



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matters of Chris Wojaczyk and
Leslie Robertson, Correctional Police
Lieutenant (PS9117P),
Youth Justice Commission

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

CSC Docket Nos. 2025-2628 and
2025-2869

Examination Appeals

ISSUED: April 8, 2026

Chris Wojaczyk and Leslie Robertson appeal the promotional examination for Correctional Police Lieutenant (PS9117P), Youth Justice Commission (YJC). These appeals have been consolidated herein.

The subject examination was administered on May 20, 2025 as a written test and consisted of 80 multiple choice questions.

An independent review of the issues presented under appeal has resulted in the following findings:

For question 24,¹ since Robertson selected the correct response, her appeal of this item is moot.

Question 25 provides that the morale among your staff has decreased due to an unexpected extended lockdown and the implementation of mandatory overtime. Additionally, residents have exhibited signs of restlessness and agitation. Consider the following: (I) assist your staff with their daily tasks and routine duties; (II) facilitate periodic opportunities for residents to be out of their cells in small groups with administrative approval; (III) maintain a discreet presence on all floors and units; and (IV) streamline communication by reducing the frequency of team lineups. The question asks which is/are the best way(s) to handle this situation at this point as center keeper. Option a was II only; option b was I and IV only; option c was II,

¹ Robertson referred to this question as the “[Prison Rape Elimination Act] rape question.”

III, and IV only; and option d was I, II, III, and IV. The keyed response was option a. Robertson argues that “[d]uring manpower issues, we attempt to increase morale/staffing issues by supervisors assisting in line staff duties . . . Having the residents out of their cells periodically helps with their restlessness and mental health too.” Robertson also states that “all the answers would apply in this question/situation.” The subject matter expert (SME) indicated that in the scenario presented, the lieutenant held lineup “every day” at the beginning of the shift; decided to “be present” on all the units and on the floor “as much as possible;” and found ways to get the residents out in smaller numbers that would not jeopardize the safety and security of staff. Thus, II is correct, but III, which involves maintaining a *discreet* presence, and IV, which involves *reducing* the frequency of lineups, are both incorrect. Whether or not assisting staff with their daily tasks and routine duties is a correct action to take is not relevant. In this regard, the examination instructions clearly advised the candidate to choose the “best” answer for each question. Because II, facilitating periodic opportunities for residents to be out of their cells in small groups with administrative approval is clearly correct, the “best” answer among the options provided is option a. Options b, c, and d all include clearly incorrect actions to take. The question is correct as keyed.

The examination presented the following scenario pertaining to questions 26-27:

Resident Cordova is displaying erratic behavior and is believed to be under the influence of an unknown substance. He suddenly collapses and is unresponsive to commands by the custody staff. A medical code is called and you are the arriving supervisor.

Question 27 provides that once Resident Cordova has been stabilized by the medical team in the infirmary, the doctor advises that the resident be transported immediately by ambulance to the emergency room for further care. Resident Cordova remains in a fragile state and is unconscious. Consider the following actions: (I) start an investigation into the drugs Resident Cordova consumed; (II) place resident Cordova in restraints; (III) conduct a full strip search of Resident Cordova prior to transport out of the facility. The question asks which action(s) is/are “most appropriate at this point.” Option a was I only; option b was II only; option c was II and III only; and option d was I, II, and III. The keyed response was option b. Robertson argues that prior to leaving a secure care facility, all residents are subject to a strip search for contraband for the safety of the officers and that “this must be accomplished regardless of the circumstances and adhered to as written in our departmental post orders.” She further argues that it is the responsibility of the shift supervisor to investigate and find the cause of the resident’s medical emergency via searches of his cell or questioning other residents. She maintains that this question “has multiple answers that involve the duties of the shift supervisor based on [the] scenario provided.” In support, Robertson submits a copy of a custody post order,

which states that “[j]uveniles shall be strip searched by a custody staff member of the same gender as the juvenile in accordance with *N.J.A.C.* [13:95-5.7].” She also highlights *N.J.A.C.* 13:95-5.7(b), which provides that strip searches of juveniles “may” be conducted in any of a number of circumstances to include the following: before a juvenile leaves the facility to go to the community, a minimum-security facility, or other area outside the secure facility and prior to the departure of the juvenile from any area where the juvenile has had access to dangerous or valuable items. The SMEs indicated that the correct answer is placing Resident Cordova in restraints (II). Specifically, regardless of whether the resident is incapacitated or not, officers have experienced residents suddenly awakening and becoming violent or aggressive. The SMEs indicated that for the safety of the resident and staff, it is always recommended to secure the resident in restraints first and foremost in this situation. Further, the SMEs indicated that if the resident is incapacitated, a full strip search (III) would not be recommended or possible and that the investigation (I) is not a priority or appropriate at this point in time. Additionally, it is noted that *N.J.A.C.* 13:95-5.7(b) provides that strip searches of juveniles *may* be conducted in the circumstances listed. Accordingly, the question is correct as keyed.

