her experience as a Human Services Specialist 1 cannot be accepted as her actual duties have not been given. The appellant's foreign degree evaluation indicates that she possesses three years of college education. Thus, she lacks three years of applicable experience per the substitution clause for education. The appellant is cautioned to complete any future application in her own words.

With regard to eligibility for a previous examination for the same title, eligibility is determined on the basis of each discrete announcement. The examination for Human Services Specialist 3 (PC1359S) was open only to employees in the title series, and did not have open-competitive requirements. Thus, the appellant's admittance to that examination has no bearing on the current examination.

An independent review of all material presented indicates that the decision of the Division of Agency Services that appellant did not meet the announced requirements for eligibility by the closing date is amply supported by the record. Appellant provides no basis to disturb this decision. Thus, appellant has failed to support her 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: Smita Patel
Kelly Glenn
Records Center