



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Robert Schrump,
Fire Lieutenant (PM2371C), Linden

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

CSC Docket No. 2023-2518

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: November 27, 2024 (ABR)

Robert Schrump appeals his score on the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Lieutenant (PM2371C), Linden. It is noted that the appellant passed the subject examination with a score of 86.230 and ranks eighth on the subject 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 evolving exercise, 23.20% was the technical score for the arriving exercise, 5.71% was the oral communication score for the arriving exercise.

The oral portion of the Fire Lieutenant 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. It is noted that candidates were told the following prior to beginning their presentations for each scenario: "In responding to the questions, be as specific as possible. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your score."

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.

On the Evolving Scenario, the appellant scored a 4 for the technical component, a 5 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. On the Arriving Scenario, the appellant scored a 4 for the technical component and a 4 for the oral communication component.

The appellant challenges his score on the technical component of the Evolving Scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenario were reviewed.

The Evolving Scenario involves a response to a fire reported on the second floor of a two-story single-family home. The candidate is the first-level fire supervisor of the first responding ladder company, Ladder 4. As the candidate arrives on scene, Battalion 5 establishes command. The incident commander (IC) orders an immediate primary search with ventilation and requests an additional alarm. Question 1 then asks the candidate to describe, in detail, what orders they should give their crew to carry out their assignment from the IC.

The SME awarded the appellant a score of 4 on based upon a finding that the appellant missed a number of additional responses, including, in part, the opportunity to ensure that 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 presentation.

CONCLUSION


In the instant matter, upon review of the appellant's appeal, the Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration (TDAA) has determined that the appellant should have received credit for the PCA at issue. However, TDAA also advises that the appellant was erroneously credited with the PCA of requesting a hoseline to the second floor for protection. In this regard, TDAA states that while the appellant made a general statement about protecting the stairs and egress in the dwelling, he did not make clear whether he would position the hoseline in question at the bottom of the stairs or bring it to the second floor, as required.¹ Accordingly, TDAA advises that the appellant's score of 4 for the technical component of the Evolving Scenario should remain unchanged. The Commission agrees with TDAA's assessment.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be granted in part and that appropriate agency records be revised to reflect the above-noted adjustments to the appellant's scoring records for the technical component of the Evolving Scenario, but that the appellant's overall score for this component remain unchanged at 4.

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 27TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2024



Allison Chris Myers
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

¹ As noted above, candidates were told the following prior to beginning their presentations for each scenario: "In responding to the questions, be as specific as possible. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your score."

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: Robert Schrump
Division of Administrative and Employee Services
Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration
Records Center