



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Yamnia Jaime,
Union County, Department of
Human Services

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

CSC DKT. NO. 2022-664
OAL DKT. NO. CSV 09761-21

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

ISSUED: JULY 20, 2022

The appeal of Yamnia Jaime, Human Services Specialist 1, Union County, Department of Human Services, release at the end of the working test period, effective August 31, 2021, was heard by Administrative Law Judge Kimberly A. Moss (ALJ), who rendered her initial decision on June 10, 2022. No exceptions were filed.

Having considered the record and the ALJ's initial decision, and having made an independent evaluation of the record, the Civil Service Commission, at its meeting of July 20, 2022, accepted and adopted the Findings of Fact and Conclusion as contained in the attached ALJ's initial decision.

ORDER

The Civil Service Commission finds that the action of the appointing authority in releasing the appellant at the end of the working test period was justified. The Commission therefore affirms that action and dismisses the appeal of Yamnia Jaime.

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 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2022

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Nicholas F. Angiulo
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

Attachment



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. CSV 09761-21

AGENCY DKT NO. 2022-664

**IN THE MATTER OF YAMNIA JAIME,
UNION COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN SERVICES,**

Yamnia Jamie, pro se

**Allan Roth, Esq and Stephanie Platt, Esq. for respondent Union County
Department of Human Services (Rudderman Roth, LLC attorney)**

Record Closed: June 6, 2022

Decided: June 10, 2022

BEFORE KIMBERLY A. MOSS, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Yamnia Jaime (Jaime or petitioner) appeals the decision of respondent Union County Department of Human Services (UCDHS) to release her after the working test period from the position of Human Service Specialist 1 (HSS1) for unsatisfactory work performance.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and filed on November 24, 2021. Hearings were held on April 1, 2022, and June 6, 2022, after which the record closed.

TESTIMONY

Jocelyn Casey

Jocelyn Casey (Casey) has been employed by UCDHS for twenty-eight years. She is a trainer for UCDHS. She trains the new hires from the Civil Service list. The training program mimics the work that the actual caseworkers do. The new hires are taught in a class. They also get on the job training. There was not much on the job training for Jaime's class due to COVID-19. The new hires are given orientation materials. There is instruction of the new hires, and they are tested weekly. There are pop quizzes and things are re-taught if necessary. They are given a flash drive with policy and training material.

During tests they can use material provided by UCDHS and any notes they have taken. The training is as close to real life as possible. There were four trainees in Jaime's class. The teaching in this class was slower so that the material could be absorbed. There were a few setbacks with math calculations. Jaime had issues with math calculations if the calculations are incorrect there is a problem. Jaimie also had a problem with writing case scenarios.

When a client comes in for eligibility determination a HSS1 must ask the client a series of questions, evaluate the answers to determine which program the client can apply for. The new hires are trained in Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP), Medicaid, and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and General Assistance (GA). The worker evaluates to determine if there is a need for emergency

services. All the programs are income based. Math calculations are important. If the client needs to bring back information, the client must be informed of this. The worker fills out the paperwork for the clients. After this the worker brings the clients information to the supervisor for review. The supervisor checks to see if the application is missing any data. The application should include the work history, and if the client receives benefits from New Jersey, any other state, or Federal benefits. The process must be completed in thirty days.

Petitioner's training began on June 1, 2021. In June 2021, she failed five of the six tests or quizzes. In July 2021 Jaime failed ten out of thirteen tests or quizzes. In August 2021, Jaime failed eight out of ten tests.

Petitioner had a meeting with Michele Adams and Casey on July 20, 2021, regarding what she needs to do to improve. She was told if she needed tutoring, she would have to send an email requesting the type of tutoring she needed. The meeting was memorialized in an email the next day.

Evaluations are done for new hires after thirty, sixty and ninety days.

Michele Adams

Michele Adams (Adams) testified that she has been a training supervisor for UCSS for three- and one-half years. She assures that the program is delivered effectively, records all grades, and evaluates tests. She also evaluates the trainers, test scores and quiz scores. If a trainee needs additional help, they email her. If a trainee has a problem, she can freely speak to the trainer. Adams was a trainer for over five years. Her training system is used by UCDHS. It is a points system.

The evaluations let the trainees know where they stand.

Lauren Montgomery

Lauren Montgomery has been a training technician for UCDHS. She creates and delivers course content. She helps the trainees with extra work and tutoring. Tutoring works by availability. An email is submitted to Adams so that it can be scheduled based on availability. She has scheduled tutoring with the trainees. She never received any information that petitioner wanted tutoring.

