

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, other than for oral communication, 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. Scores were then converted to standardized scores.

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 and a 3 for the oral communication component. For the Administration scenario, the appellant scored a 3 for the technical component and a 5 for the oral communication component. For the Arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 1 for the technical component and a 4 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his scores for the technical components of the Evolving and Administration scenarios, and for his oral communication score for 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 smoke from a two-story assisted living facility. Question 1 asked for actions, orders and requests to fully address the incident. Question 2 indicated that handicapped patients trying to evacuate the second floor are stuck on an elevator on an unknown floor, and the question asks for actions to be taken to address the current situation. Instructions indicate that, in responding to the questions, the candidate should be as specific as possible in describing actions, and should not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to a score.

For the technical component, the assessor indicated that the appellant failed to request EMS, which was a mandatory response to question 1. The assessor also indicated that the appellant missed the opportunities to request police, and to request a fire investigator, which were additional responses to question 1. For the oral communication component, the assessor noted weaknesses in organization and word usage, and examples were provided. On appeal, the appellant argues that he provided technical information and tactics which warrant a score of 3 for the

technical component and a score of 4 for the oral component. He does not provide any specific arguments regarding the assessor's comments.

A review of the appellant's video indicates that he missed the actions as noted by the assessor. As noted above, for a performance to be acceptable in the technical component, a candidate needed to present the mandatory courses of action for that scenario. The appellant missed a mandatory action in his response to question 1, requesting EMS, and therefore, his score of 2 for this component is correct. The appellant's oral communication was reviewed as well, and his performance contains the weaknesses noted by the assessor. The appellant's presentation does not warrant a higher score for either component.

The Administration scenario involves a firefighter in a residence speaking to the elderly residents with his mask down, which is a violation of department policy. Question 1 asked for actions to take to fully address the incident. Question 2 indicated that the elderly wife is confirmed to have Covid-19, and the husband has called to complain and says that he is considering legal action. This question asked for additional actions that should now be taken.

The assessor noted that the appellant missed the opportunities to check the firefighter's personnel file, a response to question 1, and to offer EAP/EAS, a response to question 2. On appeal, the appellant states that he said he would check the firefighter's personnel file.

In reply, the appellant's presentation has been reviewed, and the review does not find that the appellant stated he would check the firefighter's personnel file. His score of 3 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 15TH DAY OF MARCH, 2023

Allison Chris Myers

Allison Chris Myers
Acting Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Nicholas F. Angiulo
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: William Childs Jr.
Division of Administration
Division of Test Development and Analytics
Records Center