



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Princess Jenkins,
Department of Health

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

CSC Docket No. 2024-1333
OAL Docket No. CSV 00389-24

ISSUED: DECEMBER 19, 2025

The appeal of Princess Jenkins, an Administrative Analyst 1 with the Department of Health, of her release at the end of the working test period, effective November 15, 2023, was before Administrative Law Judge Julio C. Morejon (ALJ), who rendered his initial summary decision on November 12, 2025. 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 on December 17, 2025, accepted and adopted the ALJ's granting of the appointing authority's motion for summary decision and his recommendation to uphold the release at the end of the working test period.

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 Princess Jenkins.

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 17TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

Allison Chris Myers

Allison Chris Myers
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Dulce A. Sulit-Villamor
Director and Chief Regulatory Officer
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Office of the Chair/Chief Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

Attachment



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

MOTION FOR SUMMARY DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. CSV 00389-24

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2024-1333

PRINCESS JENKINS,

Appellant,

v.

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,**

Respondent.

Princess Jenkins, pro se, appellant

**Gina Labrecque, Deputy Attorney General, (Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General
of New Jersey) for respondent, State of New Jersey, Department of Health**

Record Closed: October 6, 2025

Decided: November 12, 2025

BEFORE JULIO C. MOREJON, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant, Princess Jenkins, (Appellant or Jenkins) appeals the decision of respondent, State of New Jersey, Department of Health (Respondent or the Department), dismissing appellant as an Administrative Analyst 1, at the conclusion of appellant's working test period effective November 15, 2023.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

By letter dated November 15, 2023, (and postmarked November 30, 2023), the Department gave Jenkins notice (Notice) that she was being removed from employment effective said date, in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.1.

Specifically, the Notice provided:

This is to inform you that during your [Jenkins'] four-month working test period (July 15-2023 through November 15, 2023) your job performance as an Administrative Analyst I in the Division of Health Facility Survey and Field Operations, has been rated "Unsatisfactory".

Your Management has indicated that you have not exhibited the necessary standard level of performance required in the job description for this title. Additionally, a review of your employment history indicates that you do not possess underlying permanent service in another title.

This serves as your official notification in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.1, that your services with the Department will conclude effective close of business November 15, 2023.

On January 2, 2024, Jenkins filed an appeal with the Civil Service Commission (the Commission), disagreeing with the Department's decision for reasons related to "multiple discrepancies, inadequate support and misrepresentations throughout the [four month] of the process", which resulted in her dismissal on November 15, 2023.

Thereafter, on January 5, 2024, Civil Service transmitted the Appeal to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) as a contested case, where the same was filed on February 16, 2024.¹

¹ On February 16, 2024, the Department corrected the initial transmittal of January 5, 2024, to reflect the correct agency transmitting this matter as the "Department of Health".

A hearing was scheduled for February 4, 2025. On January 3, 2025, the Department filed a motion for summary decision. As a result of the filing of the motion, the hearing scheduled for February 4, 2025, was adjourned to allow Jenkins to file her opposition. A motion schedule was entered whereby Jenkins was to file her opposition on January 31, 2025, and the Department was to file its reply, if any, on February 10, 2025.

On or about January 31, 2025, Jenkins requested an extension of time to file her opposition, which the Department did not oppose. The motion schedule was amended on January 31, 2025, to allow Jenkins to file her opposition on March 31, 2025. Jenkins did not file her opposition.

On April 25, 2025, an Order was entered in accordance with N.J.A.C. 1:1-1.3(a), setting forth that the date by which Jenkins had to submit her opposition on March 31, 2025, to the pending motion for summary decision is enforced and the motion will be deemed unopposed.

FACTUAL DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

After reviewing the Department's motion for summary decision, along with the exhibits contained therein, I **FIND** the following as **FACT** in this matter:

Cassandra Licata-Link, (Licata-Link) is employed by the Department as Supervising Administrative Analyst for Budget and Operations. Licata-Link was assigned the supervisor of Jenkins during Jenkins' working test period at the Department. Licata-Link supervised Jenkins from July 15, 2023 through the end of her working test period on November 15, 2023. (Certification of Cassandra Licata-Link, Exhibit A) ("Licata-Link Certification").

During her working test period, Jenkins' job duties included analysis of statistical, financial and operating reports, ability to review operating procedures and aid department officials in related operating requirements, fiscal procedures, and budget requests.

(Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit B). Jenkins was required to master the knowledge of programs, functions, organizations, budget, operations and problems of the state department/agency after a period of training. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit B).