Craig Wright

Craig Wright was in petitioner's training class. He stated that he was not told he had failing grades. Until the last three weeks of the ninety-day period he had a score of eighty-eight percent. Wright believed that the material's presentation was adequate but lacked explanation or clarity. There was no attention to detail. Going over the actual cases were confusing, and the cases had errors. In the last month, the information was confusing, and it was not simplified. He felt that he was set up to fail.

Wright did not successfully complete the working test period with UCDHS. He states that in the training they would review material and be tested on Friday. During the last two to three weeks, the tests were not on the material that was studied during the week. The teaching was progressive. If someone had an issue with the basics, they would not do well as they progressed. When a trainee asked a question, they were told to use their common sense because the trainers believed that answering the question would give away the answer.

Wright had a thirty-, sixty- and ninety-day review. The evaluations had criteria and calculations. He went over the evaluations with UCDHS. He understood the evaluations and signed them.

Wright requested extra training. He came in early for the extra training. The class was told that extra training was available. The person who provided his extra training had to ask another trainer answers to some of the test questions.

Yasmnia Jaime

Yasmnia Jaime (Jaime) testified on her own behalf. She stated that she had previously never failed a course. She left another job to take the job with UCDHS. She was eager to learn. Jaime did not believe that she was given an opportunity during her training. She believes that she was set up to fail.

Jaime took the Civil Service test for the position. She waited three years for the appointment. Her score on the Civil Service test was in the seventies. UCDHS wanted to hire Human Service workers. She does not know why UCDHS wanted her to fail. She does not believe that she was singled out to fail. She did not file a discrimination claim. She spoke to the union about being treated unfairly, but she was not a union member. She did not complain to Human Resources about being treated unfairly.

On one of Jaime's tests of June 11, 2011, question fourteen was "What is Samer's person number on MES." She answered this question wrong. She had been taught this material. On a June 17, 2021, test question ten was to calculate a household monthly income. This is a math calculation question. She answered this question wrong. She had been taught how to do the calculation. On a July 20, 2021, test, Jaime was asked another calculation question. She did not answer the question. She stated that she did not get back to it, although she answered the next three calculation questions. On a July 23, 2021, test, question six asked, "Are SNAP households eligible for benefits from the day of the interview"? She answered this wrong. She thought the question was from the date of the application.

On or about July 21, 2021, there was a one-to-one follow-up between Casey, Adams, and Jaime. Jaime states that she was not told that she needed to improve on

policy retention, program comprehension systems and case analysis, although this information was in the email sent to her on July 21, 2021. Her working test period ended on August 31, 2021.

The thirty-, sixty and ninety-day evaluations all have a section for employee comments. Jaime never commented on the evaluations. She stated that she had never seen the employee comment section, even though it is near the signature portion of the evaluation and has bold lettering. Jaime signed all three of the evaluations.

Jaime read her first evaluation of July 13, 2021. She reviewed the evaluation with the trainers they told her that she needed to improve aspects of her work. She read the supervisor comments a few days later. She was told to raise her scores. The comments state that failure to show significant improvement could lead to her not being retained. She was told that if she needed additional help with the material to inform the trainers. She did not ask for help at that time.

Jaime went over her sixty-day evaluation with the trainers. They discussed the review factors and comments. She saw the evaluation before she signed it. Jaime felt that the comments were inaccurate but did not write any employee comments. She states that the evaluation did not reflect her conversation with the trainers. Regarding her communication ability, the comments states that she gives partial explanations. Jaime states that this did not occur on every test and that the verbiage on the tests had to be the same as the verbiage on the documents. Regarding the quality of her work, it states that her math calculations were not accurate. Jaime states that she was told that her math was good, but she had other problems. Some of work showed incorrect answers and inaccuracies. She does not remember struggling with case explanations and recognizing important details.

The supervisors' comments state that she must work toward completing case actions timely and efficiently, if not, she may not be retained. It also states that she needs to utilize practice time on development of skills and ability with case writing,

coding and case analysis. It also states that if she needs additional training, she should contact the trainer. Jaime told the trainers at the review that she wanted tutoring. She did not send an email that she wanted the tutoring.

On Jaime's ninety-day review under quality of work, it states that she does not understand policy, process, analysis, coding and calculation of SNAP, GA or TANF. She did not go over this evaluation with the trainers. She was asked if she wanted to review the evaluation after she was told that she did not successfully complete the working test period.

