



The Reporter

News from the Civil Service Commission

<https://nj.gov/csc>

January 2021

IN THIS ISSUE

WELCOME

Remarks from the Chair

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION DECISIONS

Supplemental Compensation on Retirement (SCOR)

Page 2

Commission grants requests to allow retired employees to submit application for SCOR benefits outside the one-year time frame. *In the Matter of Cedric Edwards, Office of the Public Defender and In the Matter of Susan Donnelly, Department of Children and Families*

Post-Retirement Work

Page 3

Commission denies request for reconsideration of employee's appeal of the discontinuance of his unclassified appointment. *In the Matter of Duane Wallace, Township of Willingboro*

Retirement Service Credit

Page 3

Commission denies untimely appeal to adjust employment record for continuous permanent service to employee seeking pension eligibility. *In the Matter of Philip Kandl, Union County*

COURT DECISIONS

Pages 4-6

Court affirms Commission decision denying former employee SCOR benefits as employee retired in lieu of removal. *In the Matter of Jefferson Nah, Office of the Public Defender*

Round-up of significant Appellate Division opinions rendered during the second half of 2020

EXECUTIVE ORDER UPDATE

Page 7-8

OF PERSONNEL INTEREST

Page 9

2021 Virtual Events

HELPFUL LINKS

Page 10

Welcome to Issue 7 of The Reporter!

Happy New Year and welcome to 2021! I hope you and your loved ones had a happy, healthy and safe holiday season.

2020 was a very challenging time for everyone, including State and local government. The COVID-19 pandemic quickly spread through our State, forcing us to adjust our lives in ways we have never had to before. I commend each and every one of you for continuing to provide stellar work for the benefit of the residents of the State of New Jersey during this time.



Deirdre L. Webster Cobb, Esq.
Chair/Chief Executive Officer

One of the biggest milestones employees work diligently to reach is retirement. Through the years, the Civil Service Commission (Commission) has received many requests and appeals relating to retirement. In this newsletter, some common requests are highlighted. And given the COVID-19 pandemic, you may be wondering, what have been its effects on retirement and pension for you and your colleagues?

In this issue of The Reporter, we cover requests concerning Supplemental Compensation on Retirement (SCOR), post-retirement work, and the adjustment of an employee's service record for retirement purposes. We will also give an update on Executive Orders signed by Governor Philip D. Murphy due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, we will preview some of the events the Commission will be hosting in 2021.

This year, we look forward to continuing our core mission of advancing New Jersey government with fair and efficient human resources responsive to the needs of the Civil Service workforce, as we begin to safely return to fully providing you with our programs and services.

Remember, CSC works for you.

Best regards,

Deirdre L. Webster Cobb, Esq.
Chair/Chief Executive Officer
New Jersey Civil Service Commission

**Supplemental Compensation on
Retirement (SCOR)**

N.J.S.A. 11A:6-16 through *N.J.S.A.* 11A:6-23 are the statutory provisions that govern supplemental compensation for accumulated sick leave for certain State and local government employees upon retirement. Moreover, *N.J.S.A.* 11A:6-23 provides that the Commission “shall adopt rules for the implementation of supplemental compensation, which shall include but need not be limited to application and eligibility procedures.” These rules may be found in *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.1, *et seq.* In particular, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.3(a) provides that, in State service upon retirement, an employee is entitled to SCOR to be “computed at the rate of one-half the employee’s daily rate of pay for each day of earned and unused accumulated sick leave at the effective date of retirement.” With certain statutory exceptions, SCOR may not exceed \$15,000. See *N.J.S.A.* 11A:6-19.1, *N.J.S.A.* 11A:6-19.2, and *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.3(d).

First, the retired employee must be eligible for SCOR. For instance, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.1(b)1 specifically excludes payment of SCOR to employees who have been “removed for cause after an opportunity for a hearing, who retire in lieu of removal, or who retire under circumstances which would warrant removal.” In the case of [In the Matter of Jefferson Nah, Office of the Public Defender \(CSC, decided August 1, 2018\)](#), while the appellant argued that he did not resign in lieu of removal because he was only issued a Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action, the Commission found that he retired in lieu of discipline and was not entitled to SCOR. The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, affirmed the Commission’s decision as noted in the summary on [page 4](#).

