

# **COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

## **Boston Deputy Fire Chief Fire Promotion Examination**

### **Candidate Preparation Guide**

**Prepared By:**



**February 2024**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	2
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE PROMOTIONAL EXAMINATION WITH EMPHASIS ON THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST</b> .....	3
I. Date, Time, and Location .....	3
II. Technical Knowledge (TK) Content.....	3
III. Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Content .....	3
IV. Situational Judgment Test Competencies .....	3
V. Administrative Logistics.....	4
VI. Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Scoring .....	5
<b>PREPARATION STRATEGIES FOR THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST</b> .....	6
VII. Preparation Strategies .....	6
A. Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies.....	6
B. Common Pitfalls .....	8
<b>SAMPLE TEST ITEMS</b> .....	11
VIII. Sample Situational Judgment Test Items .....	11
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	16

## INTRODUCTION

This Guide is intended to provide specific information to candidates regarding the 2024 examination for the Boston Deputy Fire Chief rank. The Boston Deputy Fire Chief examination consist of two components including:

- Technical Knowledge Test [TK]
- Situational Judgment Test [SJT]

The examination components are designed based on job analysis information obtained from Boston Deputy Fire Chief incumbents from the Boston Fire Department. For each position, the job analysis identified the duties performed and the knowledge and competencies (abilities and personal characteristics) required to perform these duties effectively. The examination process is intended to assess the required knowledge and competencies in the context of important duties and tasks.

Although this Guide will provide general information about both test components, the focus of this Guide is assisting candidates in preparing for the Situational Judgment Test, as this is a new test component for these positions.

Accordingly, this Guide provides information about the Situational Judgment Test in terms of the:

- content,
- administrative logistics,
- evaluation methods,
- preparation strategies, and
- sample questions.

From the information presented in this Guide, candidates should be able to gain an understanding of the Situational Judgment Test, including the test procedures, the types of questions they will encounter, and suggested preparation strategies.

We encourage candidates to review this Guide carefully and to take advantage of all opportunities to prepare for the Situational Judgment Test.

## GOOD LUCK!

**NOTE:** In this Guide, an effort has been made to provide information about the intended format, content, logistics, and evaluation of the Situational Judgment Test. However, it is possible that minor alterations may be made in the testing procedures between the time this Guide is distributed and the administration of the test. We will work with the Human Resources Division to provide you with any updates that may be required.

# DESCRIPTION OF THE PROMOTIONAL EXAMINATION WITH EMPHASIS ON THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

- I. **Date, Time, and Location:** The computerized online written exam which contains two examination components will be administered to Boston Deputy Fire Chief candidates on Saturday, June 8, 2024. Testing will take place at multiple testing locations and different groups of candidates will be assigned to either a morning or an afternoon testing session. Two weeks prior to the exam date, you will receive a Notice to Appear that indicates the site where you will test and the arrival and testing times for your session. Please make note of your testing time to ensure you show up on time. Late arriving candidates may be disqualified from testing.
- II. **Technical Knowledge (TK) Content:** The Technical Knowledge Test will consist of 70 multiple-choice questions drawn from the sources listed on the Reading List. The TK Test consists only of closed-book questions. You will not be permitted to bring any Departmental reference sources (from the reading list) or any other documents or materials with you to the test facility. If any such materials are found in your possession once you are seated at a computer at the testing site, you may be disqualified from testing.
- III. **Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Content:** Candidates will be asked to consider the role of Boston Deputy Fire Chief and will be presented with a series of 15 job relevant scenarios. Each scenario will describe a job situation which a Boston Deputy Fire Chief might face. Following each scenario, candidates will be presented with 4 to 6 potential actions that the Boston Deputy Fire Chief in that scenario might take in response to the situation presented. Candidates will be asked to read, consider, and rate the effectiveness of each potential action using the following rating scale:

1 Highly Ineffective	2 Ineffective	3 Effective	4 Highly Effective
Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue	Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue

When rating the effectiveness of each potential action, candidates should consider only the information presented in the scenario. If knowledge of any department-specific policy or procedure is needed to determine appropriate responses to a scenario, that information will be explicitly provided in the scenario description.

