



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of S.K., Child Support
Specialist 2 (PS5507K), Division of
Family Development

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

CSC Docket No. 2025-2143

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: July 2, 2025 (SLK)

S.K. appeals the test administration of the Child Support Specialist 2 (PS5507K), Division of Family Development promotional examination.

By way of background, a total of 13 employees applied for the subject examination which had a March 21, 2024, examination closing date. All 13 applicants were admitted to the test. A total of 10 applicants, including S.K., sat for the test, which was administered on March 11, 2025. As part of S.K.'s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodation, she was provided a test administrator at this agency's Station Plaza location. The subject test was computer-based. At the top of the computer screen there were numbered boxes, 1-15, 16-25, 26-40, 41-55, and 56-65. The directions indicated that the numbered boxes at the top of the screen corresponded to each section of the test. Further, there was a test booklet that contained stimulus material to be used to answer questions 26 through 55 on the computer. The appellant did not answer questions one through 25 as her first answer was question 26. The only note from the Report On Conduct of Examination from S.K.'s assigned test administrator was that S.K. entered her social security number on the computer-based test instead of her applicant ID number. S.K. did not file an on-site appeal. The test resulted in eight of the 10 applicants who sat for the test passing while the appellant was one of the two candidates who did not pass.

On appeal, the appellant asserts that the subject test did not begin on question one and instead started later (she believes question 40) as her booklet began with

that question. Further, the appellant states that she questioned the test administrator about this, who then asked another administrator if this sounded correct, but they only advised that she should follow what the booklet and computer advised, which she did.

However, the appellant presents that she recently learned that she failed the subject test even though she had been scheduled for an interview and been a Child Support Specialist 1 since 2013, which prevents her from advancing in her career. Further, she provides that this circumstance is taking a toll on her for the same reason that she was granted an accommodation. Therefore, she contends that the test administration was unacceptable and unprofessional since no one was able to assist her with her understanding regarding which questions she was to answer, and this should never happen to someone who has an ADA accommodation. Consequently, the appellant argues that her eligibility should be based on her education and experience.

Additionally, the appellant asks if a statement can be provided from her test administrator. She reiterates her belief that her computer did not start on question one. The appellant emphasizes that in a prior examination, she had taken a test for the subject title and passed without any issues. However, she states that due to COVID-19, the scores expired. The appellant highlights that she has been with Child Support for 13 years and currently serves as the main business analyst. The appellant notes that she was interviewed for a position in the subject title, but she was not appointed as she was not a candidate on the eligible list due to this “erroneous” oversight.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.3 provides, in pertinent part, that in examination items, scoring, and administration appeals, the appeal shall include the specific objection being appealed and that the appellant shall have the burden of proof.

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.4(c) provides that an examination candidate wishing to challenge the manner in which the examination was administered must file an appeal in writing at the examination site on the day of the examination.

Initially, it is noted that the appellant’s appeal of the test administration is untimely as she needed to file an appeal in writing at the examination site on the day of the examination. See *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.4(c). In *In the Matter of Kimberlee L. Abate, et al.*, Docket No. A-4760-01T3 (App. Div. August 18, 2003), the court noted that “the obvious intent of this ‘same-day’ appeal process is to immediately identify, address and remedy any deficiencies in the manner in which the competitive examination is being administered.” A review of the Center Supervisor Report does not indicate that she filed an onsite appeal as the only monitor note was that the appellant entered her social security number rather than her applicant ID number that had been assigned

by the system when she filled out her application. Therefore, her appeal cannot be considered.

Regarding the merits, for informational purposes only, the subject test was computer-based as described above. In other words, the subject test contained 65 questions and started on question one, and the supplemental test book was to be used to assist the appellant with certain questions only. However, the record indicates that instead of starting with the first question, the appellant skipped the first 25 questions and started on question 26.


Regarding the appellant's request for a statement from her assigned test administrator who she contends will support her belief that the test did not start on question one, the Division of Test Development, Analytics, and Administration, which administered the test, was contacted. It did not support the appellant's belief and instead confirmed that the test started on question one as described above. Further, concerning the appellant's claim that she asked test administrators for assistance regarding what questions she was to answer, the test monitors were instructed to record all events that took place in the testing room, and they did not record that the appellant asked for any assistance. Additionally, as indicated above, the appellant did not file an on-site appeal. Accordingly, there is nothing in the record that indicates that the appellant asked for assistance. Moreover, the monitors were instructed to read, "Once I instruct you to begin, please refer to the introductory screen for specific instructions for your exam." Additionally, it is noted that 10 candidates sat for the test and eight passed. In other words, the instructions indicated that the test began on question one, the computer-based test that the appellant took started on question one, and based on the pass rate, there is nothing in the record that indicates that the directions did not clearly indicate that the test started on question one. Furthermore, all the candidates uniformly received the same instructions. Finally, the appellant's education and experience, her scheduled interview, and her prior passing cannot substitute for her need to demonstrate current competence by passing the subject test.

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 2ND DAY OF JULY, 2025



Allison Chris Myers
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 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: S.K.
Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration
Division of Administrative and Employee Services
Records Center