

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Emilena Veltri, Child Support Specialist 3	:		DMINISTRATIVE AC OF THE SERVICE COMMISSI	
(PS4620K), Department of Human	:			
Services		Examination Appeal		
CSC Docket No. 2019-3581	:			
	:			
	:			
		ISSUED	December 18, 2019	(RE)

Emilena Veltri, represented by Jef Henninger, Esq., appeals her score for the promotional examination Child Support Specialist 3 (PS4620K), Department of Human Services. It is noted that the appellant passed the examination with a final average of 72.898 and ranks 11<sup>th</sup> on the resultant eligible list.

The subject examination was administered via the Supervisory Test Battery (STB). The appellant had taken the STB for a previous examination, Program Support Specialist 1 Assistance Programs (PS2861K), Department of Human Services, and received a score of 554 out of 800. That score was reused for the subject examination. A notice was sent in June 2019 to the appellant informing her that she had passed the examination, and she ranked 11<sup>th</sup> of 16 passing candidates. In reply to this notice, the appellant states that her final average on this examination does not match the final average of a prior examination for which she took the Supervisory Test Battery (STB) although she had requested that her score be reused.

The appellant was advised that the reason why she had a different final average than for this examination, is that her seniority score is lower. A final average is made up of the raw score of an examination, a seniority score, and PAR points. PAR points were not used for either examination as a supervisor was competing with a subordinate. *See N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.15. When an announcement is opened to the open competitive requirements, seniority credit is given for all periods of service in a permanent capacity in any title currently in the competitive division up to the announced closing date. This was the case for the prior examination

(PS2861K), which was open to Program Support Specialists 2 Assistance Programs AND had open-competitive requirements, which was how the appellant was found eligible for that examination. For (PS2861K), the appellant had five years in a permanent capacity in any title, and therefore received a seniority score of 5.000.

The appellant was advised that the subject examination was only open to applicants in the competitive division who had an aggregate of one year of continuous permanent service as a Child Support Specialist 2. When an announcement is open to specific titles, seniority credit is only given for all periods of permanent service in those titles up to the five-year limit. See In the Matter of Joseph Berenguer (MSB, decided June 9, 2004). For (PS4620K), the appellant had two years, five months and seven days in the title Child Support Specialist 2, and therefore received a seniority score of 2.436. This resulted in a different final average. The appellant's score for the STB was reused, and she did not receive a different STB score than that of the last test administration.

In reply, the appellant appeals that she would not have retaken the test if she knew her seniority score would change. She also maintains that she was not told she could not use her prior score and did not have to retake the test.

## CONCLUSION

The record establishes that appellant took the subject examination and was subsequently found to have passed the examination. The appellant has not provided any proof or evidence of her assertion that her score is incorrect. The appellant did not retake the test. Rather, her score of 554 was reused, and it has not been changed or adjusted in any way. It is noted that final averages are not reused, only the STB score. The seniority score was different for each examination as it is based on titles under test. It is not related to the STB score, but is separate for each examination. Whenever any candidate files for an examination, if seniority is used, it will be unique to the announcement. As such, the reuse of the STB score has no bearing on the seniority score.

A thorough review of the record indicates that the determination of the Division of Agency Services was proper and consistent with civil service regulations, and that the appellant has not met 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 18<sup>th</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER, 2019

Deurdre' L. Webster Calib

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: Emilena Veltri Jef Henninger, Esq. Joe Denardo Michael Johnson Records Center