Additionally, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.4(a) provides that an employee may file an application for SCOR within one year of the effective date of retirement. However, *N.J.A.C.* 4A:1-1.2(c) provides that a rule may be relaxed for good cause. Since the provision that governs the application time period is not statutorily based, the Commission may relax *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.4(a) for good cause. The cases that follow illustrate good cause reasons for accepting a late SCOR application.

Cedric Edwards retired from State service, effective June 30, 2018, and over a year later, he filed for SCOR. However, the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) informed the Office of the Public Defender (Public Defender) that Edwards’ application was being returned as the application was not filed within one year of the effective date of retirement as required under *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.4(a). The Public Defender stated that although it provided Edwards with an application for SCOR at the time of his retirement, it did not specifically advise him of the application time frame. When Edwards contacted the Public Defender in July 2019, it instructed him to complete and submit his SCOR application as it did not realize that the time frame had elapsed. The Public Defender presented that going forward, it shall include information to retiring employees that SCOR applications must be processed within one year of retirement and that it would send follow-up reminders to all retirees. Based on equitable reasons, the Commission relaxed *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6.3.4(a) and granted the request. To read the full text, click [here](#).

***In the Matter of Susan Donnelly,
Department of Children and Families
(CSC, decided November 4, 2020)***

Susan Donnelly retired from State service, effective May 31, 2019. The Department of Children and Families requested that the provisions of *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6-3.4(a) be relaxed in order to process Donnelly’s SCOR application. It stated, among other things, that, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, business operations were adversely affected and mail delivery delayed. Had these events not occurred, it would have timely delivered Donnelly’s application. Furthermore, Donnelly noted the reasons why she was unable to submit her application until June 2020. Upon its review, the Commission indicated that “[a]lthough Donnelly should have been aware of the SCOR requirements, it is the appointing authority’s responsibility to promptly and properly provide for the processing of appropriate documentation to effectuate such entitlements.” Therefore, the Commission relaxed the provisions of *N.J.A.C.* 4A:6.3.4(a) based on equitable grounds and granted the request. To read the full text, click [here](#).

Post-Retirement Work

N.J.A.C. 4A:3-1.1 provides that all jobs in local service be allocated to the career service, unclassified service, or Senior Executive Service. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:3-1.3(a)2 and *N.J.S.A.* 11A:3-5b indicate that an appointing authority may appoint a Confidential Assistant allocated to the unclassified service. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.1(a) states that the subchapter on major discipline applies only to permanent employees in the career service or to a person serving a working test period. In addition, *N.J.S.A.* 43:15A-57.2(a) and (b) provide, in pertinent part, that an employee can earn up to \$15,000 per year and still be granted a retirement allowance. Further, *N.J.A.C.* 17:1-17.14(a)2 and (f) provide that an employee who retires and then becomes re-employed in a part-time position by his or her former employer within 180 days of retirement will not be considered to have a “bona fide severance of employment” and will be responsible for the repayment of any benefits that the employee was not entitled to receive. In the case that follows, pursuant to these regulatory provisions, the Commission found that the petitioner had retired from his career service position, and thus, could not appeal his termination of his post-retirement unclassified position.

In the Matter of Duane Wallace, Township of Willingboro (CSC, decided June 6, 2018)

Duane Wallace retired effective January 1, 2010 from his position with the Township of Willingboro as a Construction Official/Director of Inspections, a career service title. Thereafter, he was appointed to the unclassified title of Confidential Assistant effective February 1, 2010. Subsequently, Willingboro discontinued his unclassified appointment on April 28, 2017. On July 25, 2017, Wallace appealed the discontinuance of his unclassified appointment to the Commission. The Commission denied Wallace’s appeal as untimely and on the merits. See [In the Matter of Duane Wallace \(CSC, decided November 15, 2017\)](#).

On reconsideration, among other things, Wallace argued that the Commission made a material error when it found he could be removed without a hearing. Specifically, Wallace emphasized that under the Civil Service Act that no Construction Official or Sub-Code Official can be appointed to these titles without having passed a Civil Service examination. Wallace reiterated that he originally passed a Civil Service examination when he was initially appointed to these titles and satisfactorily completed a working test period. However, the Commission found that Wallace was an unclassified employee who could be terminated without a hearing

since he retired from a career service title and was immediately rehired by the same appointing authority performing the same or similar duties for a salary that greatly exceeded the \$15,000 per year limit for retired employees who were collecting a pension. The Commission commented that if Wallace’s arguments were accepted, the entire Civil Service system would be broken as all eligible employees would seek to “retire” from a career service position to collect his or her pension and then ask to be immediately rehired so that they could continue to earn a substantial salary and keep their career service status. Accordingly, the Commission denied Wallace’s request for reconsideration. To read the full text, click [here](#).

