



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

In the Matters of Tyreka Thomas,
Medical Security Officer 3(PS5107H),
Ann Klein Forensic Hospital

CSC Docket No. 2024-2634

Eligibility Appeal

ISSUED: June 10, 2026 (KMG)

Tyreka Thomas appeals the determinations of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) which found that they were not eligible for the promotional examination for Medical Security Officer 3¹ (PS5107H), Ann Klein Forensic Hospital.

By way of background, the Medical Security Officer 3(PS5107H) examination was announced with a closing date of March 21, 2024, and was open, in relevant part, to applicants who possessed three years of experience in work involving the treatment, care and custody of patients or residents requiring medical security, one year of which shall have been in a supervisory capacity. It is noted that 19 of the 42 applicants were admitted to the written examination which was held on January 16, 2025. The resulting eligible list of 17 names, promulgated on April 3, 2025, and expires April 2, 2027. Seven appointments were made from the one certification that was issued, and seven eligibles currently remain active on the PS5107H eligible list.

In her application, the appellant indicated, in relevant part, that she provisionally served in the subject title from December 2023 to the closing date; as a Medical Security officer from September 2017 to December 2023; and as a Program Director at Dungarvin from July 2015 to May 2023.² The appellant indicated, in

¹ The title name changed from Supervising Medical Security Officer to Medical Security Officer 3, effective February 21, 2026. The new title will be used in this decision.

² Agency records indicate that the appellant received a regular appointment to the title of Medical Security Officer Recruit, effective July 7, 2018; a regular appointment to the title of Senior Medical Security Officer, effective August 31, 2019; a provisional appointment, pending promotional

relevant part, that as Supervising Medical Security Officer, she assigned and instructed Medical Security Officers (MSO) engaged in providing treatment for patient or resident care; supervised MSOs in identification of patient or resident behavior patterns; supervised the work operations and/or functional programs; implemented security policies, inspected equipment, assisted police with investigations, and ensured that the security officers understood their duties and delegated tasks. The appellant also indicated, in relevant part, that as a Senior MSO, she was responsible for the safety of patients, visitors and professional staff in a psychiatric facility; enforces procedural and safety protocols in the milieu of those with mental illness; training and supervising new recruits; monitored security consoles, CCTV, and monitoring designated areas for contraband. Upon review, Agency Services determined that the appellant lacked three years of applicable experience, including supervisor experience, as she had failed to indicate that her responsibilities included work involving the care and treatment of patients or residents requiring medical security.

On appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), the appellant asserts that she has been a reliable, trustworthy and committed employee for eight years. She asserts that throughout her time, she has maintained an outstanding record, demonstrated consistent performance and actively contributed to the success of the department. The appellant maintains that her duties as a Supervising Medical Security Officer, she organized assigned work and developed effective work methods as assigned; she supervised MSOs and insured that they completed assigned tasks; assumed responsibility for the physical well-being, care and custody of patients and residents; managed the workflow and training of new hires on how they can best serve customers and terms of employees; created schedules to keep everyone busy with deadlines to meet to “prevent gaps or downtime while giving directions and feedback about what needs” improvement; maintained staffing by recruiting, selecting, orientating and training employees; coached, counseled and disciplined employees; and planned, monitored and appraised job results. The appellant also indicated that she possesses seven years of experience in work that involved the treatment, care and custody of patients requiring medical security. The appellant also asserts that she has eight years of relevant supervisory experience as a Program Director at Dungarvin, where she was responsible for setting educational standards, reviewing educational activities and policies for improvements; trained staff and supervised a staff of 15; and conferred with parents and staff regarding learning and behavioral challenges for patients.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a) requires applicants to possess all the requirements specified in an announcement for a promotional examination by the closing date.

examination procedures, to the subject title, effective December 16, 2023; and she was returned to her permanent title of Senior Medical Security Officer, effective October 4, 2025.

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a)2 provides, in pertinent part that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the promotional 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.

Initially, it is noted that a review of the appellant's application, and the information she submits on appeal, reveals that she possesses sufficient general experience. However, Agency Services correctly determined that the appellant did not indicate sufficient supervisory experience as of the closing date. A review of the appellant's application and the information she submits on appeal, reveals that the appellant possesses four months of supervisory experience, as of the closing date, for her provisional service as a Supervising Medical Security Officer. However, the appellant's supervisory experience at Dungarvan, does not meet the announced requirement, as there is no indication that her experience at Dungarvin was focused on the treatment, care and custody of patients or residents requiring medical security. *See In the Matter of Karen Conti* (CSC, decided April 19, 2017) (Commission noted that an experience requirement in an announcement that lists a number of duties which define the primary experience, requires that the applicants demonstrate that they primarily performed all those duties for the required length of time. Performance of only one or some of the duties listed is not indicative of comprehensive experience).

Further, with regard to the appellant's experience as a MSO, there is no indication that the primary focus of this position, was supervisory experience in work involving the treatment, care and custody of patients or residents requiring medical security. In order for an appellant to indicate sufficient supervisory experience she would need to demonstrate that she was responsible for ensuring that tasks that were assigned to subordinates were efficiently accomplished; independently assign and distribute work to subordinate employees; provide oral or written task instructions and maintain the flow and quality of work within a unit in order to ensure timely and effective fulfillment of objectives. Supervisors are also responsible for making available or obtaining materials, supplies, equipment, and/or plans necessary for particular tasks. They provide on-the-job training to subordinates when needed and make employee evaluations based on their own judgment. They have the authority to recommend hiring, firing, and disciplining employees. Leading lower-level staff is not equivalent to supervisory duties, which involve not only being in a leadership position, but responsibility for overseeing the work of other staff, and composing and administering formal performance reviews for subordinates. Training and ensuring that assigned tasks are completed efficiently would only be considered part of supervisory functions and more consistent with that of a lead worker. *See In the Matter of Phillip Beesley, et al.* (MSB, decided March 27, 2001) and *In the Matter of Vincent Gimmelli* (MSB, decided June 9, 2004). In this matter, the appellant has failed to indicate that as a MSO she was responsible for formal performance reviews of subordinate staff, and as such, the description of the appellant's duties does not

qualify as supervisory 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 10TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026



Mary Cruz
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Shannon L. Dalton
Director
Division of Appeals & Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Tyreka Thomas
Cheryl Manson
Division of Agency Services
Records Center