



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of Victor Negrón III,  
Fire Officer 1 (PM2389C), Jersey City

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

CSC Docket No. 2023-2256

Examination Appeal

**ISSUED: July 24, 2024 (ABR)**

Victor Negrón III appeals his score on the oral portion of the promotional examination for Fire Officer 1 (PM2389C), Jersey City. It is noted that the appellant passed the examination with a final average of 86.430 and ranks 54<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 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 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.

On the Evolving Scenario, the appellant scored a 5 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 5 for the oral communication component. On 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 technical component of the Arriving Scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenario were reviewed.

The Arriving Scenario involved a report of a fire in a storage unit in a storage facility where the candidate will be the incident commander throughout the incident and will establish command. The question asks what the candidate's concerns are when sizing up this incident and what specific actions the candidate should take to fully address this incident.

On the technical component of the Arriving Scenario, the assessor found that the appellant failed to perform the mandatory responses of ordering forcible entry on Side A to gain entry into the storage unit where the fire was located and ordering hoselines to be stretched to protect exposures. In addition, the assessor found that the appellant missed a number of additional opportunities. Based upon the foregoing, the assessor awarded the appellant a score of 2. On appeal, the appellant argues that he covered the mandatory response of ordering forcible entry at a specified point in his presentation.

In the instant matter, upon review of the appellant's presentation, the Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration (TDAA) agrees that the appellant should have been awarded credit for the mandatory response of ordering forcible entry. However, TDAA also advises that a review of the appellant's presentation also reveals that he was erroneously credited with the additional PCAs of giving progress reports to dispatch, and requesting a rehab unit due to the low temperature and weather conditions. Specifically, because the appellant stated that he would get progress reports from ladder companies, but critically failed to indicate that he would relay these reports to dispatch, as would be required of an incident commander, the SME's award of credit for the PCA of giving progress reports to dispatch must be reversed. As to the additional PCA of requesting a rehab unit based upon the lower temperature and conditions, it is noted that the appellant stated that he would assign a rehab officer. However, because assigning an officer without additional detail did not specifically convey that he would obtain a unit to relieve firefighters and get them out of the cold weather, his statement should not have resulted in credit for the subject PCA. Accordingly, TDAA indicates that, even with the award of additional credit for the mandatory PCA at issue, based upon the other PCAs that the appellant failed to identify, his score for the technical component of the Arriving Scenario should remain unchanged at 2. The Commission agrees with this assessment.

### ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that the appellant's score for the technical component of the Arriving Scenario remain unchanged at 2, but that any appropriate agency records be revised to reflect the above-noted changes to the PCAs awarded to the appellant on the subject examination.

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 24<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2024



---

Allison Chris Myers  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

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

c: Victor Negron III  
Division of Administrative and Employee Services  
Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration  
Records Center