FACTUAL DISCUSSIONS

In light of the contradictory testimony presented by respondent's witnesses and appellant and his witness, I make credibility determinations with regard to the critical facts. The choice of accepting or rejecting the witness's testimony or credibility rests with the finder of facts. Freud v. Davis, 64 N.J. Super. 242, 246 (App. Div. 1960). In addition, for testimony to be believed, it must not only come from the mouth of a credible witness, but it also has to be credible in itself. It must elicit evidence that is from such common experience and observation that it can be approved as proper under the circumstances. See Spagnuolo v. Bonnet, 60 N.J. 546 (1974); Gallo v. Gallo, 66 N.J. Super. 1 (App. Div. 1961). A credibility determination requires an overall assessment of the witness's story in light of its rationality, internal consistency and the manner in which it "hangs together" with the other evidence. Carbo v. United States, 314 F.2d 718, 749 (9th Cir. 1963). A fact finder "is free to weigh the evidence and to reject the testimony of a witness even though not contradicted when it is contrary to circumstances given in evidence or contains inherent improbabilities or contradictions which alone or in connection with other circumstances in evidence excite suspicion as to its truth." In re Perrone, 5 N.J. 514, 521-522 (1950); see D'Amato by McPherson v. D'Amato, 305 N.J. Super. 109, 115 (App. Div. 1997).

Having had an opportunity to observe the demeanor of the witnesses, I **FIND** Casey, Adams and Montgomery to be credible. Their testimony was clear and concise. Casey and Adams testimony was verified with the documentation of the tests, quizzes, and evaluations. I **FOUND** Wright to be somewhat credible, but he testified that the teaching toward the end of the working test period should be simplified and even though he knew that the testing was progressive, he was surprised that topics that the class studied at the end of the working test period were not on the later tests. I did not **FIND** Jaime to be credible. She testified that UCDHS wanted her to fail but did not notify Human Services. She stated that she requested tutoring. She was told that she had to send an email requesting tutoring and she never sent the email requesting tutoring. She disagreed with some of the comments in the evaluations but did not state her disagreement in the employees' notes. She stated that she did not see the area for employee notes, but it was very close to the signature lines.

After hearing the testimony and reviewing the evidence, I **FIND** the following **FACTS**:

Jaime started a working test period at UCDHS on June 1, 2021, as a HSS1. UCDHS has training for the new hires. The training consists of classes, tests, and quizzes. There were also thirty, sixty and ninety evaluations. The new hires are trained in SNAP, Medicaid, TANF and GA. They are trained in calculations and terminology that they would need. All the programs are income based. Math calculations are important. They also need to know the process as well as eligibility and re-determination. Initial and redetermination eligibilities are taught, they are the basis of the class.

When a trainee is not understanding the information, they slow down the pace and go over it again. Math is usually mastered in the first two to three weeks. But in petitioner's class, they needed more math instruction. The SNAP policy, calculations and scenarios are taught first, then GA, then Medicaid. The trainee work on real live systems and can access information to process or search. They cannot access the 105

system. They use a mock 105 system. The training goes up to where the worker would hand the case to the specialist.

The new hires tests have a point value. Each test starts at one hundred points. Points are subtracted for wrong answers. These tests are given a numerical value for each test. Each test has a different pass/fail level. The classes review material during the week and are tested on Fridays. The classes are progressive. The new hires should retain what they learned in the previous classes.

The Union County Social Service Successful Completion of Working Test Period document shows the requirements to be completed during the working test period. Petitioner received this document and signed and dated it.

Petitioner's training began on June 1, 2021. On June 3, 2021, a math calculation test was given. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On June 11, 2021, a Navigation FAMIS test was given. The test was to make sure the worker knows how to correctly navigate the system to get information about client's income. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. A pop quiz was given on June 17, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. A test of SSI/SOLQ/IEUS was given on June 18, 2021, which test the knowledge of the federal programs and policy test. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On June 25, 2021, a reading test screens test was given. Reading screens is part of the training. Petitioner did receive a passing grade. On that same date there was a test of the SNAP policy. SNAP is a federal program which is commonly called Food Stamps This program is audited. If the calculations are incorrect, UCDHS can distribute too much or too little SNAP benefits. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade.

