



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of Tammy Shupp,  
 Secretarial Assistant 2, Non-  
 Stenographic (PS8979K), Hunterdon  
 Developmental Center

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

CSC Docket No. 2025-2764

List Removal Appeal

**ISSUED: September 10, 2025 (SLK)**

Tammy Shupp appeals the decision to remove her name from the Secretarial Assistant 2, Non-Stenographic (PS8979K), Hunterdon Developmental Center eligible list for failing the clerical performance examination.

By way of background, the appellant was appointed provisionally pending promotional examination procedures as a Secretarial Assistant 2, Non-Stenographic, effective June 15, 2024. On November 1, 2024, the Secretarial Assistant 2, Non-Stenographic (PS8979K) examination was announced with a closing date of November 21, 2024, and required candidates to pass a typing test. Specifically, the announcement set forth that:

Note: Applicants will be required to demonstrate proficiency in keyboarding or typing. A five-minute qualifying typing test (scored on a pass/fail basis) may be scheduled or administered during the interview process...Candidates will be graded on a scale based on the number of errors made. Proficiency will be based on total words per minute minus errors. Keyboards will be provided.

A total of three employees, including the appellant applied. Two candidates, including the appellant, were determined eligible, and their names were certified (PS250664). The PS8997K eligible list expires on April 16, 2027. However, after the appellant did not pass the typing test that was administered by the appointing

authority, her name was removed from the subject eligible list. It is noted that no appointments were made on certification PS250664 as the other eligible's name was retained on the list for future certifications only.

On appeal, the appellant states that when the appointing authority first administered the typing test, she was given a small laptop. The appellant notes that she does not own a laptop, nor does she perform any duties at work on a laptop. Therefore, she asserts that she is not familiar with how a laptop works. After failing the typing test, she asked the appointing authority's human resources department (human resources) if she could re-take the typing test due to windows on the laptop popping up, which she could not close to finish the test. Thereafter, after human resources spoke with this agency, she was allowed to re-take the test.

The appellant presents that she took the second typing test on a desktop computer that was provided by human resources. However, she noted that the keyboard on the provided desktop was worn out and the letters were barely noticeable. The appellant states that she brought this to the typing test administrator's attention who responded, "oh I didn't even notice." The appellant indicates that she replied that she really needs to be able to see the letters. However, she was not offered to take the test on another computer. Consequently, the appellant provides that she took the test on the desktop provided, and she did the best that she could. Further, when she completed the test, the appellant states that she thought that she did well. However, the appellant indicates that she was later advised that she did not pass.

The appellant asserts that she takes pride in her job, and she always does her best no matter the task. The appellant claims that her position is not based on speed but based on correct spelling and grammar. Thereafter, the appellant provides that she emailed human resources explaining that the provided desktop keyboard was worn out and the letters could barely be seen. The appellant indicates that initially human resources did not respond. Upon her further follow-up, the appellant states that human resources responded that "we were very lucky they allowed you to retake the test before. We can ask but I don't have any hope for that, but who knows." However, the appellant indicates that a few days later, she received notice from this agency that her name was removed from the subject eligible list.

The appellant highlights that she has worked for the State for 21 years in Secretarial/Administrative positions. She asserts that this is the first time she had to taking a typing test for a position. The appellant states that she inquired with other secretarial staff and supervisors in other departments as to whether they had to take a typing test, and all responded that they did not. The appellant questions why she is being singled out by her human resources to take a typing test for speed, when her job description does not include such a task.

## CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-4.7(a)1, in conjunction with *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.1(a)4 provides that an eligible's name may be removed from a list for failure to pass examination procedures. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.3(b) provides that an appellant has the burden of proof to show that an appointing authority's decision to remove the appellant's name from an eligible list was in error.

A candidate typically only has one chance to pass a typing test. In the appellant's case, she was given more than one opportunity to take the examination, and unfortunately, received non-passing scores on both. Furthermore, to allow the appellant to re-take the typing test a third time would provide the appellant with an unfair advantage over the other eligible who met the qualifications for the position. Additionally, it is noted that any test administration issues must be filed in writing at the examination site on the test date. *See N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.4(c). The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, has 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." *See In the Matter of Kimberlee L. Abate, et al.*, Docket No. A-4760-01T3 (App. Div. August 18, 2003). Although the appellant indicates that she raised concerns about the keyboard that was used for the second typing test, she went ahead and completed it. If the conditions were such that she could not use the offered keyboard, she should have declined to take the test and appealed immediately. Therefore, the appointing authority has presented a sufficient basis to remove the appellant from the Secretarial Assistant 2, Non-Stenographic (PS8979K), Hunterdon Developmental Center eligible list, and the appellant has not met her burden of proof in this matter.

Concerning the appellant's statement that she has worked for the State for 21 years in Secretarial/Administrative positions and previously did not have to take a typing test, this has no relevance as the subject examination announcement indicates that candidates need to demonstrate proficiency in keyboarding or typing based on a five-minute qualifying typing test and eligibility is determined on the basis of each discrete announcement. Further, as all applicants for the subject examination needed to demonstrate typing proficiency, the appellant is not being singled out. Additionally, it is noted that personnel records indicate that the appellant's prior titles were Nursing Services Clerk and Stores Clerk, which are clerical, but not secretarial titles, that do not require incumbents to demonstrate typing proficiency. In other words, not all titles are the same, and all clerical or secretarial titles do not need to demonstrate typing proficiency. Similarly, whether other staff members, who may or may not be in secretarial or other titles where demonstrated typing proficiency is a requirement, needed to pass a typing test, has no bearing on the subject examination. Finally, while the appellant claims that typing speed is not a part of her job description, as typing proficiency, which is a combination of demonstrated

typing speed and accuracy, is a requirement for the subject title, typing speed is part of the job specification for an incumbent in the subject title.

**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 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 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: Tammy Shupp  
Debra Sharpe  
Division of Human Resource Information Services  
Records Center