



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of K.H., Supervising  
Library Assistant (PC2920G), Ocean  
County Library

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

CSC Docket No. 2026-1063

Examination Appeal

**ISSUED: April 29, 2026 (HS)**

K.H. requests a make-up examination for Supervising Library Assistant (PC2920G), Ocean County Library.

As background, the appellant, a Principal Library Assistant, applied for the subject promotional announcement, which issued on June 1, 2025 with a closing date of June 23, 2025. Candidates were sent notices informing them that the examination was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on October 2, 2025 in Cherry Hill, New Jersey. In a submission dated September 22, 2025, the appellant stated that she received this notice on September 20, 2025 and requested a make-up examination on the basis that she would be away on vacation September 27, 2025 through October 5, 2025 at a resort located in Cape May County, New Jersey. The Division of Administrative and Employee Services denied the request on or about October 2, 2025 as not satisfying the established criteria. Specifically, the division found that no documentation was submitted to show that the appellant was outside of New Jersey or a contiguous state on the date of the examination. It is noted that there were 12 applicants for the subject examination which resulted in an eligible list of seven names that promulgated on October 30, 2025 with an expiration date of October 29, 2027. A certification consisting of all seven names issued from the eligible list on November 3, 2025 (PL251779), resulting in two permanent appointments. The remaining five eligibles were retained on the eligible list for future certifications.

On appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), the appellant explains that her vacation leave request had been approved by the appointing authority in January 2025. Therefore, on January 8, 2025, the vacation was reserved

with payment of a \$200.00 nonrefundable deposit. The appellant maintains that with such “short notice,” she was unable to change her vacation date for the following reasons: (1) the non-refundable nature of the monies collected; (2) that the resort was closing on October 13, 2025 and the inability to push the vacation a week ahead; and (3) the appellant’s three medical appointments scheduled for the week of October 6, 2025 – October 10, 2025. In addition, the appellant argues that it would have been “unethical to abandon [her] family,” leaving them without a vehicle so that she could travel to the test destination on October 2, 2025.

The appellant states that she received the examination scheduling notice 12 days before the examination date and seven days before her vacation. She contends this was not reasonable notice and argues that had she been given “proper” advance notice, it “may have been possible” that she could have moved her vacation up to the week prior and been able to take the test on the scheduled date. The appellant complains that the examination scheduling notice came three months after the examination closing date, yet she was expected to take the test 12 days after receiving said notice.<sup>1</sup>

## CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.8(b) provides that candidates will be notified in an appropriate manner of the time and place of the examination, and of any postponement or cancellation.

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.9(a) provides, in pertinent part, that make-up examinations may be authorized for the following reasons: (1) error by this agency or appointing authority; (2) serious illness or disability of the candidate on the test date, provided the candidate submits a doctor’s certificate specifying that the candidate was not able to take the test on that day for medical reasons; (3) documented serious illness or death in the candidate’s immediate family; (4) natural disaster; (5) prior vacation or travel plans outside of New Jersey or any contiguous state, which cannot be reasonably changed, as evidenced by a sworn statement and relevant documentation; (6) when required for certain persons returning from military service (*see N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-4.6A); and (7) other valid reasons.

Upon review, the Commission finds that the Division of Administrative and Employee Services correctly determined that the appellant was not eligible for a make-up examination. The pertinent regulatory provision is clear: *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.9(a)5 provides for a make-up examination based on prior vacation or travel plans outside of New Jersey or any contiguous state, which cannot be reasonably changed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant states on appeal that she received the examination scheduling notice “10 days” before the test date. However, she had previously indicated in her make-up request that she had received the notice on September 20, 2025. Given that the test date was October 2, 2025, she would have had 12 days’ notice assuming September 20, 2025 was the date of receipt. It is noted that the appellant does not present any evidence to corroborate the claim of a September 20, 2025 date of receipt.

The appellant's appeal focuses on various arguments regarding her inability to reasonably change her vacation plans. However, the regulation requires that the vacation plans be *outside of New Jersey or any contiguous state*. The appellant's plans were in New Jersey, so *N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.9(a)5* is not grounds for relief. She was faced, essentially, with a scheduling conflict which is not a valid reason for a make-up. *See, e.g., In the Matter of Naomi Minus-Jackson* (CSC, decided May 3, 2017).

Further, it appears that the appellant, on appeal, is now also relying on *N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.9(a)1*, which provides, in pertinent part, that a make-up examination may be authorized based on error by this agency. Specifically, the appellant complains that she did not receive the examination scheduling notice until September 20, 2025 and that this was not enough advance notice. The appellant has not provided any evidence in corroboration of the asserted September 20, 2025 date of receipt. But even assuming that September 20, 2025 was the date of receipt, said date was 12 days before the test date, October 2, 2025. The Commission does not find this to be an unreasonable notice period. As such, the appellant was appropriately notified of the examination.

### 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 APRIL, 2026




---

Mary Cruz  
Acting Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

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

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