

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. For a performance to be acceptable, a candidate needed to present the mandatory courses of action for that scenario. 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 3 for the supervision component, and a 5 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 4 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his score for the technical component of the evolving scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenarios were reviewed.

The evolving scenario involved a report of fire on the second floor of five-story hotel of ordinary construction built in 1910. The Incident Commander (IC) orders the candidate to perform an immediate primary search and horizontal ventilation of the building. Question 1 asked for the details of the orders to give to your crew to carry out the assignment. Question 2 indicated that in the middle of the primary search, the crew finds an unconscious pregnant victim in the second floor restroom on side C. The IC has indicated that power is secured to the building and Ladder 2 has arrived. This question asked for initial actions and then specific detail required to safely remove the victim.

For the technical component, the assessor assigned a score of 2 and indicated that the appellant failed to begin his primary search on the second floor, which was

a mandatory response to question 1. It was also noted that the appellant missed the opportunities to mention senses (sight, touch, yelling) to locate victims, an additional response to question 1, and to specific that he was coordinating rescue efforts with Ladder 2, an additional response to question 2. On appeal, the appellant argues that he performed primary and secondary searches, and that he communicated contact and updates from other ladder and engine companies.

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 1 asked for the details of the orders to give to your crew to carry out the assignment. The scenario indicated that the building contains conference rooms, a lobby area and eating and drinking establishments, banquet halls, kitchen, and guest rooms. This is a five-story building and there is fire on the second and third floors. A Fire Captain who tells his crew to begin a primary search, but does not indicate where in this large building, is not providing correct information to his crew. There is a large life hazard and to begin the primary search on any other floor than the second, where the fire is biggest, could result in loss of life. The question asked for details to give to the crew, and this was a formal examination setting.

In his presentation, the appellant stated, “Entering the building, I would make sure I search off the line, in coordination with the engine company.” This response indicates that the appellant would search the first floor first. Also in response to the first question, the appellant stated, “I will constantly give progress back to the IC. I will also be in con...ah, I will be in contact with other engine companies or ladder companies, in the building. I will make sure I do a primary search. I will give a primary search thoroughly, excuse me while I look at my notes. (7 second pause) After giving all progress reports, doing all searches all overhaul has been completed in coordination with the engine. I would make sure I give my progress report of my findings or not my findings to the IC. We will search for all, search for any, search for any victims.” At another point, the appellant stated, “We would do searches in all rooms, all floors, the floors below the fire, the floors above the fire, searching all rooms, marking rooms as we leave to reduce redundancy using guide ropes, target exiting devices.” The appellant clearly did not direct his crew to search the second floor first.

The appellant did not state the additional responses listed by the assessor as well. In question 2, the IC has radioed that Ladder 2 has arrived, and the appellant is tasked with removing an unconscious pregnant victim from the second floor. When responding to this question, the appellant did not coordinate his rescue efforts for this victim with Ladder 2, but stated that he would in coordination with the engine. He also stated, “I will be in constant contact with other companies,

giving progress reports.” This information was not specific enough to conclude that the appellant was coordinating his rescue efforts for this victim with Ladder 2. Rather, it appeared that he was giving progress reports and coordinating with the engine company who was there with a protective hoseline. The appellant missed the actions noted by the assessor and his score of 2 for this component 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 9th DAY OF MAY, 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: Lonzia Ellison
Michael Johnson
Records Center