- IV. **Situational Judgment Test Competencies:** The Situational Judgment Test was designed to assess a series of competencies found to be important to effective job performance in the context of situations encountered by Boston Deputy Fire Chiefs. Based on the job analysis results, the six (6) competencies to be assessed during the Situational Judgment Test are identified below. In other words, the Situational Judgment Test scenarios reflect or align with the competencies listed below:

- 1. **Accountability:** This competency involves adhering to and applying performance standards in an appropriate, consistent, and fair manner. This includes holding oneself and others accountable by addressing and correcting problem performance or discipline violations in a timely, consistent, and fair manner.
- 2. **Adaptability:** This competency involves the ability to evaluate and modify one’s behavior to meet the needs of changing circumstances or priorities. This includes maintaining a calm and professional demeanor in both routine and stressful situations or crises. This

competency also involves the ability to demonstrate resilience by persevering through adverse or difficult circumstances and by bouncing back from setbacks, disappointments, criticism, or emotionally challenging situations.

3. **Analyzing and Deciding:** This competency involves the ability to select an appropriate and timely course of action by seeking out and analyzing information from various sources, evaluating the importance and relevance of information, and considering alternative approaches and their implications.
4. **Interpersonal Interactions:** This competency involves the ability to establish constructive working relationships with others. This includes demonstrating consideration and respect for others' feelings, needs, views, and contributions while maintaining the necessary balance to ensure that objectives continue to be met. This also includes the ability to foster a cooperative team environment and negotiate/reconcile conflict, among others.
5. **Professional Development:** This competency involves demonstrating commitment to enhancing one's existing skills and capabilities, identifying and improving in areas in need of development, participating in development opportunities and remaining receptive to or seeking constructive criticism/feedback from others. This also includes the ability to provide guidance and development opportunities to others to facilitate performance improvement and professional growth, and working with others to develop clear and focused development goals and action plans for achieving them. Finally, this competency includes sharing open, clear, and honest praise and constructive feedback regarding others' work behaviors.
6. **Leadership:** This competency involves demonstrating "drive" and the tendency to take action without being prompted to achieve objectives. It also involves the ability to work with limited or no oversight while still recognizing when it is necessary to seek others' input before taking action. This competency also involves the ability to establish goals, plan activities, and identify and direct resources in an efficient and effective manner in order to achieve objectives. This includes developing strategies for accomplishing goals that include contingencies for anticipated obstacles, allocating authority and responsibility based on personnel capabilities and priorities, clearly explaining assigned tasks and performance expectations, and monitoring/measuring progress toward goals.

- V. **Administrative Logistics:** The Situational Judgment Test will be the only test administered during a single testing session. The test will be administered on a computer in a controlled testing environment. At the start of the testing session, after a set of instructions, candidates will complete the Situational Judgment Test. It is up to the candidate to keep track of time and ensure that he/she has sufficient time to complete the test.

The timed session for this promotional examination will be 3 hours and 5 minutes. The recommended allocation of time is:

- 10 minutes to read the initial instructions for the examination
- 105 minutes (one hour and 45 minutes) to complete the Technical Knowledge Test
- 10 minutes to read the additional instructions for the Situational Judgment Test
- 60 minutes (one hour) to complete the Situational Judgment Test

Please keep in mind that the examination timer will run continuously once the examination is initiated and it is up to each candidate to ensure he/she spends the time appropriately to be able to complete the Situational Judgment Test before the timer expires.

**VI. Situational Judgment Test (SJT) Scoring:** All responses on the Situational Judgment Test will be scored against an established scoring key. Each response will be worth a minimum of zero points and a maximum of two points. Note that candidates rate the effectiveness of each potential action the Boston Deputy Fire Chief in that scenario might take using a scale that ranges from Highly Ineffective to Highly Effective. Each potential action that is rated by a candidate is considered a “response” on the Situational Judgment Test.

