



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Kristina Clayton,
Administrative Analyst 1,
Department of Environmental
Protection

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

Examination Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2018-3492

ISSUED: July 23, 2018 (RE)

Kristina Clayton appeals the determination of the Division of the Agency Services (Agency Services), which found that she was below the minimum requirements in experience for a qualifying examination for Administrative Analyst 1.

By way of background, the appellant was appointed provisionally, pending a qualifying examination (PAQ), in the Administrative Analyst 1 title effective May 27, 2017. Agency Services processed a qualifying examination for her to determine if she possessed the necessary qualifications for the subject title, which was a lateral action. The requirements are graduation from an accredited college or university with a Bachelor's degree, and four years of experience in work involving the review, analysis and evaluation of budget, organization, administrative practices, operational methods, management operations or data processing applications, or any combination thereof, which shall have included responsibility for the recommendation, planning, and/or implementation of improvements in a business or government agency. She failed the examination and Agency Services recommended a classification review of the position. She remains in her PAQ appointment in the subject title.

On her qualifying examination application, the appellant indicated that she possessed a Bachelor's degree, and she listed her positions as an Administrative Analyst 1, Administrative Assistant 3, Secretarial Assistant 3, Non-Stenographic, Technical Assistant 3, Senior Clerk, and Clerk. In its determination dated May 11, 2018, Agency Services determined that the appellant does not possess applicable

experience, including her provisional position, thereby lacking one year of required experience.

On appeal, the appellant indicates that, in her provisional position, she provides assistance in reviewing and performing analysis for enforcement actions and warrants. She states that she has also reviewed existing standard operating procedures (SOPs) and policies, for effectiveness and efficiency, which were updated and new ones were developed. She states that she analyzed the billing process and found process improvements and ways to expedite collection. She indicates that she developed, implemented, and manages the process to maintain accurate address information for regulated facilities, and assists management with improvements strategies for workflow. As an Administrative Assistant 3, she states that she reviewed and analyzed data bases of work processes and made recommendations to improve workflow, and implemented new processes including training. She researched and gathered data for correspondence and reviewed information from program areas to ensure the requestors had the information needed for their review. She also coordinated office operations, maintained office equipment, trained support staff, and did scheduling.

CONCLUSION

At the outset, it must be underscored that a “Qualifying Examination” examination requires the candidate to demonstrate on her qualifying examination application that she possesses the necessary experience for the subject title in order to effect a lateral transfer to the title. Additionally, in order for experience to be considered applicable, it must have as its primary focus full-time responsibilities in the areas required in the announcement. *See In the Matter of Bashkim Vlashi* (MSB, decided June 9, 2004).

Agency Services determined that the appellant’s experience in her current and prior-held titles did not have review, analysis and evaluation of budget, organization, administrative practices, operational methods, management operations or data processing applications, including responsibility for the recommendation, planning, and/or implementation of improvements as the primary focus of the positions. In her provisional position in the subject title, the appellant indicated that she developed and maintained SOPs, templates, and reports, and develop efficiencies and solutions to improve processes. This was the sole applicable duty amongst a large list of other duties such as assisting with docketing of actions of warrants, providing guidance to programs regarding debt collection and bill status, providing support and coordination on case management, preparing documents and judgment liens, maintaining court docket numbers in a tracking system, preparing and mailing notices of judgment, receiving calls and providing information, annually distributing lists of bills and commenting on bills, identifying bankruptcy filings and updating information and making notifications, suspending bills, locating correct mailing information, and assisting others.

Based on a holistic a review of her duties, it appears that the appellant has developed and implemented SOPs and policies as an ancillary duty to improve her own workload and the workflow. Nevertheless, the job definition for Administrative Analyst 1 does not require that the qualifying activities be performed for the division in which the position is located. That is, once the incumbent concludes her review, analysis and evaluation and makes recommendations, planning, and/or implementation of improvements, the incumbent moves to the next area within the agency to perform this function elsewhere. This is not what the appellant does, and thus, the Commission concurs with Agency Services' determination that the position requires a classification review.

Additionally, the appellant's prior-held positions, including Administrative Assistant 3, did not have the qualifying experience as the primary focus of the position. None of the extensive duties which the appellant listed on her application were applicable. Again, the appellant appears to have reviewed and analyzed the data bases and work processes of her own work or unit to make recommendations and improve the workflow. Her other administrative duties listed are not applicable.

Agency Services correctly determined that Ms. Clayton did not pass the subject qualifying examination. Therefore, she 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 18th DAY OF JULY, 2018



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. Kristina Clayton
Deni Gaskill
Kelly Glenn
Records center