Welcome to Issue 10 of The Reporter!

Hello and welcome to Issue 10 of The Reporter, our final issue of the year.

2021 has been a busy year for the Civil Service Commission (Commission), as our State continues to recover from the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Many of the Commission's services, including in-person law enforcement testing, have been administered successfully, evolving where needed to meet the ongoing needs of our stakeholders.

In Issue 9, we discussed list removal appeals involving eligibles who had their names taken off of eligible lists for reasons such as an adverse background, an adverse employment history, and for falsification. In Issue 10, we continue our focus on list removal appeals with a look at psychological reasons for removal. This includes the presentation of some of the Commission's decisions on psychological disqualification appeals.

This issue will also recap the major Commission and court decisions made throughout the year, as well as legislation that has affected the Commission and its services.

In September, the Commission was pleased to release its Fiscal Year 2021 Annual Report. This year’s theme, “The Work Continues,” provides insights and highlights on the work our agency and its employees were able to accomplish throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. We encourage you to read this report and learn more about how our team has been supporting our stakeholders throughout this unique and challenging period.

We are looking forward to another productive year in 2022 and wish you and your loved ones a happy and healthy holiday season.

Remember, CSC Works For You.

Best regards,

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb, Esq.
Chair/Chief Executive Officer
New Jersey Civil Service Commission
LIST REMOVALS: PSYCHOLOGICAL DISQUALIFICATION APPEALS

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(d) states, in relevant part, that upon receipt of a notice of an eligible’s appeal, the appointing authority shall submit to the Commission, within 20 days, all background information, including any investigations and all complete psychological, and/or psychiatric reports that were the basis for the removal request from the eligible list. Upon request, the appointing authority shall also furnish to the appellant’s attorney or to a New Jersey licensed psychologist or psychiatrist of the appellant’s choice upon request all of the information supplied to the Commission. See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(d)1. Any appointing authority that fails to submit the required materials within the specified time may have its request for removal denied, and the eligible’s name may be retained on the eligible list. See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(d)2.

Additionally, in order to facilitate the timely processing of these types of appeals, the Commission amended N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(e), effective June 21, 2017, to require appellants, if they choose to do so, to submit a report from a psychologist/psychiatrist to rebut the appointing authority’s report of psychological disqualification within 90 calendar days of filing of the appeal. See 49 N.J.R. 492(a) and 50 N.J.R. 2239(a). These timeframes were designed to facilitate an opportunity for the parties to establish a contemporaneous record of an eligible’s psychological condition at the time of appointment for the Commission to consider.

Nonetheless, N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(f) indicates that the Commission may extend the time period for filing the required reports for good cause. It is noted that, in accordance with Section 6 of Executive Order 103 which was issued in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission approved various emergency adoptions of temporary rule relaxations and modifications to Title 4A of the New Jersey Administrative Code with respect to timeframes associated with administrative appeals. In particular, N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(e) was modified to include the good cause provision found in N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(f) to extend the time period for filing psychological reports.

Furthermore, N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(g) provides that the Commission shall either conduct a written record review of the appeal or submit psychological appeals to the Medical Review Panel, which may request additional psychological reports, examinations, or other materials. In addition, N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5(g)4 indicates that, in appropriate cases, the Commission may refer an appellant for an independent professional evaluation. Finally, N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.3(b) provides that the appellant shall have the burden of proof, except for medical or psychological disqualification appeals, where the appointing authority shall have the burden of proof.

Summarized below are Commission decisions with respect to psychological disqualification appeals which highlight the importance of submitting a timely independent psychological report, the purpose of the Medical Review Panel meeting, the assessment of the appellant’s psychological suitability for the specific position sought, and the need to refer an appellant for an independent psychological evaluation.

Extension to Submit Psychological Report

In the Matter of J.D.
(CSC, decided November 24, 2020)

The appellant was afforded a full 90-calendar-day extension to submit his independent psychological report, and then he requested approximately another 90 days. However, the Commission denied the request and dismissed his appeal, as it was satisfied that the appellant was given sufficient opportunity to pursue his appeal in light of the havoc that was caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The appellant failed to show good cause to further extend the time period and accept his expert’s report. See In the Matter of J.D. (CSC, decided November 24, 2020).