Immediately upon receiving this title, Jenkins entered into a working test period at the Department ². At the time of her working test period, Jenkins was also enrolled in a performance improvement plan ("PIP"). (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit C at DOH007-DOH010; ¶ 3-4). The PIP began on June 19, 2023. Id. The goal of the PIP was for Jenkins to work collaboratively with her supervisor in retraining her on programs used in her daily job duties. Ibid. The duties included understanding accounts for coding to purchase items, purchase requests, using the NJCFS³ mainframe, travel reimbursements, time management and prioritizing tasks. Id.

Throughout the entirety of Jenkins' PIP and working test period, Licata-Link drafted NJCFS activity questions to aid Jenkins in becoming more knowledgeable of the NJCFS system. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit D at DOH260-DOH289; ¶ 7). Licata-Link had weekly PIP meetings with Jenkins the entirety of her working test period. (See Licata-Link Certification at ¶ 5.) Additionally, throughout the working test period, Jenkins was provided trainings on the NJStart, MACse, NJCFS, and Business Objects. (Licata-Link Certification at ¶ 6; Exhibit E).

The first working test period began on July 15, 2023 and continued to September 15, 2023. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit A). Jenkins received an unsatisfactory rating for this first half of her working test period. Id. The second working test period began on September 15, 2023 and continued to November 15, 2023. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit F). Jenkins also received an unsatisfactory rating for the second half of her working test period. Id.

² Jenkins was first hired as an Administrative Analyst Trainee in July 2022. She worked as a trainee for one year (as this is a one-year appointment). In June 2023, Jenkins was enrolled in a PIP. Then she was promoted to the Administrative Analyst 1 position in July 2023 and entered a working test period for that title.

³ NJCFS is the mainframe banking system used in daily tasks for Jenkins' job duties.

The reasoning for the unsatisfactory ratings for both reports was consistent. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit G). Jenkins did not grasp the accounting codes even with supplemental trainings. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit H). Jenkins had difficulty determining the difference between "ReqTrack" and Requisition. ReqTrack is the system to track purchases, conferences, trainings, etc. (Licata-Link Certification, Exhibit H; ¶ 8). "Requisitions" are created in NJStart for procurement of products. Id. These are two essential systems that are used daily in her job duties for budgeting and operational purposes. (Licata-Link Certification, ¶ 8). Additionally, Jenkins lacked communication and timeliness with assignments. (Exhibit G at DOH097, DOH115, DOH140, and DOH149).

Specifically, Licata-Link requested the status of travel reimbursement on several instances and Jenkins did not respond until several PIP meetings later. Ibid. At almost every PIP meeting, Jenkins' errors with accounting codes continued. (See Exhibit G at DOH069, DOH109, DOH136-137, DOH141, DOH148, DOH177-178, DOH189, DOH208, DOH236, DOH246, and DOH253-254). She did not exhibit the necessary standard of level of performance required for her job duties. (see Exhibit I).

As a result of these two unsatisfactory ratings, Jenkins was terminated on November 15, 2023. (See Exhibit I).

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Standards for summary decision

Under the Uniform Administrative Procedure Rules, N.J.A.C. 1:1-1.1 to -21.6, "[a] party may move for summary decision upon all or any of the substantive issues in a contested case." N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.5(a). Such motion "shall be served with briefs and with or without supporting affidavits" and "[t]he decision sought may be rendered if the papers and discovery which have been filed, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact challenged and that the moving party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law." N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.5(b). When the motion "is made and

supported, an adverse party in order to prevail must by responding affidavit set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue which can only be determined in an evidentiary proceeding." Id.

This rule is substantially similar to the summary-judgment rule embodied in the New Jersey Court Rules. See Judson v. Peoples Bank & Trust Co. of Westfield, 17 N.J. 67, 74 (1954). In Brill v. Guardian Life Insurance Co., 142 N.J. 520, 540 (1995), the New Jersey Supreme Court addressed the appropriate test to be employed in deciding the motion.

In evaluating the merits of the motion, all inferences of doubt are drawn against the movant and in favor of the party against whom the motion is directed. Judson, 17 N.J. at 75. However, "[w]hen a motion for summary decision is made and supported, an adverse party in order to prevail must by responding affidavit set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue which can only be determined in an evidentiary proceeding." N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.5(b).

After reviewing the motion papers filed herein, along with certifications and exhibits attached thereto, and having previously Ordered on April 25, 2025, that the within motion is uncontested, I **CONCLUDE** this matter is ripe for summary decision under N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.5(b).

