



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

In the Matter of Daniel Florio,
Veterans Service Officer 2 (S1122F),
Statewide

CSC Docket No. 2025-865

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: May 20, 2026 (KMG)

Daniel Florio appeals the determination of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services), which found that he did not meet the experience requirement for the open competitive examination for Veterans Service Officer 2 (S1122F), Statewide.

By way of background, the subject examination was announced with a closing date of August 21, 2024, and was open, in relevant part, to applicants who possessed a Master’s degree in Social Work, Education, Psychology, Nursing, or other related areas; and one year of professional program delivery experience in providing social services assistance for the disabled or other client population which may include the investigation, analysis, and evaluation of socio-economic situations. The subject eligible list of 15 names promulgated on March 6, 2025 and expires on March 5, 2027. Four appointments were made from three certifications, and eight names remain active on the (S1122F) eligible list.

Upon review of the appellant’s application, Agency Services credited the appellant’s Master’s degree in Education. However, it did not credit him with any applicable experience. On his application, the appellant indicated, in relevant part, that as the owner of the Veteran Training Group, the appellant trained and licensed veterans in the area of plumbing and backflow prevention. The appellant also stated that he served as a Police Officer/Academy Instructor with Jefferson Township, as a Master Sergeant in the United States Airforce, and as Sprinkler Fitter. However, the appellant failed to indicate that he had any program delivery experience in providing social services assistance. Thus, Agency Services determined that he lacked the required one year of applicable experience.

On appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), the appellant argues that he possesses sufficient relevant experience as a “Veteran Service Officer”¹ with the Department of Veteran Affairs², a Police Officer and Academy Instructor for Jefferson Township, and as Master Sergeant in the United States Air Force National Guard. The appellant asserts that, as a “Veteran Service Officer,” he counseled over 80 veterans and assisted them in receiving social service assistance. He notes that his responsibilities included assessing the needs of the veterans, building trust, and utilizing specialized training to further assist veterans. The appellant further claims that while employed as a Police Officer, he acted as liaison to military members and advised them of Veterans Affairs and other assistant programs available to them. Furthermore, the appellant claims that, while serving as a Master Sergeant, he counseled veterans during active duty and discharge, and counseled them on “VA” compensation, disability, education, pension, healthcare and suicide prevention.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.3(b) provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the open competitive examination announcement by the closing date. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.3(b) provides that the appellant has the burden of proof in examination appeals.

Under *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(g), the Commission can accept clarifying information in eligibility appeals. However, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-2.1(f) provides that an application may only be amended prior to the announced closing date. For example, information submitted on appeal pertaining to duties in a given position that expands or enlarges information previously submitted is considered clarifying and is accepted. However, any documentation indicating work in a setting that was not previously listed on an application or resume cannot be considered after the closing date. Thus, absent a rule relaxation, the Commission can only consider information provided on appeal regarding the positions listed on the appellant’s original application. *See In the Matter of Diana Begley* (MSB, decided November 17, 2004). In this matter, since the appellant failed to list his “Veteran Service Officer” employment on his application, it is considered amending information. However, even assuming *arguendo* that his experience as a “Veteran Service Officer” was accepted, it would only provide him

¹ Although the appellant states that he served in the title of “Veteran Service Officer,” agency records indicate that he served in the unclassified title of Special Staff Officer 1 from February 26, 2024 to August 13, 2025.

² On January 9, 2026, Public Law 2025, Chapter 139 took effect, creating the Department of Veterans Affairs, and transferring certain functions, powers and duties previously held by the Department Military and Veterans Affairs, including, but not limited to, the authority to determine whether any person seeking to be considered a veteran or a disabled veteran under *N.J.S.A.* 11A:5-1 met the requirements. The remaining functions, powers and duties would stay in the newly named Department of Military Affairs.

with six months of applicable experience as of the closing date of the subject announcement.

Moreover, it is noted that Agency Services correctly determined that none of the appellant's experience that he did list on his application and resume was applicable as none of the primary focus of the experience was professional program delivery experience in providing social services assistance for the disabled or other client population which may include the investigation, analysis, and evaluation of socio-economic situations. In this regard, in order for experience to be considered applicable, it must have as its primary focus full-time responsibilities in the areas required in the announcement. *See In the Matter of Bashkim Vlashi* (MSB, decided June 9, 2004). However, the experience that the appellant listed on his application and resume had, as their primary focus, law enforcement, plumbing, and training experience. Accordingly, the record reflects that the appellant did not meet the requirements for the title under test, and there is no basis to disturb the determination of Agency Services.

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 20TH DAY OF MAY, 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: Daniel Florio
Division of Agency Services
Records Center