Retirement Service Credit

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to review an employee’s eligibility for pension benefits. However, the Commission does have the authority to review and adjust Civil Service employment records in accordance with Civil Service law and rules. Such requests must be timely made pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-1.1(b), which provides that “[u]nless a different time period is stated, an appeal must be filed within 20 days after either the appellant has notice or should reasonably have known of the decision, situation, or action being appealed. The case below illustrates the Commission’s jurisdiction on these issues.

In the Matter of Philip Kandl, Union County (CSC, decided February 26, 2020)

Philip Kandl was permanently appointed to the title of Accounting Assistant with Union County, effective June 11, 1998. He resigned in good standing, effective October 2, 1998, to accept a temporary appointment as a Workforce Investment Board (WIB) Assistant, effective October 3, 1998. He was thereafter appointed to the career service title of Contract Administrator 1, effective January 1, 2015. Subsequently, Kandl accepted an unclassified appointment as a County Division Head, effective November 22, 2016. On October 23, 2018, Kandl requested that Agency Services amend his employment record to show continuous permanent service in a full-time Civil Service position for the period between October 2, 1998 and December 31, 2014, maintaining that his employment history made clear that he was not a “temporary” employee and that the appointing authority arbitrarily denied him a Civil Service title and Public Employees’ Retirement System (PERS) enrollment, while providing the same to all other WIB employees.

On March 8, 2019, Agency Services denied Kandl’s request, stating that it could not take such action unless the appointing authority requested it. On appeal, Kandl argued that his full-time employment as a WIB Assistant between October 1998 and December 2014 should not have been classified as “temporary.” Union County maintained that the Commission lacked jurisdiction over the matter because it involved a PERS eligibility determination. However, it submitted that, even if the Commission had jurisdiction, Kandl’s request was untimely. The appointing authority averred that Kandl voluntarily accepted a grant-funded position as a WIB Assistant that was not a career service position and was contingent upon the receipt of Workforce Investment Act funding. Initially, the Commission emphasized that it did not have jurisdiction to review Kandl’s PERS eligibility and that its review was limited to his request to revise his employment record in accordance with the Civil Service law and rules.

The Commission found that the record demonstrated that Kandl knew or should have known that he was relinquishing his permanent status as an Accounting Assistant and accepting a temporary appointment to the title of WIB Assistant. However, he did not challenge this action with this agency until October 2018, approximately 20 years after it occurred. Even assuming that the appellant failed to recognize a need to challenge his temporary appointment in 1998, the record indicated that he received a November 29, 2017 determination letter from the Division of Pensions and Benefits, which clearly stated he was ineligible to purchase PERS service credit for the relevant period because he was classified as a temporary employee after resigning from his position as an Accounting Assistant and he did not provide any explanation as to why he failed to seek relief from this agency until October 2018.

The Commission further noted that even if Kandl had timely appealed his temporary status while serving as a WIB Assistant, his appointment would not have automatically become a permanent career service appointment, as the only requirement would have been for the temporary appointment to have been terminated. Therefore, the Commission found that Agency Services properly denied the appellant’s request to adjust his record. To read the full text, click [here](#).

Set forth below are decisions of the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, on appeal from Commission decisions. Unless otherwise noted, the Appellate Division opinions have not been approved for publication. As such, their use is limited in accordance with R. 1:36-3 of the New Jersey Court Rules. Full texts of the opinions may be searched on the court’s website by clicking [here](#).

In the Matter of Jefferson Nah, Office of the Public Defender, Docket No. A-0356-18T1 (App. Div.,decided December 27, 2019)

Court affirms [In the Matter of Jefferson Nah, Office of the Public Defender \(CSC, decided August 1, 2018\)](#), denying Clerk Driver SCOR because employee retired in lieu of removal. The Public Defender issued Jefferson Nah, a Clerk Driver, a disciplinary notice seeking his removal. Nah and the appointing authority reached a settlement, in which he would resign in good standing and retire and the appointing authority would withdraw the disciplinary charges. Nah thereafter sought his SCOR payment, which the Commission denied because he retired in lieu of removal. Nah appealed, arguing that he “resigned in good standing and retired in lieu of pursuing the disciplinary grievance process.” Nah repeated the same argument in his appeal before the Appellate Division. The court curtly rejected his argument and affirmed.