The scoring key for each potential action (i.e., the “correct” or most appropriate effectiveness rating for that scenario response) was determined by a group of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from the Boston Fire Department. These SMEs determined the most appropriate effectiveness rating (i.e., the scoring key) for each potential action.

Candidates will receive one point for each response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate is on the same “side” of the effectiveness scale as the scoring key, plus one additional point per response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate matches the scoring key exactly. Zero points will be awarded for a response if the effectiveness rating identified by the candidate is on the opposite “side” of the effectiveness scale from the scoring key. Illustrative examples of the scoring process are provided below.

<b>Candidate Effectiveness Rating</b>	<b>Scoring Key</b>	<b>Points Awarded to Candidate</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Highly Effective OR Effective	Ineffective	0	The candidate’s response is on the “effective side” of the rating scale, and the scoring key is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale. The candidate’s response is therefore on the opposite side of the scale from the scoring key, and 0 points are awarded.
Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	1	The candidate’s response is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale, and the scoring key is on the “ineffective side” of the rating scale. The candidate’s response is therefore on the same side of the scale as the scoring key, and 1 point is awarded.
Ineffective	Ineffective	2	The candidate’s response is on the same side of the scale (“ineffective”) as the scoring key, so 1 initial point is awarded. In addition, the candidate’s rating of “Ineffective” matches the scoring key, so an additional 1 point is awarded. The candidate therefore receives 2 points for this response.

All scoring computations will be performed by Talogy using the scoring key established by the Boston Fire Department SMEs.

# PREPARATION STRATEGIES FOR THE SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

**VII. Preparation Strategies:** The Situational Judgment Test is designed to assess the underlying competencies as they contribute to the performance of Boston Deputy Fire Chiefs. Technical knowledge of policies, procedures, rules, and regulations is not the primary focus since knowledge is assessed as part of the Technical Knowledge Test. However, keep in mind that the competencies involve such things as analyzing information, considering alternative approaches and their implications, identifying and coordinating resources, and monitoring progress toward goals. When these competencies are applied to resolve a situation or problem, it is with a foundation and understanding of acceptable behaviors and procedures whether on scene or in an administrative setting.

You can improve your performance on a Situational Judgment Test in a couple of different ways. First, know and understand the test situation so that you can avoid making mistakes caused by a failure to understand the meaning of test questions, test format, or test procedures. Second, you can try to gain an understanding of your own test-taking behavior. If you become aware of the kinds of errors that are common on Situational Judgment Tests, you can try to avoid them. This section of the Guide provides suggestions for improving your performance in each of these areas:

- **Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies - Understanding the Test Situation:** This section provides some strategies that you can apply when taking the Situational Judgment Test. These strategies include such suggestions as systematically breaking down the rating scale and answering easier questions first.
- **Common Pitfalls - Understanding Your Own Test-Taking Behavior:** This section provides information about common pitfalls in test-taking in general, in situational judgment tests in particular, and reasons why you might face such pitfalls. You are encouraged to identify the kinds of behaviors you might tend to engage in by reading through this list. In this way, you will be more aware of the tendency toward these pitfalls when you take the test and can determine what steps you can take to avoid them.

## **A. Situational Judgment Test-Taking Strategies**

The purpose of the Situational Judgment Test is to evaluate the competencies required to perform certain work-related situations, particularly as they relate to making decisions or judgments regarding effective versus ineffective behaviors in those situations. Because we want to directly evaluate these competencies, we are offering the following suggestions.

### **1. Make sure you understand the test format and requirements**

- a) Read all directions carefully.
- b) Read each scenario and all potential actions carefully before attempting to rate them. Scenarios and potential actions are brief, so re-reading may be a good use of your time to ensure you have not misunderstood anything in the scenario or potential actions.
- c) Make sure you know how to use the rating scale to rate the effectiveness of each potential action.

