

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 4 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 1 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his score 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 supervision question for the arriving scenario involved the appellant's crew. They did not follow orders to change air cylinders and go to rehab, but were found to be sitting in the engine with empty tanks. The assessor assigned a score of 1, and noted that the candidate missed the opportunities to interview the members of the company individually, provide any necessary training, advise them of consequences of insubordination, and keep the Chief informed of the investigation progress or outcomes. On appeal, the appellant states that he said he would communicate with the Chief on the current situation, and that he would review and evaluate his subordinates on SOP's and SOG's.

In reply, a review of the file indicates that the appellant ordered his company to change their cylinders and ordered them to rehab. The appellant received credit for these actions, and for reviewing applicable SOP's and SOG's, but that was the extent of his applicable supervising duties. He then addressed the issue with the Rehab Officer in the scenario, not his own crew. In effect, the appellant was supervising the wrong subordinate, as though the Rehab Officer was at fault, rather

than his own crew. He took no further actions regarding the supervision of his crew.

As to the missed opportunity regarding informing the Chief, the appellant did not independently answer each question, but mixed his responses to the questions together. When replying to the supervisory question, question 3, he included actions he would take for question 2, which were specific actions to take regarding the fire at the scene. Then, he discussed how he would handle the Rehab Officer and his last statement was, "And I will communicate with the Chief with all the situations that have gone on in this scenario." 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 communicated with the Chief regarding "all the situations that have gone on in this scenario." This response was not specific and did not include informing the Chief of progress or outcomes of his investigation. The appellant missed the actions noted by the assessor. The appellant also missed many other opportunities to take other actions regarding his company and his score of 1 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: Willmark Munoz
Michael Johnson
Records Center