



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION  
OF THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of Frank Sermarini,  
Administrative Analyst 3,  
Information Systems, Department of  
Labor and Workforce Development

Examination Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2023-1414

ISSUED: March 29, 2023 (RE)

Frank Sermarini appeals the determination of the Division of the Agency Services (Agency Services) which found that he was below the minimum requirements in experience for a qualifying examination for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems, Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

By way of background, the appellant was appointed provisionally, pending a qualifying examination (PAQ), in the Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems title effective July 2, 2022. Agency Services processed a qualifying examination for the appellant on October 24, 2022, to determine if he possessed the necessary qualifications for the subject title. The requirements for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems are graduation from an accredited college or university with a Bachelor's degree, and three years of experience in work involving the review, analysis, and evaluation of the administrative, business, and/or operational policies, procedures, practices, and processes and/or the technological requirements of an organization for the purpose of revising/enhancing existing information systems and/or developing/acquiring and implementing new IT solutions and services. Additional experience could have been substituted for the education requirement on a year for year basis. The appellant was found not to possess the necessary qualifications. It is noted that he has not yet been returned to his permanent title, Network Administrator 1.

On his qualifying examination application, the appellant indicated that he possessed 119 college credits. The maximum credit allowable for an incomplete degree is three years, six months. As such, the appellant was required to possess

three years, six months of experience per the substitution clause for education. He listed positions as an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems, two positions as Network Administrator 1, Technical Support Representative with Commerce Bank, and Branch Associate with W.W. Grainger Inc. It is noted that the appellant indicated his second position as a Network Administrator 1 was from March 2005 to November 2017. Official records indicate that the appellant was a Network Administrator 1, OIT from July 2010, an Information Technology Specialist from June 2006 to July 2010, and a Data Processing Programmer 3 from March 2005 to June 2006. For this position, he provided one set of duties. He was credited with six months of applicable experience as a provisional Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. The appellant's remaining positions were inapplicable. Since the appellant lacked three years of applicable experience, he did not pass the qualifying examination for the subject title.

On appeal, the appellant states that he was a System Administrator in his Network Administrator 1 positions, and that this is applicable experience as it matches one of the examples of work on the job specification for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. He states that he has provided IT recommendations to management, formulated IT policies and procedures, and functioned as project leader on many IT projects.

## CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-7.6(c) states, in pertinent part, that if the nature of the work, education and experience qualifications of both titles are dissimilar for a lateral title change, then the employee shall be appointed pending examination. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.3(b) provides that the appellant has the burden of proof in examination appeals.

At the outset, it must be underscored that a qualifying examination requires the candidate to demonstrate on his application that he possesses the necessary experience for the subject title 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).

A review of the appellant's application reveals that he does not meet the experience requirements for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. When an applicant indicates extensive experience in titles established under the State Classification Plan, it is appropriate to utilize the job specifications to determine the primary focus of the duties of incumbents serving in career service titles. In his positions with the State, the appellant was credited for his experience as an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. His remaining positions do not have work involving *the review, analysis, and evaluation of the administrative, business, and/or operational policies, procedures, practices, and processes and/or*

*the technological requirements of an organization* for the purpose of revising/enhancing existing information systems and/or developing/acquiring and implementing new IT solutions and services. Each position can have only one primary focus. The duties performed most of the time and the importance of those duties, or the preponderance of the duties, identify the primary focus of the position.

Revising and enhancing existing information systems and/or developing/acquiring and implementing new IT solutions and services alone does not meet the experience requirement. Rather, this is the purpose of the work of reviewing, analyzing, and evaluating of the administrative, business, and/or operational policies, procedures, practices, and processes and/or the technological requirements of an organization. The primary focus of a title is in the job definition, and examples of work on the job specification are listed in order of importance. The first example of work is “confers with department/agency personnel to analyze current operational procedures, business rules and practices; determines feasibility for automation, identifies problems or areas for improvements, and develops solutions.” The 17<sup>TH</sup> example of work is “may serve as System Administrator; administers and maintains system security rules and policies; tracks and evaluates program performance, databases, or production systems; provides system support to users.” That a primary focus of a position, or even a duty, match an example of work on a job specification is not a basis for establishing eligibility. Rather, the primary focus of the position must match the requirements on the job specification.

The description of duties listed on appeal does not support that the primary foci of his remaining positions as listed on his qualifying examination application and attachment included qualifying work. Accordingly, Agency Services correctly determined that the appellant did not pass the subject qualifying examination. Therefore, he 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 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2023

*Allison Chris Myers*

---

Allison Chris Myers  
Acting Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

Nicholas F. Angiulo  
Director  
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Written Record Appeals Unit  
P. O. Box 3,12  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-03,12

c. Frank Sermarini  
Ebonik Gibson  
Division of Agency Services  
Records Center