- d) Make sure you know how much time you have remaining to complete the test. As you take the test, check the timer on the computer periodically so that you can keep track of the amount of time remaining in the testing period.

## 2. Proceed through the scenarios strategically

- a) Break down the rating scale. First, think about whether each potential action for the given scenario is generally “effective” or generally “ineffective.” Imagine the person in the situation responding in the way that is described in the given item. Then think about whether that action would generally make the situation better or worse. When thinking about the ramifications of the given action, you may want to consider the impact that action would have on others described in the scenario. Consider things such as whether the action promotes or inhibits safety, whether the action is consistent with any expressly stated rules or policies, and whether the action demonstrates strong levels of responsibility, adaptability, leadership, professionalism, etc. If you believe the given action would make the situation better, you should respond by selecting a rating on the “effective” side of the scale. If you believe the given action would make the situation worse, you should respond by selecting a rating on the “ineffective” side of the scale.

Once you have determined whether the potential action is effective or ineffective, then think about the degree to which that response is either effective or ineffective. If a given response is extremely or very likely to improve the situation, or if the response would make the situation much better, then you should select the “Very Effective” rating. If you believe a given response is somewhat likely to improve the situation, or if the response would make the situation a little bit better, then you should select the “Effective” rating. Similarly, on the ineffective side of the scale, if you believe an action would be extremely or very likely to worsen the situation, or would worsen the situation to a large degree, you should select the “Very Ineffective” rating. If you believe an action would be somewhat likely to worsen the situation, or would make the situation somewhat worse, you should select the “Ineffective” rating.

- b) Rate the “easier” potential actions first. As you read the potential actions for a given scenario, you may find that some of those actions are easy to rate (e.g., they are clearly “Very Effective” or clearly “Ineffective”). Rate those potential actions first to get them out of the way, and then spend time thinking about the actions that may be a little more difficult to judge. Don’t forget to use the strategy described above in step (a) to evaluate the effectiveness of the potential actions.
- c) Take a mental break when needed. If you feel that your ability to concentrate is decreasing at points during the test, take a brief mental break. Close your eyes and take a minute to clear your mind and relax. Of course, you must keep in mind the time limit for the test, but a brief mental break may well be worth the few seconds or minutes it takes.
- d) Answer every question. You will not lose any more credit for an incorrect response than you will for no response, so even if you must guess, rate every potential action. If the test period is about to end, and you believe there will be several scenarios that you will not be able to get to, reserve some time (e.g., 60 seconds) at the end of the test period to rate the scenario’s potential actions, even if you must guess. While your guesses may not be correct, the alternative is to leave these actions blank and be assured of getting them wrong.

### 3. Use extra time wisely

Once you complete the test, go back and review your responses to make sure they still make sense to you as you read through them again. Pay particular attention to scenarios and potential actions where you may have initially questioned your responses. Re-read them, think through them again in a systematic way, and make sure you are comfortable with your responses. You will not get extra points for completing the test before the time limit expires, so if time remains, review as many of your responses as time allows.

Remember, test administrators will be available to help every candidate, but only to clarify procedures. If you have any procedural questions, ask for assistance before the test begins.

#### **B. Common Pitfalls**

There are several common reasons candidates might choose an incorrect rating for a potential action. Eight of these reasons are presented below along with suggestions for avoiding these errors.

1. **Misreading the rating scale:** Candidates may mistakenly indicate a rating for a potential action other than the one they intended to indicate, simply due to misreading the scale. Be sure to make note of the scale anchors (1 = Highly Ineffective, 2 = Ineffective, 3 = Effective, 4 = Highly Effective) and the directionality of the rating scale - lower ratings indicate ineffective responses and higher ratings indicate effective responses.