In the Matter of Algenoria Simpson, Police Sergeant (PM4108N), East Orange, Docket No. A-1323-18T1 (App. Div. July 14, 2020)

Court affirms [In the Matter of Algenoria Simpson, Police Sergeant \(PM4108N\), East Orange \(CSC, decided October 3, 2018\)](#), which upheld the bypass of a Police Sergeant candidate on leave finding that the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) only guarantees the right to be restored to one’s prior or equivalent position. Algenoria Simpson, a Police Officer with East Orange, appealed the Commission’s decision to uphold East Orange’s bypass of his name on a certification for a position as a Police Sergeant. Less than a month after the eligible list was issued, Simpson was injured and on leave under FMLA. While on leave, East Orange bypassed his name for promotion. Simpson thereafter appealed, but the Commission denied his appeal indicating that East Orange’s statement that it needed to bypass him because it had an immediate need was a legitimate business reason.

Further, the Commission denied Simpson's request for reconsideration as he provided no evidence to support his argument that the reasons for his bypass were pretextual. On appeal, the Appellate Division affirmed the Commission's decision as it found that there was nothing arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable in its decision as FMLA only guarantees the right to be restored to one's prior or equivalent position and an eligible can be removed from a list if they are not available for appointment under N.J.A.C. 4A:4-4.7(a)(3). It also found that Simpson did not meet the standard for reconsideration nor did the matter require a hearing.

***In the Matter of Odalys Rastatter,
City of Passaic, Docket No. A-3323-16T4
(App. Div. August 17, 2020)***

Court affirms *In the Matter of Odalys Rastatter, City of Passaic* (CSC, decided February 22, 2017), which rejected initial decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) and upheld removal of Police Lieutenant on charges of being absent without leave, falsification, and failure to supervise. Odalys Rastatter, a former Police Lieutenant with the City of Passaic, was removed for "having been absent without leave during Superstorm Sandy, lying to her supervisor and internal affairs about her whereabouts, directing a subordinate to falsify her time records, and failing to supervise the officers and civilians under her command." Rastatter appealed her removal to the Commission and the matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The ALJ found Rastatter's witnesses more credible than the appointing authority's witnesses and recommended that the charges be reversed. Although the City filed exceptions, the Commission lacked a quorum, and the ALJ's recommended decision was deemed adopted in March 2016. The City filed a request for reconsideration with the Commission, which had a quorum at the time. The Commission found that the record presented insufficient information for it to decide whether the credibility determinations of the ALJ were supported and ordered transcripts of the OAL hearing for its review. After its review, the Commission rejected the ALJ's decision as it found that the ALJ's credibility determinations were not supported by the credible evidence in the record.

The Commission concluded that the appointing authority established the charges against Rastatter and that removal was the appropriate penalty for Rastatter's conduct. The Commission denied Rastatter's motion for reconsideration, rejecting her arguments that it was statutorily prohibited from making its own factual findings and credibility determinations and that the Commission's

Chairperson at the time had an "undisclosed" conflict requiring his recusal based on his previous employment as the City's business administrator. The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission's decision, substantially for the reasons set forth in "its cogent and comprehensive final agency decision."

***In the Matter of Communication[s] Operator,
Secured Facilities, Department of Corrections,
Hudson County, Docket No. A-1871-18T3
(App. Div. August 27, 2020)***

Court affirms *In the Matter of Communication[s] Operator, Secured Facilities, Department of Corrections* (CSC, decided November 21, 2018), which found that the job specification allowed incumbents to open and close security doors/gates upon custodial supervisor direction. The union representing County Correction Officers (Correction Officers) (now known as County Correctional Police Officers) in Hudson County complained to Agency Services that Juvenile Detention Officers, who were transferred to the county jail and working in the title of Communications Operator, Secured Facilities, were performing tasks that were reserved for custodial staff. This led to a directive from Agency Services that these employees could not perform observation and regulation of inmate movements that were reserved for custodial staff. In response to a subsequent complaint by the union, Agency Services sought enforcement of its directive. The Commission found that the applicable regulatory provisions did not preclude the opening and closing of security doors and gates by incumbents in the Communications Operator, Secured Facilities title and noted that based on a prior decision, the job specification for the title was revised to include these tasks since incumbents do not perform these tasks on their own initiative, but rather, following direction of a custodial supervisor. Further, the Commission found that there were no specific examples where incumbents were opening and closing gates on their own initiative.

