

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 2 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 3 for the technical component, a 5 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his scores for the technical components of both scenarios. 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 bar area that has spread to the second and third floors of a five-story hotel of ordinary construction. Upon arrival, the fire is knocked down and the Incident Commander (IC) orders the candidate, who is the supervisor of the second responding ladder company, to begin salvage and overhaul operations on the first floor. Question 1 asked candidates to describe their initial actions in detail, including descriptions of techniques, life safety concerns, and building construction considerations. Question 2 indicated that a member of the crew was looking at a wall with the thermal imaging camera (TIC) on the A/D corner during overhaul operations and saw hot spots. It asked for actions that should be taken based on this new information. The assessor noted that the appellant failed to extinguish any extension appropriately, which was a mandatory response to question 2. It was also noted that he missed the opportunities to check carbon monoxide levels and to begin overhaul at the fire's point of origin, which were additional responses to question 1. On appeal, the appellant states that he

exposed hidden fire, mentioned void spaces, and had a charged hose line in coordination with the engine company.

A review of the appellant's presentation indicates that he received credit in question 1 for stretching a hoseline to extinguish hotspots. Also, the appellant received credit for checking pipe chases/concealed spaces, which was a separate mandatory response for question 1. Thereafter, in responding to question 2, the appellant notified the IC of the hotspot found, and he doublechecked the area, pulled ceilings, opened walls, removed debris, and looked for victims or ventilation spots. He then said he would work in teams of two, give progress reports to command, work in coordination with a charged hose line, and inform command "when we are complete." In reply, 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." The appellant cannot receive credit for extinguishing any extension appropriately when he did not articulate this in his presentation. He missed this mandatory response, and the other responses indicated by the assessor, and his score of 2 for this component is correct.

The arriving scenario involved a report of a collision of a pickup truck and a tour bus. Question 1 asked candidates to perform an initial report on arrival using proper radio protocols. Question 2 asked for specific actions to be taken after the initial report. The assessor assigned a score of 3 using the "flex rule," and indicated that the appellant failed to address multiple victims with multiple injuries, which was a mandatory response to question 1. It was also noted that he missed the opportunity to establish his command post upwind and uphill, which was an additional response to question 2. On appeal, the appellant argues that he said he would interview, treat, extricate, package, remove, check vital signs, search for, and send to the hospital the victims or people around the scene.

Regarding the flex rule, mandatory responses are responses that are requirements for a performance to be acceptable (a score of 3). Sometimes, a candidate states many additional responses but does not give a mandatory response. The flex rule was designed to assign a score of 3 to candidates who fail to give a mandatory response but who provide many additional responses. However, a score higher than a 3 cannot be provided in those cases.

This was a formal examination and candidates were required to respond to the questions appropriately and articulate their knowledge verbally. The appellant provided a proper response for question 1 that did not include indicating to dispatch that there are multiple victims with multiple injuries. The appellant stated, "I have a two vehicle, I have an MVA two vehicles involved collision a pickup truck and a tour bus." For this response, the appellant received credit for indicating there was a

motor vehicle collision with two vehicles involved, which was another mandatory response. However, the appellant did not inform dispatch of multiple victims, at least two unconscious adult males in the pickup truck and more in the bus including the bus driver experiencing symptoms of a heart attack, with multiple injuries. The two individuals in the pickup truck had multiple head and chest wounds and both individuals were pinned in. The appellant did not state to dispatch that he had multiple victims with multiple injuries, and dispatch is not likely to be aware of this because the appellant took actions such as extricating the driver or addressing the injured. The appellant missed a mandatory response, as well as the additional response listed by the assessor, and his score of 3 for this component, using the flex rule, 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 ON
THE 24th DAY OF APRIL, 2019



Deirdre 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: Eric Miller
Michael Johnson
Records Center