In a similar vein, note that the rating scale asks about the *effectiveness* of each potential action. You are NOT to rate the *likelihood* that someone (including you) might take the action listed. Instead, you are to rate, if the Deputy Fire Chief in that scenario did take the listed action, how effective that action would be.

2. **Misunderstanding the instructions or making false assumptions:** Candidates may fail to fully read the instructions, or may assume they already know how to proceed without reading the instructions, especially when there is pressure to finish before the test time limit. The instructions for rating the potential actions will be presented with each new scenario. It is important that you understand the instructions before rating the potential actions. The instructions will be as follows:

“Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the Deputy Fire Chief might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.”

Important Note: You do NOT have to select a different rating for every potential action to the same scenario. You may rate more than one action as Effective, more than one as Highly Ineffective, etc. Similarly, you do NOT have to select every point on the scale when evaluating the potential actions within each scenario. In other words, it is NOT necessary to assume that every scenario will include at least one potential action at each of the four levels of effectiveness. Within any given scenario, you may find that there are no potential actions to which you give a rating of “Highly Effective,” or no actions to which you give a rating of “Ineffective,” etc.

An example is provided below of a scenario with four potential actions. The darkened numbered circles indicate the effectiveness rating selected by the candidate for each potential action. Notice that, in this example, a rating of “Effective” is given to two of the potential actions, and the rating of “Highly Ineffective” is not used at all. As previously mentioned, there is no requirement to select a rating from each point on the scale for the potential actions for the same scenario.

### Scenario Example

A brief description of the scenario involving a Boston Deputy Fire Chief will be presented here.

Potential Actions		1 Highly Ineffective	2 Ineffective	3 Effective	4 Highly Effective
		Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue	Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue
A)	Boston DFC Example takes action A in response to the scenario above.	①	②	③	④
B)	Boston DFC Example takes action B in response to the scenario above.	①	②	③	④
C)	Boston DFC Example takes action C in response to the scenario above.	①	②	③	④
D)	Boston DFC Example takes action D in response to the scenario above.	①	②	③	④

- 3. Viewing the potential scenario actions as interdependent:** Within any given scenario, the listed actions that the Deputy Fire Chief might take in response to that scenario are NOT to be viewed as chronological or as interdependent in any way. The responses do NOT build on one another. Instead, each potential action listed for a scenario is meant to be viewed and rated independently from the other actions. Be sure to rate each potential action separately.
- 4. Misreading part of the scenario or potential action by overlooking a keyword or phrase:** The solution to this problem is taking the time to read carefully and thoroughly, re-reading if there is time. Make note of keywords or phrases that may indicate the most effective ways in which to respond to a situation. Be sure not to overlook critical words such as “not” – for example, “this individual has not been trained to operate this particular piece of equipment.” Overlooking the word “not” in this phrase could lead to faulty assumptions about the most effective actions to take in a scenario that involves assigning the best resources to operate the equipment.
- 5. Not knowing the meaning of one or more key terms:** Situational Judgment Test scenarios and potential actions will not include a great deal of technical terminology. Nevertheless, when taking the test, if you have difficulty with a term, re-read the sentence to determine its general meaning without worrying about the exact meaning of the particular word. Try to understand the general message of the sentence or paragraph. The meaning of the unfamiliar word should become clearer once you understand the general context within which it has been

placed.

- 6. Not sticking to the scenario as presented:** When evaluating Situational Judgment Test potential actions, it is tempting to make assumptions or jump to conclusions based on preconceived notions or past experiences related to the scenario being described. Be careful NOT to make assumptions or jump to conclusions. Focus on the information provided in the scenario. Do not assume or add information or think about “what ifs” such as, “If the immediate supervisor has this type of personality, I might respond differently,” or “If this has been an ongoing issue, then this might be an appropriate response,” etc. Focus solely on the information provided when reading and thinking about the scenario and potential actions. If there is added information that is needed (e.g., information about personality conflicts, background stating that an issue is ongoing or has occurred repeatedly), that information will be clearly stated in the scenario. If some challenge, problem, or conflict is not stated in the scenario itself, do NOT assume it exists and do NOT let such an assumption impact your responses.