Question 29 provides that Officer Kimmel is assigned a new resident following the weekly classification meeting. Officer Kimmel notices that the new resident suddenly becomes visibly uneasy upon seeing the unit population. Additionally, he also notices several residents whispering to each other after spotting the new arrival during a head count in the day space. Consider the following: (I) contact the area supervisor about what he has observed; (II) escort the resident into the day space to ease his fears; (III) call the new resident into the officer’s station and see if he’ll discuss his apprehension; and (IV) ensure continued close observation of the interactions between the new resident and the unit population. The question asks which actions are “most appropriate for Officer Kimmel at this point.” The keyed response was option a, I and III only. Robertson argues that “all answers . . . should apply,” corresponding to option d. The SMEs indicated that keeping the new resident away from the unit population after observing the odd behavior is the safest thing to do first and foremost. In this scenario, it cannot be assumed that it was mere nerves on the new resident’s part and “kids-being-kids” at the sight of a new person. Thus, II and IV are not appropriate at this point. The SMEs added that making the supervisor aware of the situation was paramount. Accordingly, the question is correct as keyed.

Question 30 provides that Officer Matt called Sergeant Reyes stating that Resident Eamon was refusing to lock in his cell at the prescribed time due to his desire to continue to watch television. At the time, Resident Eamon was passively resisting. Sergeant Reyes, who was in another part of the facility, said he would arrive shortly and instructed Officer Matt to call again if an immediate issue arose. Sergeant Reyes quickly arrived to the housing unit. Upon reaching the housing unit, Sergeant Reyes observed that the television area was in disarray, with trash

scattered, furniture damaged, and a phone smashed by Resident Eamon. The question asks what most likely went wrong that led to this outcome, based on the scenario. The keyed response was option d, that Officer Matt did not call for extra officers or a supervisor to assist when Resident Eamon's behavior escalated. Robertson argues that the correct response is option a, that Sergeant Reyes neglected to respond immediately to the housing unit after receiving Officer Matt's call. Specifically, she argues that Sergeant Reyes should have responded to the unit once he was called because the situation escalated quickly "as a result of his delay." She states, "When a supervisor is called for assistance by an officer regardless of the amount of the information relayed he/she should respond immediately per our policies to restore order on any housing unit situation." She further contends that Sergeant Reyes "would have received any additional information from the officer and resident had he showed up to the unit for clarification." The SME indicated that when things got out of hand after the initial phone call, Officer Matt should have radioed for additional officers and a supervisor. It should also be noted that the question specifies that Resident Eamon was only "passively resisting" at the time of the initial call, at which time Sergeant Reyes was in another part of the facility and said he would arrive shortly. Sergeant Reyes specifically instructed Officer Matt to "call again if an immediate issue arose." The question further specifies that Sergeant Reyes "quickly arrived" to the housing unit. Thus, concluding that Sergeant Reyes neglected to respond immediately to the housing unit after receiving Officer Matt's call is not reasonable. Accordingly, the question is correct as keyed.

For question 31, since Robertson selected the correct response, her appeal of this item is moot.

The examination presented the following scenario pertaining to questions 32-34:

During a medication movement, Residents Cohen and Stan were lined up in the hallway when Resident Cohen began to intentionally invade Resident Stan's personal space. Officer Hunley, who was escorting the residents, issued a verbal warning to Resident Cohen to stop and step away from Resident Stan. Resident Cohen did not comply, leading to an exchange of words between the two residents that escalated into a physical fight when Resident Stan lunged at Resident Cohen. Officer Hunley ordered the residents to stop and called a code.

During the altercation, Officer Walton assisted in removing Resident Cohen and instinctively caught a small baggie that fell from Resident Cohen's right shirt sleeve. The bag broke open, spilling an unknown brown powdery substance into the air around Officer Walton and onto his skin. Before Officer Walton could inform the arriving Sergeant Willow of what happened to him, Officer Walton began to sweat

profusely and felt disoriented. He then collapsed to the ground, unconscious and breathing erratically.

Question 32 provides that Sergeant Willow turns and sees Officer Walton unconscious on the ground. Officer Hunley has just called a medical code. Consider the following: (I) 911 is activated; (II) CPR is administered; (III) staff dons PPE; and (IV) the shift commander is notified. The question asks, in responding to the collapse of Officer Walton, which actions are appropriate at this point. The keyed response was option c, I, III, and IV only. Robertson argues that the correct response is option d, all actions. “All of the actions should take place if someone falls unconscious. First steps to render aid is to follow CPR protocols as a first responder. If his breathing was erratic, how would we know if he stopped breathing but through the steps of CPR if necessary . . . In some cases, Narcan may be used if it involves exposure to unknown drug substance.” Robertson presents the following excerpt from the website of the American Heart Association:

For the general public or bystanders who witness an adult suddenly collapse: compression-only CPR, or Hands-Only CPR. Hands-Only CPR is CPR without mouth-to-mouth breaths. It is recommended for use by people who see a teen or adult suddenly collapse in an out-of-hospital setting (such as at home, at work, or in a park).

