



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Anthony Scalcione,
et al., Police Captain,
various jurisdictions

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

CSC Docket Nos. 2018-1259, *et al.*

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: APRIL 2, 2018 (JH)

Anthony Scalcione (PM0642V), Jersey City; Harrison Cranmer (PM0654V), Millville; and Andrew McGurr (PM0675V), Teaneck; appeal the examination for Police Captain (various jurisdictions). These appeals have been consolidated due to common issues presented by the appellants.

The subject exam consists of two parts: a multiple-choice portion and an oral portion. The written portion was administered on October 5, 2017 and consisted of 70 multiple choice questions.

McGurr presents that he was only provided with 30 minutes for review and he was not permitted to review his “own test booklet and [his] own scored answer sheet.” In addition, he contends that his ability to take notes on exam items was severely curtailed. As such, he requests that any appealed item in which he selected the correct response be disregarded and that if he misidentified an item number in his appeal, his argument be addressed.

Regarding review, it is noted that the time allotted for candidates to review is a percentage of the time allotted to take the examination. The review procedure is not designed to allow candidates to retake the examination, but rather to allow candidates to recognize flawed questions. First, it is presumed that most of the questions are not flawed and would not require more than a cursory reading. Second, the review procedure is not designed to facilitate perfection of a candidate’s test score, but rather to facilitate perfection of the scoring key. To that end, knowledge of what choice a particular appellant made is not required to properly

evaluate the correctness of the official scoring key. Appeals of questions for which the appellant selected the correct answer are not improvident if the question or keyed answer is flawed.

With respect to misidentified items, to the extent that it is possible to identify the items in question, they are reviewed. It is noted that it is the responsibility of the appellant to accurately describe appealed items.

An independent review of the issues presented under appeal has resulted in the following findings:

For question 23, since McGurr selected the correct response, his appeal of this item is moot.

Questions 31 refers to Kären Matison Hess, Christine Hess Orthmann, and Shaun LaDue, *Management and Supervision in Law Enforcement* (7th ed. 2015) and indicates that you are considering purchasing new technology for automating certain internal reporting processes. There are various options to consider, so you seek input from staff who will be directly impacted. Rather than calling a meeting, you send questionnaires to the staff who will be involved in the decision-making. Once you have received their questionnaires back, you will send the answers to all participants, and ask them to complete the questionnaire again considering those various answers. The question asks, according to Hess, *et al.*, for the problem-solving process for determining the training needs of officers you are using. The keyed response is option c, "The Delphi Technique." Scalcione contends that option b, "The Modified Delphi Technique," is correct. In this regard, he presents that the question does not indicate whether consensus was achieved and the questionnaire was only sent out twice. The text indicates that pursuant to the Delphi technique, "rather than calling a meeting, management sends questionnaires to those who will be involved in the decision making process . . . Management then circulates the answers to all participants, who are asked to again complete the questionnaire considering various answers. This continues until a consensus is reached. Usually, three or four cycles are enough." With respect to the modified Delphi technique, the text provides:

The Delphi technique can be modified to take away the open-endedness. This modified Delphi technique presents a questionnaire that contains policy statements representing key issues to be decided and a response column with three choices: agree with, not certain but willing to try and disagree with. Those who do not agree are asked to indicate the changes they would recommend that would make the statement acceptable. This is Phase 1. . . Phase 2 shows the number replying with each option for each statement and the choice each respondent circled. Respondents are then asked to reconsider their

original responses and make any changes they want based on the responses of others . . . Phase 3 is a tally of the responses in Phase 2 and a summary of the actions to be taken for each item, based on those responses. Many of these decision-making methods are also appropriate for a department using problem-solving policing. Considerable overlap can be seen between the two processes.

Candidates were instructed to choose the single best answer among the options. In this regard, while option c may not provide the complete description of the Delphi technique, *i.e.*, “until a consensus is reached,” the process described in the question stem is clearly not the modified Delphi technique. Thus, option b is not the best response.

Question 50 refers to Hess, *et al.*, *supra*, and indicates that one of the mistakes you have noticed among the newly-promoted lieutenants is that they do not feel comfortable delegating work. They try to accomplish all of their assignments by themselves, and it often leads to excess stress and feelings of being overwhelmed. Lieutenant Miles is resistant to delegating any work to his sergeants, so you speak to him about the benefits of effective delegation. The question asks, according to Hess, *et al.*, for one of the benefits of effective delegation. The keyed response is option c, “It may serve as a motivating technique for the sergeants.” Cranmer argues that option a, “Lieutenant Miles will be freed up and no longer be responsible for completion of the assignments,” is correct. He refers to the text which provides that delegation “is the way managers and supervisors free up time to get their work done while avoiding getting caught up in ‘administrivia.’” It is noted that the preceding sentence in the text states, “Delegation is *not* passing the buck, shirking personal responsibility, or dumping on someone.” The text further emphasizes that delegation “is not an abdication of responsibility.” Accordingly, Lieutenant Miles is still responsible for the completion of the assignments. As such, option a is not the best response.

CONCLUSION

A thorough review of appellants’ submissions and the test materials reveals that the appellants’ examination scores are amply supported by the record, and the appellants have failed to meet their burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals 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 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2018

Deidre L. Webster Cobb

Deidre L. Webster Cobb
Acting Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

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

c: Anthony Scalcione (2018-1259)
Harrison Cranmer (2018-1243)
Andrew McGurr (2018-1199)
Michael Johnson
Records Center