

## STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Danny Espaillat, Fire Captain (PM2337C), Newark

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

:

:

**Examination Appeal** 

CSC Docket No. 2023-2299

:

**ISSUED:** August 14, 2024 (ABR)

Danny Espaillat appeals his score on the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Captain (PM2337C), Newark. It is noted that the appellant passed the examination with a final average of 83.390 and ranks 65<sup>th</sup> on the eligible list.

This two-part examination consisted of a written multiple-choice portion and an oral portion. Candidates were required to pass the written portion of the examination, and then were ranked on their performance on both portions of the examination. The test was worth 80 percent of the final score and seniority was worth the remaining 20 percent. Of the test weights, 35.90% of the score was the written multiple-choice portion, 22.04% was the technical score for the evolving exercise, 7.45% was the supervision score for the evolving exercise, 5.71% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise, 5.71% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise.

The oral portion of the Fire Officer 1 examination consisted of two scenarios: a fire scene simulation with questions designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of fire fighters and the ability to assess fire conditions and hazards in an evolving incident on the fireground (Evolving Scenario); and a fire scene simulation designed to measure the knowledge of safe rescue tactics and procedures to safeguard citizens, supervision of firefighters and the ability to plan strategies and tactics based upon a building's

structure and condition (Arriving Scenario). Knowledge of supervision was measured by a question in the Evolving Scenario, and was scored for that scenario. 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. 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 4 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. For the Arriving Scenario, the appellant scored a 2 for the technical component and a 5 for the oral communication component.

The appellant challenges his score for the supervision component of the Evolving Scenario.

The supervision component of the Evolving Scenario provides that during overhaul procedures the candidate notices a firefighter joking around with another firefighter and behaving recklessly and that the candidate sees this firefighter remove his self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) prematurely and perform actions sloppily with his attention is not fully on the matter at hand. The question asks what actions the candidate should take to handle this both on-scene and back at the firehouse.

The assessor awarded the appellant a score of 4 for the supervision component of the Evolving Scenario, finding that the appellant missed a number of opportunities, including the opportunity to ensure the rest of the crew was wearing proper personal protective equipment (PPE). On appeal, the appellant maintains that he covered this PCA at a specified point during his Evolving Scenario presentation.

In the instant matter, the appellant has not demonstrated that he should have been credited with the Evolving Scenario PCA of ensuring that the rest of the crew was wearing proper PPE in response to the personnel safety issues the appellant observed during overhaul operations. In this regard, the statement cited by the appellant was made in response to Question 1 from the technical component of the Evolving Scenario, which addresses the initial response to a vehicle fire, as opposed to the subsequent overhaul operations that are the subject of the supervision component of the Evolving Scenario. In other words, while the appellant ensured that his crew was wearing proper PPE at the start of the response to the vehicle fire, he did not subsequently ensure that the rest of the crew was still wearing proper PPE after observing a member of his crew remove his SCBA during overhaul operations, as required to receive credit for the supervision component PCA at issue.

Further, a review of the appellant's presentation reveals that he was awarded credit for several Evolving Scenario technical and supervision PCAs in error. Specifically, on the technical component, the appellant was erroneously awarded credit for the following additional responses: establish a rapid intervention crew (RIC); ensure crews open the car's hood; ensure any hotspots are extinguished; instruct crew to direct hose stream under the dashboard; and instruct crew to run water over and under the engine compartment. As to the supervision component of the Evolving Scenario, the appellant should not have been awarded credit for the PCA of informing the firefighter about his right to union representation, as the appellant stated he would meet with the firefighter or the union if the firefighter requested them, rather than preemptively informing the firefighter about his right to union representation, as was required under the scoring standard. Based upon the foregoing, the appellant's Evolving Scenario technical component score shall be lowered from 4 to 3, while his supervision component score shall remain unchanged at 4.

## 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 and that the appellant's score for the technical component of the Evolving Scenario be lowered from 4 to 3. Additionally, it is ordered that appropriate agency records be revised to reflect the above-noted credit change for the supervision component of the Evolving Scenario, but that the appellant's overall score for this component remain unchanged at 4. It is further ordered that the foregoing scoring changes be given retroactive effect.

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  $14^{\mathrm{TH}}$  DAY OF AUGUST, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_

allison Chin Myers

Allison Chris Myers

Chairperson

Civil Service Commission

Inquiries Nicholas F. Angiulo

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: Danny Espaillat

Division of Administrative and Employee Services Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration

Division of Human Resource Information Services

Records Center