The union appealed to the Appellate Division arguing that the Commission failed to address whether Communications Operators, Secured Facilities, should be permitted to be assigned to the control rooms of the adult correctional facility, as it asserted that such assignment necessarily entails the performance of custodial duties. Moreover, it claimed that factual disputes existed that required a hearing. The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission's decision for the reason expressed by the Commission in "its clear and comprehensive decision."

In the Matter of Monique Smith, Irvington Township, Department of Public Safety
Docket No. A-2987-18T2
(App. Div. October 2, 2020)

Court remands *In the Matter of Monique Smith, Irvington Township, Department of Public Safety* (CSC, decided March 6, 2019) to ALJ for findings of fact as to whether infraction constituted disciplinary action since reckless driving was not “identical” to a charge of unbecoming conduct. Monique Smith, then a Police Captain with Irvington Township, appealed her 90 working day suspension and the denial of her request for counsel fees. Smith had been suspended due to a personal incident where she was charged with two motor vehicle infractions and six other violations. After a criminal trial, Smith was found guilty of reckless driving. Subsequently, a departmental hearing was held, and Smith was issued a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action which imposed a six-month suspension against her for charges related to conduct unbecoming a public employee and other sufficient cause.

Smith appealed to the Commission, and the matter was transmitted to the OAL as a contested case. The ALJ relied on the criminal trial judge’s decision based on the doctrine of collateral estoppel since Smith did not appeal it. The ALJ found that two of the conduct unbecoming a public employee charges and three other sufficient cause charges were sustained. The ALJ recommended that Smith’s suspension be modified to 90 days and she be awarded one-half of her attorney’s fees. Smith filed exceptions to the ALJ’s decision to the Commission. The Commission accepted the ALJ’s findings of fact but emphasized that it was modifying the suspension to a 90 *working day* suspension. It also emphasized that since the appellant is receiving a 90 working day suspension, it could not award counsel fees.

On appeal to the Appellate Division, the court found that the doctrine of collateral estoppel was inapplicable as Smith’s reckless driving guilty verdict was not “identical” to a charge of unbecoming conduct, which was never presented or litigated before the criminal trial judge. It concluded that the ALJ was required to set forth her own findings of fact in deciding that Smith’s actions constituted a disciplinary violation. Therefore, the Appellate Division vacated the Commission’s decision and remanded the matter for the ALJ to set forth findings of fact and conclusions of law separate from the fact-finders and conclusions reached by the Law Division judge in Smith’s criminal case. It is noted that on October 6, 2020, Smith’s appeal was remanded to the OAL in accordance with the Appellate Division decision.

In the Matter of Jasen Mitchell, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Department of Public Safety
Docket No. A-5605-17T2
(App. Div. December 1, 2020)

Court affirms *In the Matter of Jasen Mitchell, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Department of Public Safety* (CSC, decided June 20, 2018), which upheld employee’s resignation not in good standing. Jasen Mitchell, a former Emergency Medical Technician (EMT), was injured while on duty for the Borough of Wildwood Crest (Borough) in 2010. After rehabilitation, he was medically cleared for “modified duty,” but he could not perform the duties of an EMT. Thereafter, the Borough offered him a position as a Public Safety Telecommunicator, which had a higher salary and the same benefits and seniority rights. However, Mitchell failed to appear for training for the position and the Borough issued a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action charging him with “resignation not in good standing.” Mitchell appealed the matter to the Commission and the matter was transmitted to the OAL as a contested case. The ALJ recommended that his “resignation not in good standing” be upheld. The Commission accepted the recommendation and found that the Borough’s action “in removing and resigning [Mitchell] not in good standing was justified.”

On appeal to the Appellate Division, Mitchell argued that the Commission failed to consider his letter “wherein he informed the Borough he was not attending training.” However, the Appellate Division noted that the letter “simply stated that Mitchell intended to pursue his accidental disability pension, and without any authority or approval by the Borough, he intended to remain on sick leave.” Mitchell also contended that the Commission failed to consider that he never accepted the position. However, the Appellate Division indicated that “it is not for us . . . to disturb [the] credibility determination[s]” of the ALJ, as adopted by the Commission. Further, it indicated that the Commission’s decision “is supported by sufficient credible evidence on the record as a whole.”