Similarly, focus on the potential actions that are provided. It may be that the course of action that YOU would take is not listed as an option, or that you can think of other, more or less effective, alternative actions that are not listed as potential actions. Do not allow yourself to be too distracted by thinking about alternative actions that are not provided. Focus on the potential actions that are listed and the context provided around those actions in the scenario.

- 7. Committing common rating errors or biases:** When using any kind of rating scale, such as the effectiveness rating scale that will be used to rate the potential actions, candidates often tend to have natural biases that lead them to only use portions of the scale. One common bias is to use only the extremities of the scale – in this case, only “Highly Effective” or “Highly Ineffective.” Another common bias is to avoid those extreme ratings and only use the middle points of the scale – in this case, only “Effective” or “Ineffective.” Other common biases involve being overly “lenient” by rating every potential action somewhere on the “effective” side of the scale, or instead being overly “critical” by rating every potential action somewhere on the “ineffective” side of the scale.

The key to overcoming these errors or biases is to re-read the meaning of each anchor, and systematically think through how effective each potential action is. Look back at strategy A2a (*Proceed through the scenarios strategically – Break down the rating scale*) as a reminder.

- 8. Rushing or not taking enough time to think through your ratings:** When there is an overall time limit to the test, it is tempting to rush through the reading of the scenarios and the rating of the potential actions. Note, you should have sufficient time to read carefully through all the scenarios and potential actions. Do not agonize for several minutes over one potential action but do take the time needed to carefully read and consider the action. Some additional tips for systematically thinking through your ratings of the potential actions include:

- Have an answer in mind before you look over the potential actions. Thinking about the most effective action to a scenario may help you anticipate what effective versus ineffective actions might look like, which can aid you in rating the potential actions that are listed. Be careful, however, not to dismiss all listed potential actions as ineffective simply because they do not match exactly what YOU might do in that situation. Keep in mind there may be several effective (and by extension several ineffective) actions to address any given challenge.
- Consider the rationale behind your rating of each potential action. If someone were to ask you why you rated a particular action as Ineffective, Highly Effective, etc., would you be able to provide a reason? If not, you may wish to re-think your rating.

## SAMPLE TEST ITEMS

Some samples are provided below to give you an idea of what to expect on the Situational Judgment Test. These scenarios and potential actions represent generic prototypes that are similar in format, length, and content to the types of scenarios and actions that will appear on the upcoming Situational Judgment Test.

### **VIII. Sample Situational Judgment Test Items**

These sample scenarios and potential actions are meant to illustrate the nature of the test you will complete. The format (i.e., instructions, scenario description, listing of potential actions with associated effectiveness rating scale) mirrors the format you will see during the actual Situational Judgment Test.

For each example scenario, the scoring key (i.e., the effectiveness rating that is considered most accurate) is provided on the page following the scenario. You may use the scenarios as practice items and then look to the page following the scenario for the answer key.

The final Situational Judgment Test items that appear on the actual exam have been vetted/approved by Boston Fire Department experts, who have also determined the official scoring key for each potential scenario response. These same experts reviewed and vetted the sample item listed below, and agreed on the scoring key indicated below for these example items. The scoring key provided for the sample items, therefore, follows the same logic and judgment process as that used by the experts to develop the key for the actual SJT items.

## **Boston Deputy Fire Chief Example 1**

Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the Boston Deputy Fire Chief (DFC) might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.

### **Scenario**

DFC Manuel is in charge of a large paid fire detail at a high-rise under construction, with multiple firefighters on scene serving as fire watchers. DFC Manuel receives a call from the general contractor who is angry because Firefighter Jackson is sleeping while welding is in progress. The contractor texts DFC Manuel a video of Firefighter Jackson asleep. Firefighter Jackson has had previous complaints for sleeping at paid details.