Medical Review Panel Meeting

In the Matter of J.W.R.
(CSC, decided July 29, 2020)

In addressing the appellant’s exceptions to the Medical Review Panel’s Report and Recommendation, the Commission noted that the Medical Review Panel meeting is not a formal hearing where testimony is given and examinations and cross-examinations are permitted. Instead, the meeting is to afford the members of the Medical Panel, which consists of two psychologists and a psychiatrist, the opportunity to question an appellant directly to clarify responses to test items and behaviors in the appellant’s own words. The Commission, in the present case, deferred to and agreed with the expert opinion of its Medical Review Panel and denied the appeal. See In the Matter of J.W.R. (CSC, decided July 29, 2020).
Psychological Fitness for Specific Position

In the Matter of J.L.M.  
(CSC, decided August 4, 2021)

The appellant was deemed to be psychologically unfit to be a Police Officer since, among other things, he engaged in a recent off-duty “hit and run” accident which injured a pedestrian and drove his vehicle with tinted windows for over a year after being cited for that violation. Thus, despite his employment as a Class II Police Officer, the Commission found that the appellant exhibited extremely poor judgment in the two instances at issue, and therefore, he did not meet the higher standard expected of those who seek to serve as a Police Officer. See In the Matter of J.L.M. (CSC, decided August 4, 2021).

Military Experiences

In the Matter of J.E.  
(CSC, decided September 1, 2021)

The Commission was not persuaded by the appellant’s exceptions, which focused primarily on an assertion that the Medical Review Panel failed to correlate his level of maturity and judgment with the job performance of a Police Officer and to consider the recommendation of his Sergeant. Regarding the latter, the Commission noted that military experiences are more structured and narrower in scope than those experiences one might encounter in a law enforcement position, particularly one that deals with the public, and that military experience does not necessarily equate with law enforcement success. Therefore, in this case, considering the position at issue and the negative recommendations of the appointing authority’s evaluator and those of the Medical Review Panel, the Commission could not ratify the appellant’s psychological fitness to serve as a Police Officer. See In the Matter of J.E. (CSC, decided September 1, 2021).

Independent Psychological Evaluation

In the Matter of T.D.E.  
(CSC, decided January 20, 2021)

The Medical Review Panel was concerned with the appellant’s alcohol consumption and requested that the appellant undergo an independent evaluation. The Commission agreed and ordered that the appellant undergo an independent evaluation to ascertain whether that behavior deemed him psychologically unsuitable for a Fire Fighter position. Consequently, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1(c), the appellant’s appeal was dismissed for lack of pursuit. See In the Matter of T.D.E. (CSC, decided January 20, 2021).

In the Matter of X.D.  
(CSC, decided April 7, 2021)

As concluded by the Commission’s independent evaluator, the appellant was found to have lacked the cognitive ability to effectively perform the duties of a Correctional Police Officer. The Commission emphasized that, in addition to his own evaluation and testing, the independent evaluator conducts a review of the Medical Review Panel’s Report and Recommendation and the raw data, recommendations and conclusions drawn by the various evaluators prior to rendering his own conclusions and recommendations, which are based firmly on his expertise in the field of psychology and his experience in evaluating the psychological suitability of hundreds of applicants for employment in law enforcement and public safety positions. Thus, the Commission did not find persuasive that its independent evaluator failed to perform a proper psychological evaluation or considered the prior evaluators’ findings. Moreover, the Commission noted that the appellant was provided with his regulatory entitlement to submit his own psychological evaluation and present exceptions to the Medical Review Panel’s recommendation referring him for an independent evaluation and to the independent evaluator’s report, which could have included a “rebuttal expert report” if he so chose. See In the Matter of X.D. (CSC, decided April 7, 2021).

2022 Commission Meetings

In accordance with Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1975, the following is the schedule of the Commission board meetings. All meetings are open to the public and will be held at 10:00 a.m. telephonically. The public may listen to the meetings by calling 1-877-336-1831 and entering Access Code 8654076. Public comments and questions about items on the agenda may be sent to DARA@csc.nj.gov.

| January 19, 2022 | July 20, 2022 |
| February 2, 2022 | August 3, 2022 |
| February 16, 2022 | August 24, 2022 |
| March 2, 2022 | September 21, 2022 |
| March 23, 2022 | October 5, 2022 |
| April 6, 2022 | November 2, 2022 |
| April 27, 2022 | November 23, 2022 |
| May 18, 2022 | December 7, 2022 |
| June 15, 2022 | December 21, 2022 |
| June 29, 2022 |    |
Set forth below are decisions of the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, on appeal from Commission decisions, that have not been previously featured in The Reporter. 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.

DISCIPLINE

Attendance


The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision, _In the Matter of Billie Hayes_ (CSC Decided March 27, 2018), recon. den. (CSC, decided January 16, 2019), to grant the Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services’ request for summary judgment, which sustained the removal and resignation not in good standing due to absences without permission, job abandonment, and chronic absenteeism of a Quality Control Viewer who had suffered a head injury at work and was cleared to return to work but did not do so.