To view regulations and laws which affect Civil Service employees and employers, please follow this [link](#). For information on proposed and recently adopted regulations, please visit our website [page](#). If you wish to register for the Rules e-Notification system, which e-mails recipients regarding Civil Service regulatory activity, please click [here](#).

EXECUTIVE ORDER UPDATE

Executive Order 115

On April 6, 2020, Governor Philip D. Murphy signed Executive Order 115, which cleared the way for recently retired State workers to rejoin their former departments temporarily in the wake of the State of Emergency (Emergency) created by the COVID-19 pandemic. “Right now we need all the experienced help we can get whether it be retired law enforcement officers returning to duty or nurses who can return to University Hospital or folks who can help staff the labor departments,” said Governor Murphy.

A key feature of Executive Order 115 is its removal of barriers which previously prevented retired public employees from returning to work without impacting their pension status.

In particular, the provisions of the Order include:

For the duration of this Emergency, retirees may return to employment by Government Agencies in any capacity, including but not limited to full-time employee, part-time employee, or special law enforcement officer, without having to re-enroll in any retirement system, if the following conditions are met: a. The retiree has retired before the date of this Order; and b. The retiree has completed at least a thirty day separation from their employer, from the date of retirement or the date of [the Pension] Board approval, whichever is later; and c. The retiree’s return to employment is needed because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Where either (i) a retiree has been retired from public employment for less than six months, and that retiree is returning to their most recent Government Agency employer in any capacity, or (ii) a retiree is returning to

work as a full-time employee with their most recent Government Agency employer, then that employer must complete a form provided by the Division of Pensions [and Benefits] substantiating that the retiree’s return to employment is needed because of the COVID-19 pandemic, based on that retiree’s skills and/or experience, and detailing the retiree’s general duties, before that retiree may return to employment pursuant to Paragraph 1 of this Order.

Any retiree returning to employment under Paragraph 1 of the Order shall, for purposes of any retirement system, continue to be a retiree. If such retiree is already enrolled in the [State Health Benefits Plan] as a retiree, they shall continue to maintain such coverage during their temporary return to employment.

Executive Order 115 took effect immediately and “shall remain in effect until revoked or modified by the Governor, who shall consult with the Commissioner of the [Department of Health] as appropriate.”

To view Executive Order 115 in its entirety, please follow this link: <https://nj.gov/infobank/eo/056murphy/pdf/EO-115.pdf>



EXECUTIVE ORDER UPDATE

Executive Order 192

As the State continues to work to distribute the vaccine against COVID-19 to citizens, Executive Order 192, which provides guidance on protocols to maintain to protect workers, remains in effect.

Executive Order 192 reinforced previously signed orders which required the use of face coverings, remaining socially distanced, and the practice of hyper hygiene, while also adding new protective protocols for those returning to the in-person workplace.

Employers are required to enforce the following protocols for the workplace:

Employers must make available, at their expense, face masks to their employees.

Employers may permit employees to remove face masks when the employees are situated at their workstations that are more than six feet away from other individuals at the workplace, or when an individual is alone in a walled office.

Employers may deny entry to the worksite to any employee who declines to wear a face mask, except when doing so would violate State or federal law. Where an employee cannot wear a mask because of a disability, an employer may, consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, be required to provide the employee with a reasonable accommodation unless doing so would be an undue hardship on the employer's operations.

Prior to each shift, employers must conduct daily health checks of employees, through means such as temperature screenings, visual symptom checking, self-assessment checklists, and/or health questionnaires, consistent with CDC guidance.

If it is determined that an employee appears to have COVID-19 related symptoms, that person should be immediately separated and sent home.

To view Executive Order 192 in its entirety, please follow this link: <https://nj.gov/infobank/eo/056murphy/pdf/EO-192.pdf>



Please also visit <https://www.state.nj.us/csc/employees/covid.html>, which has other pertinent information regarding the COVID-19 response. If you have further inquiries on this issue, please email us at CSC-COVID19.Inquiries@csc.nj.gov.

The Commission continues to monitor Executive Orders and new legislation affecting the Civil Service community and will issue appropriate guidelines and promulgate regulations as necessary.