The evaluations let the trainees know where they stand. Petitioner's first evaluation was for time period June 1, 2021 through July 1, 2021. Adams and/or Casey reviewed the evaluations with Jaime. She scored needs improvement on Job Knowledge. This is based on comments and test scores. She needs to do more

practice on systems and use study time. She could not decipher the coding and needed to review SNAP policy. She scored needs improvement on Self-Motivated/Initiative. She needed to take advantage of study time. She scored needs improvement in Reliability and Consistency. Petitioner needed to ask questions. The prior work should have carried over. She needed improvement on Communication Ability. She needed to tell the trainers what she did not understand, and her writing did not have enough information. She needed improvement in her Decision-Making Abilities. She needed to improve on analyzing the information on the screen and applying it appropriately. She needed to improve her Planning and Organizational Skills. She needed to improve meeting deadlines. She needed improvement in Quality of Work. She needed to improve her comprehension and retention of material.

The evaluation was explained to petitioner. The Supervisor comments were that she needed to continue to study policy and practice applying policy. She needed to better utilize practice time. She was told that failure to improve could result in her not being retained. Jaime did not request tutoring at this time.

On July 1, 2021, a test was given where the trainees were given a case scenario and had to impute the information into the computer. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There was also a three-part SNAP test given on July 1, 2022, Petitioner did not receive a passing grade on any of the tests. On July 7, 2021, a comprehension of the program and policy of SNAP test was given. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On July 9, 2021, a test on SNAP eligibility was given. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On July 19, 2021, there was a test on SNAP calculation which the trainees did at home and emailed in. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. Around this time there was a pop quiz regarding SNAP earned income credit. Petitioner did receive a passing grade. Petitioner had a meeting with Michele Adams and Casey on July 20, 2021, regarding what she needs to do to improve. She was told if she needed tutoring, she would have to send an email requesting the type of tutoring she needed. The meeting was memorialized in an email the next day.

On July 23, 2021, two case scenario tests were given to determine SNAP eligibility and the amounts of benefits if eligible. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade on either test. Also on July 23, 2021, there was a test on program and policy for SNAP and expedited SNAP. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade.

The trainers' comments regarding what petitioner did not submit was that there were no casebook (CB) notes, the 105 information was not turned in and there was an incomplete WFNJ client notification form, it was missing vital information. The comments were in reference to what petitioner submitted and what she did not submit. On July 30, 2021, a follow up expedited SNAP test was given. This was to test retrieving details from case scenarios, run systems, input information in IMFS to see if the person qualifies for benefits. In this test petitioner missed 105 materials including social security number, and date of birth. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There was also a SNAP policy test on July 30, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade.

Her sixty-day evaluation performance review covered July 2, 2021, to August 1, 2021. Adams was the reviewer. Petitioner needed improvement in Job Knowledge. She needed to practice self-employment calculations, her policy testing had incomplete and incorrect answers. She needed to improve in Self-Motivation/Initiative. She was not confident in what would move the case forward. She needed improvement in Performance under Pressure. She needed to increase her speed and accuracy in testing. Her tests were incomplete and there were blank answers. The information was continuously retaught. She needed improvement in Reliability and Consistency. She needed to proofread and review screens. She had missed information on letters and forms. She need improvement with Adaptability to Change. She had to practice processor procedures, she needed to improve her Communication Abilities. Her verbal responses in class were not clear. She has partial explanations on her class exercises and tests. The client notification reports were missing citations. She needed improvement on her Decision-Making Ability. She is missing details in case scenarios which makes the SNAP benefits inaccurate. She needed improvement on Planning and

Organization. She needs to read and understand the SNAP policy. She needed improvement on her Quality of Work. She struggles with written case explanations and recognizing important details in case scenarios which detrimental to SNAP allotment accuracy. Some of her work has incomplete or inaccurate answers. She was told that she must improve to be retained. She was given the evaluation and it was explained to her. Petitioner asked for help during the sixty-day evaluation. She was told she needed to put the request in an email. Petitioner never sent a request for tutoring by email or any other form of writing.

On July 19, 2021, she was given a laptop and USB, so that she could work at home.

Three tests were administered on August 6, 2021, two for case processing which petitioner did not receive passing scores, and one for SNAP policy which petitioner received a passing score. On August 13, 2021, there was a re-determination test. Petitioner did receive a passing grade. There was also a SNAP policy re-determination test on August 13, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On the same date there was a SNAP/GA test as well. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. On August 20, 2021, there was a GA policy test. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There was a class exercise on August 25, 2021. The teachers' comments were that in IMFS/GAAS/105 petitioner missed blocks on pending status of GAAS. Wrong dates and incorrect information on GAAS when opening. On August 27, 2021, there was a score sheet which was filed out by the instructor. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There was a final exam of policy overview on August 27, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There was final coding exam as well on August 27, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade. There were also final exams on re-determination and SNAP on August 27, 2021. Petitioner did not receive a passing grade on either.