Disgorgement


A former Police Officer was removed due to his two guilty pleas of second-degree official misconduct, which included allegations of sexual misconduct while on duty. Additionally, the appointing authority attempted to fine the appellant instead of paying him his accrued sick and vacation time prior to his suspension, which the Commission reversed. _See In the Matter of Wilfredo Guzman_ (CSC, decided January 15, 2020). On appeal, the appointing authority argued that it could impose the fine due to the appellant’s breach of duty, among other arguments. The Appellate Division found that the Commission did not have discretion to have imposed “disgorgement” of the appellant’s accrued benefit time under the applicable statutes and regulation nor could it “have imposed disgorgement under a separate breach of fiduciary duty theory.” Accordingly, it affirmed the Commission’s decision.

Religious Accommodation


The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision in _In the Matter of Clifton Bloomfield_ (CSC, decided October 23, 2019) to uphold the removal of a Police Officer who had requested not to be scheduled to work from sundown on Fridays to sundown on Saturdays due to religious reasons. The Commission found that the appointing authority met its burden of proof that this request unreasonably interfered with its safe and efficient operation of the workplace. The Commission also rejected the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) to uphold a release at the end of the working test period. The Appellate Division affirmed that the matter was a disciplinary action and not a release. Further, it affirmed the removal as there was “substantial credible evidence supporting the Commission’s finding that respondent made a bona fide effort to accommodate petitioner’s religious beliefs and respondent demonstrated that providing an accommodation would constitute a hardship.”

Written Charge


The appellant received a 30-working-day suspension for three charges. The ALJ recommended modifying the penalty to a 20-working-day suspension because the ALJ sustained two, not three, charges. In _In the Matter of Alex Navas_ (CSC, decided June 12, 2019), the Commission reversed the suspension in its entirety. The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision regarding one charge, but it remanded the other charge to the Commission to be decided on the merits. The Commission did not sustain that charge because the written charge did not mirror the sustained charge. The Appellate Division found that the appellant had full notice of the sustained charge and the specifications from the testimony. On remand, the Commission found that Navas clearly failed to follow a directive from his director and had acknowledged this fact in his testimony. Accordingly, the Commission found that given that the one charge was sustained, a 10-working-day suspension was an appropriate penalty to be imposed on Navas. _See In the Matter of Alex Navas_ (CSC, decided June 2, 2021).
BACK PAY

_in the Matter of William Able, City of Newark,,

The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision in _In the Matter of William Able_ (CSC, decided April 4, 2018) and _In the Matter of William Able_ (CSC, decided June 12, 2019) to modify the removal of a Senior Custodian with the Newark School District to a six-month suspension and to deny him back pay prior to the Commission’s decision to reinstate him due to a lack of reasonable efforts to mitigate. However, the court reversed the part of the decision that denied back pay from the Commission’s reinstatement decision until actual reinstatement. _N.J.A.C. 4A:2-10(d)(5)_ provides that there is no duty to mitigate during this period, and thus, the court remanded the matter to the Commission for a determination of the appellant’s back pay during this 10-week period. On remand from the Appellate Division, the Commission granted back pay to Able from the issue date of its decision modifying his removal to the date of his actual reinstatement. _See In the Matter of William Able_ (CSC, decided September 1, 2021).

EXAMINATION

_in the Matter of Michael Acosta, Police Lieutenant
(PM0971A), West New York,

The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision in _In the Matter of Michael Acosta_ (CSC, decided October 23, 2019) to deny a Police Sergeant’s request to submit a late application for a Police Lieutenant promotional examination, where the appellant claimed that he did not receive the announcement that was emailed to him due to technical issues that his station had with the email system. However, the record did not support that there were technical issues for the entire 22-day application notice period, and the appellant had access to his work email through two mobile devices. He also had access to the Commission website, where the examination announcement was posted.

LAYOFF

_in the Matter of the Layoff of Daisey Battle, et al.,
by the City of Newark,

The ALJ found that the City of Newark failed to comply with the ALJ’s discovery orders. Consequently, the ALJ struck the City of Newark’s answer and defenses, awarded counsel fees, suppressed the City of Newark’s testimony, and determined that the layoffs were not in good faith. The ALJ’s Initial Decision was deemed adopted by the Commission since it lacked a quorum. The Appellate Division affirmed the ALJ’s determination that the City of Newark failed to comply with the ALJ’s discovery orders and his sanctions on the City of Newark by suppressing its briefs, defenses, and evidence. However, the Appellate Division reversed the portion of the ALJ’s decision which entered a determination that the layoffs were conducted in bad faith and remanded the matter for a hearing on the merits.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION
ON RETIREMENT (SCOR)

_in the Matter of the Estate of Robert Levin, Office
of Legislative Services, Docket No. A-3893-18T4

The Appellate Division affirmed the Commission’s decision in _In the Matter of the Estate of Robert Levin_ (CSC, decided March 27, 2019) to deny the spouse of a deceased employee of the Office of Legislative Services his SCOR payment. The employee had been diagnosed with a terminal illness and had his retirement papers “in place” but continued to work and passed away before his retirement. Because his separation from employment was not based on retirement, as required to collect SCOR under _N.J.S.A. 11A:6-16_, the employee was not eligible for SCOR.