OF PERSONNEL INTEREST

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION 2021 VIRTUAL EVENTS



#CSCWorksForYou

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission's Office of Diversity Programs and Employee Advisory Service were able to shift their regularly scheduled events to a virtual platform. In 2021, these offices will continue to host these events in order to reach their respective audiences.

In an effort to promote careers in State and local government, the Office of Diversity Programs is slated to continue its series of Virtual Information Sessions tailored towards job seekers and college/university students around the State. The office will also be hosting its quarterly Diversity Council meeting on January 14, 2021 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 pm. Diversity, equity, and inclusion webinars are being planned for the spring.

The Employee Advisory Service is set to host monthly webinars on various employee mental wellness topics through June 2021 and will host its Annual Mental Wellness Symposium in October 2021. Exact dates and topics have not been set for these events yet but will be posted as soon as they become available.

The Commission is committed to hosting events that positively impact the Civil Service workforce and job seekers across the Garden State and looks forward to another year of successful events.

Please check the Commission's website and social media for specific dates and times of the events.

Commission Website

<https://nj.gov/csc>

Facebook: [NJ Civil Service Commission](#)

Twitter: [@NJCivilService](#)

Instagram: [@NJCivilService](#)

Hashtag: #CSCWorksForYou



Follow Us on Social Media

For information regarding retirement webinars and seminars, please visit the webpage of the Division of Pensions and Benefits, Department of the Treasury, at <https://www.state.nj.us/treasury/pensions/member-training.shtml>.

HELPFUL LINKS

Accessing Commission Decisions

The Commission's website is located at <https://nj.gov/csc>, where you can find information regarding job announcements and examinations, employee programs, forms and publications, regulations and laws governing Civil Service, the Commission meeting agenda, and Commission decisions.

The full texts of decisions are available on-line for cases decided on or after July 16, 2014. To access the text of a decision, first use the search function for Search Minutes/Decisions (<https://nj.gov/csc/about/meetings/search>).

You can search by meeting date, appellant or appointing authority name, or keyword. When you retrieve the minutes for the meeting, look for the agenda item pertaining to your search. The decision can be accessed through a link in the item.

If you know the meeting date on which the appeal was decided, you can access the minutes directly through the Minutes of Previous Meetings page (<https://nj.gov/csc/about/meetings/minutes/>).

Click the meeting date, and a list of agenda items will appear. Minutes of meetings and associated decisions are posted after approval of the minutes, usually at the next scheduled meeting of the Commission.

Civil Service Commission Website

<https://nj.gov/csc>

Office of the Chair/Chief Executive Officer

<https://www.state.nj.us/csc/about/chair/>

Commission Decisions

(July 16, 2014 to the present)

<https://nj.gov/csc/about/meetings/search> or
<https://nj.gov/csc/about/meetings/minutes/>

Civil Service Regulations and Laws

www.nj.gov/csc/about/about/regulations/index.html

Filing Appeals with the Civil Service Commission

www.nj.gov/csc/authorities/faq/appeals

Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs

www.nj.gov/csc/about/divisions/merit/

Job Announcements and Testing

www.nj.gov/csc/seekers/jobs/announcements

Public Safety Testing News

www.nj.gov/csc/about/news/safety/index.html

Division of Test Development and Analytics

<https://nj.gov/csc/about/divisions/selection/>

Division of Agency Services

www.nj.gov/csc/about/divisions/slo/

Division of EEO/AA

<https://www.state.nj.us/csc/about/divisions/eo/index.html>

Employee Advisory Service

<https://www.state.nj.us/csc/employees/programs/advisory/eas.html>

Employee Advisory Service Publications

<https://www.nj.gov/csc/employees/programs/advisory/publications.html>

Center for Learning and Improving Performance (CLIP)

www.nj.gov/csc/employees/training/index.html

The Training Post Newsletter

www.nj.gov/csc/employees/training/training_newsletter.html

Issues of The Reporter

<https://nj.gov/csc/about/publications/merit/>

If you have questions or comments regarding The Reporter, please email us at: TheReporter@csc.nj.gov. We welcome suggestions on topics or areas of interest you would like to see in upcoming issues of The Reporter.

If you wish to subscribe to The Reporter, please click the link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/The_Reporter. If you wish to unsubscribe, please email us.