Robertson also presents a YJC policy concerning Narcan administration. The policy provides, among other things, the following guidance:

- “If no pulse, initiate CPR and AED (if available) as per normal protocol; notify incoming EMS.”
- “If at any time pulses are lost, initiate CPR and AED as per normal protocol.”

SMEs confirmed that administering CPR is incorrect because there is no indication that Officer Walton has stopped breathing and it is evident that this is a drug overdose. Robertson’s documentation is not supportive of her argument as the question provides no information that Officer Walton has lost pulses. The question is correct as keyed.

Question 33 asks which action should be taken “first” regarding the evidence of the baggie and substance on the ground while awaiting the medical team. Option a was ensure that photographic evidence of the scene is taken; option b was establish a perimeter around the baggie and substance; option c was notify the Office of Investigations (OOD); and option d was collect the baggie and substance in an approved receptacle. The keyed response was option b. Robertson argues that “[i]f there is a crime scene all actions are required as well as preserving evidence and scene. [OOI] will be notified and a chain of custody must be established. The custody

supervisor establishes the area is a crime scene and preserves its integrity until investigations unit arrives. However, it is the responsibility of the shift supervisor for collection and storage placement of contraband/evidence per our policy and procedures. After all items are logged and accounted for, then an investigator takes possession after he releases the crime scene.” The question clearly asks for the “first” action to be taken. The SME confirmed that the immediate action that needs to be taken regarding evidence handling and the baggie is that the area should be secured along with the evidence. The question is correct as keyed.

Question 35 provides as follows:

During a live camera audit, four residents were observed smoking an unknown substance in one of the dayrooms. A housing unit officer reviewed the footage to identify the residents. The four residents did not display any unusual behavior or emergent symptoms. They were escorted to a secure area where strip searches were conducted that yielded negative results for contraband. Which action is **INCORRECT** when handling this incident? You should, or ensure that

- (a) the four residents are medically assessed.
- (b) a request for body cavity searches is initiated.
- (c) cell searches of the four residents are conducted.
- (d) the four residents are ordered to produce urine samples.

Wojaczyk argues that “[t]he final sentence presents as a question in capital letters asking which multiple choice is ‘INCORRECT,’ then the sentence asks which multiple choice is the correct course of action. Essentially, the test taker is questioned twice, with both questions framed in opposition.” The candidate is only being asked to identify the incorrect action. The phrase “You should, or ensure that” does not begin a new question but rather merely serves as introductory language applicable to each of the four options. Accordingly, the question is appropriate as written.

Question 37 provides that you have been informed that Resident Sloane has been refusing meals. A sergeant has spoken to Resident Sloane privately about this, but Resident Sloane was unwilling to say why he hasn’t been eating. The question asks which action should be taken “first.” The keyed response was option c, have Resident Sloane seen by medical. Robertson argues that the correct response is option b, have Resident Sloane seen by mental health staff. She maintains that “[w]hen a resident refuses to eat he should be not only seen by a qualified health care professional but a qualified mental health care professional to assess or evaluate the mental state or well being of the resident. It is policy that we send the resident to mental health staff first without the existence of any emergent health conditions (*i.e.*, malnutrition, dehydration, *etc.*). There are many reasons and red flags in a correctional facility why a resident may stop eating. Usually it is a mental health

staff that evaluates and finds out the why first. Both medical and mental health clinicians are important in this circumstance. Per our policies both are involved to evaluate the reason and physical condition of the resident.” In support, Robertson submits copies of YJC policies titled “Suicide Prevention Secure Care Facilities,” the purpose of which is “to implement procedures to minimize the risk of suicide occurring within the resident population at the [YJC]’s secure care facilities,” and “Psychiatric Screening Secure Care Facilities,” which states a policy that the “[YJC] shall pursue an Emergency Crisis Assessment for residents who present as a danger to themselves or others as a result of mental illness that require psychiatric stabilization in a hospital setting.” Robertson also provides a Prison Rape Elimination Act policy, which includes “[e]ating disturbances” in a list of behavioral effects of sexual abuse, and notes that “[s]ome of these behaviors can be attributed to other causes besides sexual abuse as well.” Resident Sloane did not mention why he has not been eating. SMEs indicated that for the YJC, the “first” action will be having the resident seen by medical. They indicated that having the resident seen by mental health staff would happen once it is determined from medical that mental health intervention would be necessary. The question is correct as keyed.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.3(b) provides that the appellant has the burden of proof in examination appeals.

A thorough review of appellants’ submissions and the test materials reveals that the appellants’ examination scores are amply supported by the record, and the appellants have failed to meet their burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals 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 8TH 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: Chris Wojaczyk (2025-2628)
Leslie Robertson (2025-2869)
Division of Administrative and Employee Services
Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration
Records Center