NJ.gov
On September 28, 2021, Governor Philip D. Murphy signed three bills into law related to the promotion of diversity among law enforcement positions throughout the State.

The first enactment, S2765 (P.L. 2021, c. 234), requires the Commission or a vendor selected by the Commission to analyze the racial composition of law enforcement agencies in the State and identify which agencies might benefit the most from eliminating any preference in hiring based upon residency. All law enforcement agencies within the State will be required to provide the Commission with any requested information, including those in non-Civil Service jurisdictions. The legislation also mandates that the Commission use this analysis to evaluate whether the practice of removing eligibles from certain lists based upon residency should be discontinued. Moreover, the Commission will be required to create a program that will offer at least one of the following to residents of low-income communities or municipalities with at least one “qualified opportunity zone”: (1) sponsor free or low cost preparatory courses for the entry-level law enforcement examination (LEE); or (2) provide, secure, or identify scholarships for alternate route programs or preparatory courses for the LEE. The act took immediate effect after it was signed into law on September 28, 2021.

The second bill enacted, S2766 (P.L. 2021, c. 235), requires the Commission to establish and maintain a mentoring program for certain Civil Service law enforcement applicants with a purpose of helping them address obstacles unique to their circumstances. Specifically, applicants who reside in municipalities with a median income at or below 250 percent of the federal poverty line will be eligible to be mentored through this program. Mentors will be assigned to these candidates through the duration of the examination cycle, until a mentee completes the hiring process. Mentors are to include current or former law enforcement officers in good standing who obtained their positions through the Civil Service process or any other person that the Commission deems appropriate. The law also provides parameters for the future expansion of this program to remedy past discrimination. The act will take effect on March 1, 2023.

The third bill signed into law, S2767 (P.L. 2021, c. 236), took immediate effect and requires the Commission to develop and maintain a database with background information for entry-level law enforcement candidates for positions in State law enforcement agencies and local Civil Service jurisdictions. The Commission, in consultation with national and State law enforcement organizations, will also be required to develop universal guidelines and best practices for background investigations conducted by appointing authorities. In addition, the Commission, with the input of various stakeholders, will have to develop a universal background application for all law enforcement agencies to use in their selection processes for Police Officers. Further, once the universal application is implemented, candidates will use it to select their preferred contact method for status updates and certification notices. Records of these notifications will be maintained in the database created under this legislation. Finally, the Commission will also be required to conduct, or select a qualified vendor to conduct, a diversity analysis of the ethnic and racial make-up of all law enforcement agencies in the State, including law enforcement agencies in non-Civil Service jurisdictions.

Governor Murphy also signed Executive Order No. 265, which establishes the Office of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging within the Office of the Governor. As outlined in Executive Order No. 265, the office will, in part, be responsible for coordinating the policymaking processes of State agencies with respect to strengthening diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging amongst State employees. In his signing day statement, Governor Murphy said, “With today’s executive order and bill signings, we are building on our commitment to advance equity for New Jerseyans who have been left behind for far too long.”

To view enacted regulations and laws which affect Civil Service employees and employers, please visit our Regulations and Laws page. For information on proposed and recently adopted regulations, please visit our Proposed and Recently Adopted Regulations page. If you wish to register for the Rules e-Notification system, which emails recipients regarding Civil Service regulatory activity, please click here.
This year’s issues of *The Reporter* have covered many topics, including retirement, testing, law enforcement, and the impact of COVID-19. Here is a recap of some of the topics from 2021.

In Issue 7, the focus was retirement. We discussed Supplemental Compensation on Retirement (SCOR), including a decision by the Commission to allow retired employees to submit applications for SCOR benefits outside the one-year time frame that the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division subsequently affirmed. This issue also covered post-retirement work and featured a summary of a decision in which the Commission denied a request for reconsideration of an employee’s appeal of the discontinuance of his unclassified appointment. We also covered retirement service credit and presented a case in which the Commission denied an untimely appeal to adjust continuous permanent service in the employment record of an employee seeking pension eligibility.