The employer performance review for ninety days covered August 2, 2021, to September 1, 2021. Her job performance in the following categories was

unsatisfactory: Job Knowledge, Self-Motivated/Initiative, Performance under Pressure, Reliability and Consistency, Adaptability to Change, Communication Ability, Decision Making Ability, Planning and Organizational Skills, and Quality of Work. Petitioner was not recommended to be retained. She failed to meet the performance standard. She was confused about case action and coding. She was indecisive about the work; she did not fully understand policy and process.

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

One of the objectives of the civil service laws and regulations is to ensure the merit and fitness of public service employees. See N.J.S.A. 11A:1-2; State-Operated Sch. Dist. of City of Newark v. Gaines, 309 N.J. Super. 327, 332 (App. Div. 1998), certif. denied, 156 N.J. 381 (1998). Toward this end, a candidate for permanent employee status must successfully complete a probationary or working test period. N.J.S.A. 11A:4-15. The working test period is considered part of the examination process and designed to enable an appointing authority to evaluate whether an employee can satisfactorily perform the duties of the title meriting permanent status. N.J.S.A. 11A:4-15; N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.1(a). It is intended "to supplement the examining process by providing a means for testing an employee's fitness through observed job performance under actual working conditions." Dodd v. Van Riper, 135 N.J.L. 167, 171 (E. & A. 1947).

It is well settled that "a basic condition of permanent or absolute appointment for any civil service employee is the favorable opinion of the employee's fitness as formed by the appointing authority during the probationary period." Dodd, supra, 135 N.J.L. at 171. "[T]he sole test is an opinion formed by observation of the employee's work," which opinion must be "formed in good faith" Lingrell v. New Jersey Civil Serv. Comm'n, 131 N.J.L. 461, 462 (Sup. Ct. 1944). The function of the working test period is not for the purpose of providing the employee further training to qualify him for the position. Briggs v. Dep't of Civil Serv., 64 N.J. Super. 351, 355 (App. Div. 1960).

In an appeal from an employee's termination at the conclusion of a working test period, the employee shoulders the burden of proving that the appointing authority's "action was in bad faith." N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.3(b). If bad faith is found, the employee is entitled to a new full or shortened working test period and, if appropriate, other remedies. N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.3(c). The basic test is whether the appointing authority exercised good faith in determining that the employee was not competent to perform satisfactorily the duties of the position. See Briggs, supra, 64 N.J. Super. at 356; Devine v. Plainfield, 31 N.J. Super. 300, 303-04 (App. Div. 1954); Lingrell, supra, 131 N.J.L. at 462. In general, good faith has been defined as meaning "honesty of purpose and integrity of conduct with respect to a given subject." Smith v. Whitman, 39 N.J. 397, 405 (1963). As stated in Schopf v. New Jersey Department of Labor, 96 N.J.A.R.2d. (CSV) 853, 857:

In this matter, there was no evidence of bad faith on behalf of UCDHS. Petitioner failed most of the tests and quizzes during the working test period. She was told during the thirty- and sixty-day evaluation the areas that she was having problems and that she needed to improve for her to be retained by UCDHS. Each evaluation stated that she needed to improve on Job Knowledge, Self-Motivated/Initiative, Reliability and Consistency, Communication Ability, Decision Making Ability, Planning and Organizational Skills, and Quality of Work. She did not improve in those areas. The sixty day and ninety-day evaluations state that she also needed to improve on Performance under Pressure and Adaptability to Change. She did not improve in these areas.

When petitioner requested tutoring after the sixty-day evaluation, she was told to send an email of the request. Petitioner never sent an email or any other writing requesting tutoring to UCDHC.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and applicable law, it is **ORDERED** that the determination of the UCDHS that petitioner did not successfully complete the working test period is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

I hereby FILE my initial decision with the **CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION** for consideration.

This recommended decision may be adopted, modified or rejected by the **CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**, which by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. If the Civil Service Commission does not adopt, modify or reject this decision within forty-five days and unless such time limit is otherwise extended, this recommended decision shall become a final decision in accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10.

Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the **DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF APPEALS AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, UNIT H, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**, 44 South Clinton Avenue, PO Box 312, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.

June 10, 2022

DATE



KIMBERLY A. MOSS, ALJ

Date Received at Agency:

June 10, 2022

Date Mailed to Parties:

June 10, 2022

ljb

WITNESSES

For Appellant

Craig White

For Respondent:

Jocelyn Casey

Michele Adams

Lauren Montgomery

EXHIBITS

For Petitioner

None

For Respondent

Exhibit	Document Name Identification
UC-1	Yamnia Jaime Working Test Period Acknowledgement Form
UC-2	Summary of Yamnia Jaime's Test, Quizzes, and Classwork
UC-3	Yamnia Jaime's 6-4-21 Calculations Test and Score
UC-4	Yamnia Jaime's 6-7-21 Acronym's Test and Score
UC-5S	Yamnia Jaime's 6-11-21 MES/FAMIS Test and Score
UC-6	Yamnia Jaime's 6-17-21 SSI-SOLQ-IEVS Pop Quiz and Score
UC-7	Yamnia Jaime's 6-18-21 SSI-SOL -IEVS Test and Score
UC-8	Yamnia Jaime's 6-25-21 Reading Screens Test and Score

UC-9	Yamnia Jaime's 6-25-21 SNAP Police Test and Score
UC-10	Yamnia Jaime's 7-1-21 AOSS Application Test and Score
UC-11	Yamnia Jaime's 7-1-21 Ex edited Tool Test and Score
UC-12	Yamnia Jaime's 7-1-21 SNAP Police Test and Score
UC-13	Yamnia Jaime's 7-7-21 SNAP Police Test and Score
UC-14	Yamnia Jaime's 7-9-21 SNAP Police on Eli ibili and Aliens and Score
UC-15	Yamnia Jaime's 7-19-21 SNAP Police and Calculations Test and Score
UC-16	Yamnia Jaime's 7-20-21 Calculations PO Quiz and Score
UC-17	Yamnia Jaime's 7-23-21 Ex edited Processing Test and Score
UC-18	Yamnia Jaime's 7-23-21 SNAP Police Test and Score
UC-19	Yamnia Jaime's 7-29-21 Class Exercise and Teacher Comments
UC-20	Yamnia Jaime's 7-30-21 Ex edited Case Processing Test and Score
UC-21	Yamnia Jaime's 7-30-21 SNAP Police Test and score
UC-22	Yamnia Jaime's 8-6-21 Case Processing Test Case 1 Test and Score
UC-23	Yamnia Jaime's 8-6-21 Case Processing Test Case 2 Test and Score
UC-24	Yamnia Jaime's 8-6-21 SNAP Police Test and Score
UC-25	Yamnia Jaime's 8-13-21 Redetermination Case Test and Score
UC-26	Yamnia Jaime's 8-13-21 Second Redetermination Case Test and Score
UC-27	Yamnia Jaime's 8-13-21 SNAP Police O Book Test and score
U-28	Yamnia Jaime's 8-20-21 GA/SNAP Processing Test and Score
UC-29	Yamnia Jaime's 8-20-21 SNAP Police Open Book Test and Score
UC-30	Yamnia Jaime's 8-25-21 Class Exercise and Teacher's Comments
UC-31	Yamnia Jaime's 807-21 GA SNAP Intake Processing Test and Score
UC-32	Yamnia Jaime's 8-27-21 SNAP/TANF/GA Police Test and Score
UC-33	Yamnia Jaime's 8-27-21 Redet N Line Coding Test and Score
UC-34	Yamnia Jaime's 8-27-21 <u>Redetermination Processing Test and Score</u>
UC-35	Yamnia Jaime's 8-27-21 Second Redetermination Processing Test and Score
UC-36	Yamnia Jaime's Cumulative Progress Re ort Excel Spreadsheet

UC-37	7-21-21 Email Providing Yamnia Jaime Progress Report Summary Write-Up from Michele Adams, Acting Training Supervisor
UC-38	7-21-21 Yamnia Jaime Progress Report Summary Write Up from Jocelyn Case
UC-39	6-1-21 through 7-1-21 Performance Evaluation for Yamnia Jaime 30 day
UC-40	7-2-21 through 8-1-21 Performance Evaluation for Yamnia Jaime 60-day
	8-2-21 through 9-1-21 Performance Evaluation for Yamnia Jaime 90 day