



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

In the Matter of Devin Bonifazi and
Marc Manfredi, Sheriff's Officer
Sergeant, Mercer County (PC2956W)

Examination Appeals

CSC Docket Nos. 2019-3378 and
2019-3387

ISSUED: JULY 16, 2019 (ABR)

Devin Bonifazi and Marc Manfredi appeal the promotional examination for Sheriff's Officer Sergeant (PC2956W), Mercer County. These appeals have been consolidated due to common issues presented by the appellants.

The subject examination was administered on May 2, 2019 and consisted of 80 multiple choice questions.

Bonifazi's appeal involves Question 28 on the examination. Manfredi's appeal involves Questions 59 and 60 on the examination.

Question 28 presents a scenario where the examinee is conducting a meeting regarding a change in vendors and discussing new vendor options. It states that after the examinee spends a several minutes exhaustively discussing everything they know about a new food service vendor, it becomes clear that a few colleagues are losing interest in the discussion. The question asks the examinee to consider the following:

- I. Move on to a different vendor-related topic
- II. Refocus the presentation on other, more interested participants
- III. Ask one of the people losing interest to provide a specific example related to the current topic

The question then asks how, according to Bruce Tepper and Ida Halasz, *Supervision: A Handbook for Success* (1998), the situation should be addressed.

The keyed response is option b, “I and III only.” Bonifazi argues that option d, “I, II, and III,” is the best response. Specifically, Bonifazi argues that the book states that all three options are correct.

Questions 59 and 60 are based upon the following scenario:

Officer Tweedle is summoned by a woman who tells him that her friend is sick in the restroom and needs medical attention. Officer Tweedle enters the restroom and observes an unconscious woman on the floor. The examinee and another officer arrive as Officer Tweedle checks the vital signs of the unconscious woman. Officer Tweedle tells the examinee that that the woman is breathing but is otherwise unresponsive and has a white powdery substance around her nostrils. The woman who summoned help then states that she believes her friend experienced an overdose and hands the unconscious woman’s purse to the examinee.

Question 59 asks what the examinee should do first in the above-noted situation. The keyed response is option a, “[e]nsure that EMS has been notified and is responding.” Manfredi argues that option d, “ask the woman who summoned help if she knows where the substance that was ingested is located and if there is any left,” is the best response. Specifically, Manfredi asserts that because Officer Tweedle is trained to call EMS before anything else and it is known that the unconscious woman is breathing, it is paramount that he, the examinee, minimizes the potential danger at the scene by containing the alleged drugs. In this regard, he maintains that, according to the National Association of State EMS Officials’ (NASEMO) education standards for Emergency Medical Responders (EMR), the first action to be taken is a “scene size-up” within five minutes. Additionally he submits that under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHSTA) National Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Education Standards, the first action should be a “scene size-up,” including “impact of the environment of patient care, addressing hazards [and] standard precautions.”

Question 60 asks what the best second course of action is in the above-noted scenario. The keyed response is option d, “ask the woman who summoned help if she knows where the substance that was ingested is located and if there is any left.” Manfredi asserts that the best response is option a, “[e]nsure that EMS has been notified and is responding.” In this regard, Manfredi asserts that, according to the NASEMO’s education standards for EMR, the second step is to conduct an assessment to preserve life within 20 minutes. He also submits that under the NHSTA’s National EMS Education Standards, the primary assessment of the patient is the second step that must be completed.

It is noted that the Division of Test Development and Analytics contacted a Subject Matter Expert (SME) who indicated that with the fact pattern presented for Questions 59 and 60, the first action to take is to confirm that EMS has been called and that the next action should be to ask the woman who requested assistance if she knows where the substance the unconscious woman ingested is located and if there is any of it left, particularly as it is potentially lethal and a could be lethal to any persons, officers and EMS who will be at the scene.

CONCLUSION

With Question 28, Bonifazi maintains that Tepper and Halasz would state that shifting to a different vendor-related topic, refocusing the presentation on more interested participants, or asking a person losing interest to provide a specific example related to the current topic are all appropriate ways to address colleagues losing interest at a meeting about vender options. However, Bonifazi does not cite a specific page or section in *Supervision: A Handbook for Success* to support his argument. The Civil Service Commission (Commission) notes that when discussing typical meeting problems, the authors state that if people are losing interest, an appropriate response is to “[a]sk someone in the group for a specific example or move to another subject.” See Tepper and Halsz at 78. Accordingly, the Commission finds that Question 28 is correct as keyed.

With Question 59, Manfredi argues that the first action he, the examinee, needs to take in the applicable scenario is to ask the woman who summoned help if she knows where the substance the unconscious woman ingested is located and if there is any left. However, according to the SME, the best first course of action is to ensure that EMS has been notified and is responding. The Commission notes that the fact pattern does not state that Officer Tweedle has called EMS. Moreover, given that any delay in treatment could have serious consequences, it is imperative to verify that Tweedle did in fact call EMS. Even if one assumes that Tweedle is trained to call EMS first, it is conceivable that he might have been unable to do so in the moments prior to the examinee’s arrival. Any potential hazards at the scene can be assessed immediately after confirming whether EMS has been called and, if necessary, calling them. The NASEMO and NHSTA educational standards cited by Manfredi do not offer sufficient proof to rebut such a course of action. In this regard, it is emphasized that each of these education standards provides a framework for designing EMS training programs and that they do not offer detailed descriptions for each step to be taken when responding to an incident such as this. Finally, it is noted that the timeframes Manfredi provides appear to be the NASEMO’s recommendations for how much time to spend on the training for the cited topic areas, rather than the response to an actual incident. Accordingly, the Commission finds that Question 59 is correct as keyed.

With Question 60, Manfredi cites the NASEMO's and NHSTA's education standards to argue that the appropriate second action is to confirm that Tweedle called for EMS. Conversely, the SME states that after confirming that EMS is notified, the next action that should be taken is to ask the woman who requested assistance if she knows where the substance the unconscious woman ingested is located and if there is any of it left, particularly as it is potentially lethal and a could be lethal to any persons, officers and EMS who will be at the scene. The Commission finds that the educational standards cited by Manfredi do not provide sufficient information to conclude otherwise and that the SME's explanation supports the keyed response. Consequently, the Commission finds that Question 60 is correct as keyed.

Accordingly, the appellants' examination scores are amply supported by the record and the appellants have failed to meet their burdens of proof in these matters.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in these matters. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 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: Devin Bonifazi (2019-3378)
Marc Manfredi (2019-3387)
Michael Johnson
Joseph DeNardo
Records Center