Issue 7 also highlighted two executive orders affecting the Commission. The first, Executive Order 115, cleared the way for recently retired State workers to rejoin their former departments temporarily in the wake of the state of emergency created by the COVID-19 pandemic. A key feature of Executive Order 115 was its removal of barriers which previously prevented retired public employees from returning to work without impacting their pension status. The other item discussed was Executive Order 192, which set forth protocols intended to protect workers in the workplace, including the required use of face coverings, social distancing, and hyper hygiene.

In Issue 8, we covered a range of topics related to public safety, including appointments, list revivals, court decisions and legislative changes. Two decisions of the Commission related to appointments were presented. In the first case, the Commission allowed scores from the Law Enforcement Examination (LEE) (S9999U) to be applied to a promotional examination for State Park Police Officer Trainee and directed that permanent appointments to the title be made. In the second case, the Commission expanded promotional opportunities for Security Officers and permitted promotional examination procedures to be utilized as a recruitment tool for Police Officer Recruit Human Services. Regarding list revivals, the Commission revived and extended promotional public safety eligible lists for one year beyond their original expiration date or until the next list promulgates.

This issue also discussed legislation regarding the LEE. Specifically, P.L. 2021, c. 7, which Governor Philip D. Murphy signed into law on February 4, 2021, provides candidates for certain entry-level law enforcement positions with an exemption from the LEE and permits them to be appointed upon successful completion of an approved police training course. Thus, appointing authorities were given another option to fill critical positions in our State. Likewise, the examination exemption provides candidates with an additional avenue to obtain a position.

In Issue 9, the focus was on list removal appeals. A number of list removal appeal decisions from the Commission were presented involving issues ranging from an eligible’s interest in appointment to claims of falsification. It was also noted that, upon disposition of a certification, an appointing authority that requests the removal of an eligible’s name from an eligible list must submit all documents and arguments upon which it bases its request.

Three legislative updates were also presented in this issue. One was P.L. 2019, c. 272, N.J.S.A. 10:5-5., known as the “Create a Respectful and Open Workspace for Natural Hair Act” (CROWN Act). The law amended the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination to clarify that race discrimination includes discrimination based on “traits historically associated with race, including, but not limited to, hair texture, hair type, and protective hairstyles” and defines “protective hairstyles” as “including, but not limited to, such hairstyles as braids, locks, and twists.” Another law signed by Governor Murphy was P.L. 2021, c. 107, which amended P.L. 2019, c. 247 and revised the modified basic training program for County Correctional Police Officers. Finally, P.L.. 2021, c. 123, which amended P.L. 2016, c. 4., N.J.S.A. 52:27BBB-4, was signed into law. This amendment extended the period of stabilization and recovery for local governments under the Municipal Stabilization and Recover Act and reinstated Civil Service jurisdiction to those municipalities deemed in need of State oversight.

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*. 
The Commission’s divisions and offices continue to hold events on virtual platforms in order to reach their respective stakeholders.

In an effort to promote careers in State and local government, the Office of Diversity Programs has hosted its series of Virtual Information Sessions tailored towards job seekers and recent college graduates around the State.

The office will hold a number of these Virtual Information Sessions in the coming months for those interested in working in State and local government.

Graduates may register for the “Winter Recent Graduates: How to Apply to State and Local Jobs” Virtual Information Session noted below using the following link:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WinterRecentGraduatesCSC2021

Tuesday, December 14, 2021 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Thursday, December 16, 2021 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

The Office of Diversity Programs will also be hosting its 3rd Annual State Workforce Diversity Summit on Thursday, December 9, 2021. This year’s event is entitled, “Developing Programs for Employee Engagement and Wellness.” Those interested in attending the summit can register at the link below:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CSCDiversitySummit2021

Managing the Stress of the Holidays – The holidays are a joyous time for many but can come with additional activities and responsibilities that can be quite stressful. This practical presentation will provide several helpful tips and strategies for managing our stress and keeping our lives in balance during this important season.

Thursday, December 9, 2021, 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/329525151725709839

How to Effectively Delegate Tasks & Responsibilities - The ability to delegate is a key skill for every leader. This important session will discuss the process of delegating, and how to do it in a way that's motivating to employees and gets good results.

Thursday, December 9, 2021, 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/735811450842098703

The Commission is committed to hosting events that positively impact the Civil Service workforce and job seekers across the Garden State.

2022 Human Resources Advisory Board Meeting Schedule

- Tuesday, January 11, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- Tuesday, April 5, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- Tuesday, July 12, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- Tuesday, October 4, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

More details on the meetings will become available at a later date.
Accessing Commission Decisions

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

The full texts of decisions are available online 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/