One of the objectives of the civil service laws and regulations is to ensure the merit and fitness of public service employees. 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, 135 N.J.L. at 171. "[T]he sole test is an opinion formed by observation of the employee's work," which opinion [*22] 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 with further training to qualify him for the position. Briggs v. Dep't of Civil Serv., 64 N.J. Super. 351, 355 (App. Div. 1960).

The case before this tribunal concerns Jenkins' release at the end of her working test period. The working test period is not a time for further training; rather, it is part of the testing process in which an employee must demonstrate their competence in their position. Briggs v. NJ Dept. of Civil Service, 64 N.J. Super 351 (App. Div. 1960). Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.1(b), "all regular appointments to a title in the career service shall be subject to a working test period". This period lasts for four months. N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.2(b)2. Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.1(c), an employee "shall perform the duties of the title for which appointment was made". As stated in N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.1(c), the purpose of the working test period is "to permit an appointing authority to determine whether an employee can satisfactorily perform the duties of the title".

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, 64 N.J. Super. at 356; Devine v. Plainfield, 31 N.J. Super. 300, 303-04 (App. Div. 1954); Lingrell, 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:

No set rule may be formulated when attempting to determine whether an employee's termination at the end of the working test period was based on opinions of the appointing authority formed in good or bad faith.. . It is only required that the opinion be based on actual observations and that those observations form a rational basis for the opinion.

Good faith in this context means "the appointing authority has actually observed the probationer's performance and found it to be unsatisfactory." Sokolowsky v. Twp. of Freehold Dep't of Code Enforcement, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 1 55, 1 57; Davis v. Newark Pub. Library, 9 N.J.A.R. 84, 87. In addition, "[a] fair evaluation period is further evidenced by the giving of guidance and advice due to a probationer, as well as a notification of any deficiencies in performance." Sokolowsky, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) at 57; Davis, 9 N.J.A.R. at 87-88.

Here, Jenkins has the burden to show that the Department acted in bad faith when terminating her from her position as Administrative Analyst 1. To date, Jenkins has not provided any evidence to suggest any bad faith occurred by the Department. The facts in the record indicate a good faith effort on the part of the Department to ensure Jenkins' success. The proofs submitted reveal that the Department provided the required four month working test period and issued two progress reports, which were both unsatisfactory. In the documentation submitted in the Department's moving papers along with the two unsatisfactory progress reports, there is ample evidence to support that Jenkins was not exhibiting the necessary standard of performance to continue with this job title at the Department.

The first working test period report is dated July 15, 2023 through September 15, 2023. The second working test period report provided for the second half of Jenkins working test period began on September 15, 2023 through November 15, 2023. Both reports provided similar feedback to Jenkins about her performance during the working

test period. Each PIP report corresponded to the weekly meetings where Licata-Link provided Jenkins with feedback on how she was progressing in the PIP.

Jenkins alleges in the Petition filed herein that she was poorly trained. However, as the Department's proofs submitted reveal, on numerous occasions she was retrained on tasks along with her colleagues. Formal training was given to Jenkins on MACse, travel authorizations, NJStart, agency orders, travel reimbursements, and agency vouchers. All of which were necessary to master in order to perform Jenkins' job duties.

The record further reveals that by the end of the working test period, Jenkins still needed to familiarize herself with the systems used on a daily basis, i.e. NJStart, MACse, NJCFS, and Business Objects. She failed to do so. Jenkins needed continual guidance learning the accounting for purchases and utilizing the manuals, spreadsheets, and documents created for accounting information. Throughout the entirety of her working test period, Jenkins had difficulty determining the difference between ReqTrack and Requisition.

As a result of the proofs submitted by the Department in its motion for summary decision, and Jenkins' failure to provide any proofs herein, I **CONCLUDE** that Jenkins' has failed to establish that the Department acted in bad faith in releasing Jenkins at the conclusion of her working test period in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.3(b).

As Jenkins has not provided her opposition to the within motion, she has failed to produce any evidence of bad faith on the part of the Department. Accordingly, I **CONCLUDE** that summary decision is **GRANTED** in favor of the Department because the undisputed facts in this matter support the Department's decision to release Jenkins for failure in satisfactorily completing her working test period, and Jenkins' petition of appeal is **DISMISSED**.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Department's motion for summary decision is **GRANTED** as a matter of law under N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.5(b).

It is further **ORDERED** that Jenkins' petition of appeal is **DISMISSED**.

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.

November 12, 2025

DATE

Julio Morejon
JULIO C. MOREJON, ALJ

Date Received at Agency:

November 12, 2025

Date E-Mailed to Parties:

November 12, 2025

lr

APPENDIX

EXHIBITS

For Appellant

None

For Respondent:

Notice of Motion for Summary Decision, supporting Brief, Certification with Exhibits.