



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

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

In the Matter of Timothy Griffin,  
Fire Lieutenant (PM1083V),  
Long Branch

CSC Docket No. 2019-2099

Examination Appeal

**ISSUED:** April 22, 2019 (RE)

Timothy Griffin appeals his score for the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Lieutenant (PM1083V), Long Branch. It is noted that the appellant passed the subject examination with a final score of 88.310 and his name appears as the 2<sup>nd</sup> ranked eligible on the subject list.

It is noted for the record that 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, 31.35% of the score was the written multiple-choice portion, 22.49% was the technical score for the evolving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the evolving exercise, 4.28% was the oral communication score for the evolving exercise, 19.23% was the technical score for the arriving exercise, 7.53% was the supervision score for the arriving exercise, and 7.59% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise.

The oral portion of the Fire Captain 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); 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). 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 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 5 for each 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 involves the handling of salvage and overhaul in the basement and garage of a single-family home after the fire was knocked down. For the technical component, the assessor assigned a score of 4, and noted that the candidate missed the opportunity to check carbon monoxide levels. This was a PCA for question 1, which asked for initial actions. On appeal, the appellant states that he gave this response.

In reply, a review of the file indicates that, for the technical component, the appellant provided all mandatory responses and eight additional PCAs. Also, he stated the action noted by the assessor as he indicated his company would meter the building for carbon monoxide. Nevertheless, while the appellant gave the action that the assessor said he did not, this does not elevate his score to a five. For a score of 4, assessors are required to list only one missed response, although there

may be more. In this case, for question 1, the appellant also missed stating the actions of ensuring proper lighting at the scene, providing additional ventilation, and securing the garage doors in an open position. He missed two additional responses for question 2 as well. Thus, his response to this question was more than acceptable, but not optimal, and his score of 4 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 17<sup>th</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 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: Timothy Griffin  
Michael Johnson  
Records Center