



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

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

In the Matter of  
Koundinya Kalinadhabhotla,  
Network Administrator 1 OIT  
(PS8151U), Office of Information  
Technology

Examination Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2019-3164

**ISSUED:** July 1, 2019 (RE)

Koundinya Kalinadhabhotla, represented by Dudley Burge, CWA Local 1032, appeals the decision of the Division of Agency Services which found that he did not meet the educational requirements for the promotional examination for Network Administrator 1 OIT (PS8151U), Office of Information Technology.

The subject examination announcement was issued with an August 21, 2018 closing date, and was open to employees in the non-competitive division who were currently serving in the title Information Technology Specialist, had an aggregate of one year of continuous permanent service as of the closing date, and meet the requirements OR to employees in the competitive division who have an aggregate of one year of continuous permanent service as of the closing date in any competitive title and who meet the requirements. The requirements included graduation from an accredited college or university with a Bachelor's degree, including a minimum of 18 semester hour credits in Mathematics and/or Computer Science, and three years of experience in the development, implementation, and maintenance of multi-network, multi-user Local Area Networks (LAN), Metropolitan Area Networks (MAN), Storage Area Networks (SAN), and/or Wide Area Networks (WAN) environments. Applicants who did not possess a Bachelor's degree but possess the 18 semester hour credits could substitute additional experience as indicated on a year-for-year basis with thirty semester hour credits being equal to one (1) year of experience. It was noted that:

Evidence of formal training in Computer Science/Information Technology received at an accredited institution could be submitted

with the application for evaluation for possible credit. These training courses will be examined to see how they compare, both in hours/content, to college courses to which they equate, sixteen training hours being equal to one college credit. In house training courses will not be accepted as meeting this criteria; thus, they will not be evaluated.

The appellant was determined to be below the minimum requirements in education. It is noted that 16 applicants were admitted, and the examination has not yet been held.

The appellant indicated that he possessed a Bachelor's degree in Finance, but only nine required credits. As such, he was found to be lacking nine credits in Mathematics or Computer Science.

On appeal, the appellant argues that he should be eligible as he has six credits in Mathematics and nine credits in Computer Science, although he does not indicate which classes these were. He submitted a copy of his transcript, two course certificates, and a training history. He states that he attended the classes Troubleshooting TCP/IP Networks with Wireshark (30 hours), ITIL Foundation with a certified instructor from CA Technologies (18 hours), and Configuring F5 Big-IP APM v11 with a certified instructor from Nexum, Inc. (18 hours). He believes that these classes equal three college credits. He argues that the specificity of instruction is relevant to his work and that the instructors are certified and teaching state-of-the-art technologies. He maintains that this was not in-house training, but that the instructors were outside experts who developed the curriculum outside of State government. In support, the Deputy Chief Technology Officer at OIT states that the appellant has over 48 hours of detailed and specific formal networking and IT training that was tailored to the Networking Administrator 1 title. The Deputy states that the college classes would only give information in broad technology terms, not with the detail and focus of the network technology platforms specific to OIT. He argues that the knowledge transfer of these classes is more than equivalent to college classes, and that the appellant is performing the work of a Network Administrator 1 OIT.

## 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.

The review of the announcement indicates that a *minimum* of 18 semester hour credits in Mathematics and/or Computer Science courses is required. Only Evidence of formal training in Computer Science/Information Technology received

at an accredited institution could be submitted with the application for evaluation for possible credit.

The appellant was recognized as having nine college credits, however, the Civil Service Commission counts 12; Basic Calculus, Management Information Systems, Computer and Program 1, and Computer and Program 2, for three credits each. Another math class could not be located on the appellant's transcript, as he asserts. It is noted that Statistics is a separate subject from Mathematics or Computer Science. As such, the appellant is lacking six specific college credits. The notation indicated that "in house" training courses will not be evaluated. "In house" training is not limited solely to that provided by State government employees. Clearly, OIT contracted with outside vendors to provide training to individuals. However, these classes were given "in house" as they were provided by the employer.

Most three-credit college and university courses require 45 to 48 contact hours, meeting for three hours per week over a 15-week semester. The appellant indicated training for 30, 18 and 18 hours, respectively, in these classes. Generally, when training is accepted, 16 training hours are equal to one college credit. The appellant's assertion that these classes are equivalent to six college credits, and the opinion of the Deputy Chief Technology Officer, are insufficient. In order for this substitution to be accepted, the appellant must provide documentation from an accredited institution of higher learning stating that the school would accept these training hours as equivalent to Mathematics and/or Computer Science courses at that institution, and provide the number of college credits that would be equivalent. This documentation from the institution must come from the Department Head or Chair associated with the major or course area in question. *See In the Matter of Jason Tesauro* (MSB, decided February 27, 2002). Otherwise, the appellant lacks six college credits in Mathematics or Computer Science. This is a competitive situation, with 16 admitted applicants who meet the minimum requirements. It is not fair to these individuals to accept this training as not "in house" and equivalent to six college credits without the confirmation of an institution of higher learning.

An independent review of all material presented indicates that the decision of the Division of 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 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 26<sup>th</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 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: Koundinya Kalinadhabhotla  
Dudley Burge  
Kelly Glenn  
Records Center