

structure and condition (arriving). Knowledge of supervision was measured by questions in both scenarios, and was scored for each. For the evolving scenario, candidates were provided with a 15-minute preparation period, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond. For the arriving scenario, a five minute preparation period was given and candidates had 10 minutes to respond.

The candidates' responses were scored on technical knowledge and oral communication ability. Prior to the administration of the exam, a panel of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) determined the scoring criteria, using generally approved fire command practices, firefighting practices, and reference materials. Scoring decisions were based on SME-approved possible courses of action (PCAs) including those actions that must be taken to resolve the situation as presented. For a performance to be acceptable, a candidate needed to present the mandatory courses of action for that scenario. Only those oral responses that depicted relevant behaviors that were observable and could be quantified were assessed in the scoring process. Each performance was evaluated by two SMEs who currently are a first level supervisor or higher. If the SME scores differed by 1 point, the score was averaged. If they differed by more than 1 point, the SMEs were required to confer with each other until they agreed on a score. Scores were then converted to standardized scores.

Candidates were rated on a five-point scale, with 5 as the optimal response, 4 as a more than acceptable passing response, 3 as a minimally acceptable passing response, 2 as a less than acceptable response, and 1 as a much less than acceptable response. For each of the scenes, and for oral communication, the requirements for each score were defined.

For the evolving scenario, the appellant scored a 4 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. For the arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 5 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his scores for the technical and supervision components of the evolving scenario, and for the supervision component of the arriving scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenarios were reviewed.

The evolving scenario involved a fire in a pet store in the middle of a four-store strip mall of lightweight, steel-joint construction built in the 1980s. It is 7:30 AM on a Tuesday in February and the temperature is 33° Fahrenheit with clear skies and a wind blowing from east to west at 8 miles per hour. Upon arrival, it is noticed that smoke is coming from the side A windows of the pet store. The candidate is the commanding officer of the first arriving ladder company and he establishes command. There were two technical questions. Question 1 asked for specific

actions to be taken upon arrival. Question 2 indicates that, during the incident the candidate notices smoke inside of the furniture store on side B. The question asked what actions should now be taken, based on this new information. The supervision question indicates that during the overhaul, the candidate observes his crew laughing and using inappropriate language while overhauling the pet store. The pet store owner is now on the scene and observes this and complains to the candidate. This question asks what should be done at the scene and after returning to the firehouse. Instructions indicate that, in responding to the questions, the candidate should be as specific as possible in describing actions, and should not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to a score.

In regard to the technical component, the assessors noted that the appellant missed the opportunity to call for animal control. On appeal, the appellant states that he called for police and Red Cross for displaced victims, and he was referring to the animals from the pet store.

In reply, animals are not considered to be displaced victims, and the Red Cross is not called to deal with animals. The appellant's arguments are misplaced, and he did not call for animal control as indicated by the assessors. The appellant's score for this component will not be changed.

In regard to the supervision component, the assessors noted that the appellant missed the opportunity to review any applicable SOPs and SOGs. On appeal, the appellant states that he took actions in response to question 1 which shows that he was following SOPs and SOGs.

In reply, the appellant seems to have confused questions 1 and 3. His actions taken for question 1 are not pertinent to the assessor notes for question 3. A review of the appellant's video and related examination materials indicates that, for question 3, he did not review any applicable SOPs and SOGs as indicated by the assessors. His score of 4 for this component is correct.

The arriving scenario involves a report of fire coming from a two-story, wood-frame house built in the 1970's. It is 1:00 PM on a Saturday in June, 92°F, with sunny skies and a wind blowing from the east to the west at 5 mph. The candidate is the officer of the first arriving engine company and the first officer on scene. Upon arrival, the candidate notices smoke coming from the first and second floor windows on side A. Dispatch reports that the caller is an occupant in a second floor bedroom and the caller said she was taking a nap, and when she woke up her bedroom was filled with smoke. The technical question asked for specific actions to take upon arrival. The supervision question indicated that the candidate notices a rookie firefighter on his crew having trouble raising a ladder. The question asked for actions to take at the scene and after returning to the firehouse. Instructions

indicate that, in responding to the questions, the candidate should be as specific as possible in describing actions, and should not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to a score.

In regard to the supervision component of the arriving scenario, the assessors noted that the appellant missed the opportunity to review the rookie firefighter's training records. On appeal, the appellant states that he asked for information regarding the rookie, and ordered training. He states that he requested the rookie's documentation and records from supervisors and training officers, and had a follow up.

A review of the appellant's video and related examination materials indicates that the appellant received credit for providing any necessary firefighter training, and following up with the firefighter. Nevertheless, credit cannot be given for information that is implied or assumed, and this was indicated in the instructions to candidates. Once back at the firehouse, the appellant did not review the rookie firefighter's training records. Instead, the appellant stated, "We'll be asking his supervisor for an update of what has happened. Is it ah, an ability problem, is it an unaware problem, is it a problem with freelancing? There is no freelancing. You have to maintain the ah the, the group you'll be working with other people. You'll be asking the supervisor to update you when getting back to quarters. If he, if it's a ah ability problem we will mentor, train and help. We will look for upcoming training. We will ask for documentation. We will notify the training officer. Ah, we will make sure he is okay, and if anything has happened, we will make sure that if it's unaware, we'll there'll be training also. We'll ask for up, updates and upcoming meetings. We will call for a rehab center. Ah, temperature controlled rehab center due to the temperature of the day. There will be food and adequate liquids for, for all members." In this passage, the appellant asks for documentation, but that could be anything. The assessors were looking for the response that the appellant would review the rookie firefighter's training records, and the appellant did not provide this response. The supervision question indicated that the rookie firefighter was on his crew, and the appellant responded as though the rookie was under someone else's supervision when he asked the rookie's supervisor for an update. The appellant missed the action noted by the assessor and his score of 4 is correct.

CONCLUSION

A thorough review of the appellant's submissions and the test materials indicates that the decision below is amply supported by the record, and the appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this matter.

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
THE 10th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016


Robert M. Czech
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

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

c: Keith Castaldo
Michael Johnson
Records Center

