



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of Darryl Wright,  
Deputy Police Chief (PM2303E), East  
Orange

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

Examination Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2024-635

**ISSUED: April 30, 2025 (TG)**

Darryl Wright appeals his score on the examination for Deputy Police Chief (PM2303E) East Orange. He also appeals the procedures utilized during the examination review process. It is noted that the appellant achieved a passing score of 89.310 on the subject examination and is ranked sixth on the subject eligible list.

This oral examination consisted of four questions: the first question covered Police administration; the second question covered Police management; the third question covered criminal law; and the fourth question covered leadership and supervision. The appellant received scores of 4, 5, 3, and 5 respectively. The technical portions of the examination were scored by a subject matter expert (SME), who had currently or formally held the title under test, and the oral communication component was scored by Civil Service Commission (Commission) staff.

The appellant appealed his technical score for question one. Specifically, on question one, the assessor noted that the appellant missed the opportunity to indicate that a Police Officer had a duty to inform and report when excessive force was used. On appeal, the appellant contends that he did identify the duty to intervene as well as report. Regarding the examination review, the appellant indicates that when he arrived, he was given a summary sheet that had his identifying information on it, but described questions that were not on the examination that he took. He further indicates that once he raised this issue, he was given a second scoring summary sheet,

and that the second sheet properly indicated the questions as well as the summary of the possible courses of action that he missed.

In reply, the Division of Test Development, Analytics, and Administration (TDAA ) has indicated that, in fact, an incorrect scoring summary sheet was initially provided to the appellant during review, but once he raised concerns about it, it was able to identify the error and provide him with the correct scoring summary sheet. As that error was contemporaneously remedied, the appellant is not entitled to any further relief on that issue. Regarding the appellant's score for the first question, question one referred to the Attorney General Guidelines on the use of excessive force. As previously indicated, the assessor identified that the appellant missed the opportunity to indicate that a Police Officer should intervene when witnessing excessive force, as well as report the use of excessive force. A review of the appellant's examination indicates that in fact, he did state that officers had a duty to intervene, and later indicated that any observation of the use of excessive force must be reported. As a result, the appellant covered this possible course of action (PCA), and as such, as confirmed by TDAA, the appellant should be awarded credit for this PCA. As such, the appellant's score for question one will be changed from a 4 to a 5.

Regarding questions two and four, the appellant contends that he was not provided with any listing of possible courses of action that he missed. The Commission notes that the appellant received the maximum score of 5 for both of these questions and as a result, any challenge to these questions would be moot since the score could not increase. Finally with respect to question three, although the appellant did not raise any specific issues regarding his score on this question, given the confusion caused by the incorrectly provided scoring summary sheet, the appellant's response for question three has been reviewed. Upon review, the assessor missed identifying a correct response given by the appellant regarding if weapons were located off premises that a warrant would need to be obtained in order to seize those weapons. The appellant did identify this in his response. However, the addition of this PCA does not change the appellant's score for that question and his score for that question properly remains at 3. A full and thorough review did not disclose any other errors or omissions on the part of the assessor.

## **CONCLUSION**

A thorough review of the appellant's submissions and the test materials indicates that the appellant has not met his burden of proof regarding his challenge to the examination review and has met his burden of proof regarding his challenge to his score on question one.

**ORDER**

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be granted in part and that the appellant's score on question one be raised from 4 to 5 with retroactive effect. It is also ordered that he be credited for the additional PCA identified above on question three but his score for that question remain at 3.

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 30<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2025



---

Allison Chris Myers  
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: Darryl Wright  
Division of Administrative and Employee Services  
Division of Test Development, Analytics and Administration  
Division of Human Resource Information Services  
Records Center