



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

In the Matter of David Korzun,
Fire Captain (PM1019V),
Bayonne

CSC Docket No. 2019-2645

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: April 29, 2019 (RE)

David Korzun appeals his score for the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Captain (PM1019V), Bayonne. It is noted that the appellant passed the subject examination with a final average of 84.570 and ranks 16th on the resultant eligible list.

This two-part examination consisted of a written multiple-choice portion and an oral portion. Candidates were required to pass the written portion of the examination, and then were ranked on their performance on both portions of the examination. The test was worth 80 percent of the final score and seniority was worth the remaining 20 percent. Of the test weights, 31.35% of the score was the written multiple-choice portion, 22.49% was the technical score for the evolving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the evolving exercise, 4.28% was the oral communication score for the evolving exercise, 19.23% was the technical score for the arriving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the arriving exercise, and 7.59% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise.

The oral portion of the Fire Captain examination consisted of two scenarios: a fire scene simulation with questions designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of fire fighters and the ability to assess fire conditions and hazards in an evolving incident on the fireground (evolving); and a fire scene simulation designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of firefighters and the ability to plan strategies and tactics based upon a building's 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. Only those oral responses that depicted relevant behaviors that were observable and could be quantified were assessed in the scoring process.

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 5 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. For the arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 2 for the technical component, a 3 for the supervision component, and a 3 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his score for the technical 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 arriving scenario involved a report of fire at a barbecue restaurant, one employee is missing, and the hood suppression system has failed. Question 1 asked candidates to use proper radio protocols to perform an initial report upon arrival, while question 2 asked for specific actions to be taken after making this initial report.

For the technical component, the assessor noted that the appellant failed to check the cockloft for extension, which was a mandatory response to question 2. It was also noted that he missed the opportunity to appoint a safety officer, and to establish a secondary water supply, which were additional responses to question 2. On appeal, the appellant argues that he checked for extension as part of overhaul.

At the end of every scenario and prior to the questions, instructions state, "In responding to the questions, make sure your actions directly relate to the scenario. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your

score.” Question 2 asked for specific actions to take after the initial radio report. A review of the presentation reveals that, in response to question 2 and regarding Engine 1, the appellant stated, “They are going to try to um, they are going to try to manually operate the hood system to put out the fire. They are going to locate, confine and extinguish. Check for extension. They are going to ah, coordinate with companies on scene. They will ah, report back to command with the conditions, actions and needs.” In this passage, the appellant does not indicate that the engine company is performing overhaul. Nevertheless, even if it were, checking for extension is generic, as fire could have extended anywhere. The required action was to check the cockloft for extension, and the appellant did not state this mandatory response. Credit cannot be given for information that is implied or assumed. If the appellant knew he needed to have his crews check the cockloft for extension, he needed to articulate this action to receive credit for it. Later in the presentation, the appellant ordered ladder companies to conduct overhaul, and he did not have them check the cockloft for extension. The appellant missed a mandatory response, as well as the other responses listed by the assessor, and his score will not be changed.

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 ON
THE 24th DAY OF APRIL, 2019



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

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

c: David Korzun
Michael Johnson
Records Center