		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
		<b>Highly Ineffective</b>	<b>Ineffective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Highly Effective</b>
<b>Potential Actions</b>		Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue	Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue
A)	DFC Manuel immediately goes to the location and speaks to the Firefighter to investigate further.	①	②	③	④
B)	DFC Manuel immediately relieves the Firefighter and calls the Detail Office for a replacement.	①	②	③	④
C)	DFC Manuel tells the Firefighter he needs to be sure to stay awake and alert on the job and allows him to continue working.	①	②	③	④
D)	DFC Manuel tells the contractor it is not his job to worry about the Firefighters.	①	②	③	④
E)	DFC Manuel apologizes to the contractor and says he will address the situation immediately.	①	②	③	④

In the Boston Deputy Fire Chief Example 1 listed on the previous page:

- Option A is considered Highly Effective (4; Very likely to improve the situation) because DFC Manuel is taking immediate steps to personally investigate the situation and talk with the Firefighter directly.
- Option B is considered Highly Effective (4; Very likely to improve the situation) because DFC Manuel is holding the Firefighter accountable for his actions by immediately relieving him of duty. DFC Manuel is further ensuring that a replacement is sent so that the construction site can have someone on watch during welding activities.
- Option C is considered Highly Ineffective (1; Very likely to worsen the situation) because, by simply telling the Firefighter he must stay awake and alert, DFC Manuel is not holding the Firefighter accountable or demonstrating that there are any consequences for his actions. This, coupled with the fact that DFC Manuel allows the Firefighter, who has had previous complaints for sleeping on paid details, to continue working is likely to worsen the situation because the Firefighter is likely to simply fall asleep on the job again. This is likely to lead to not only to negative relationships with the construction crew, but further presents a safety hazard given that there is no one keeping watch during welding activities.
- Option D is considered Highly Ineffective (1; Very likely to worsen the situation) because the DFC is not only failing to address the problem with the Firefighter, which allows a safety hazard to continue, but the DFC is also dismissing the concerns of the contractor. This is likely to make the contractor angry, and the contractor may then escalate the situation.
- Option E is considered Effective (3; Likely to improve the situation) because DFC Manuel is taking a good first step by apologizing to the contractor and promising to investigate the situation. This is likely to satisfy the contractor, at least for the time being, and avoid having the contractor escalate the situation. Option E does not go on, however, to state that the DFC actually did investigate the situation. This is a good first step that is likely to improve the situation, but without knowing that the DFC did in fact follow up and investigate, Option E does not rise to the level of Highly Effective (4).

## **Boston Deputy Fire Chief Example 2**

Read the brief scenario description below, followed by a number of potential actions the Boston Deputy Fire Chief (DFC) might take in response to the situation described. Rate the effectiveness of each separate action, independent of the other potential actions, using the rating scale provided. Be sure to rate the effectiveness of all of the potential actions. You may use the same rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Ineffective) for multiple actions within a single scenario. Further, within any given scenario, you are not required to use every effectiveness rating; there may be no listed actions to which you give a rating of Ineffective, for example, or no actions to which you give a rating of Highly Effective.

### **Scenario**

DFC Cooke, a relatively new Chief, is assigned to the Hazmat Division. Captain Kelly has been assigned to the Hazmat Division for 10 years and offers to advise DFC Cooke on the financial reimbursement process for materials used.

<b>Potential Actions</b>		<b>1 Highly Ineffective</b>	<b>2 Ineffective</b>	<b>3 Effective</b>	<b>4 Highly Effective</b>
		Very likely to worsen the situation OR Very unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to worsen the situation OR Unlikely to resolve the issue	Likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve some or part of the issue	Very likely to improve the situation OR Likely to resolve most or all of the issue
A)	DFC Cooke tells Captain Kelly that as the DFC he is comfortable making all decisions.	①	②	③	④
B)	DFC Cooke respectfully thanks Captain Kelly but declines the offer of advice.	①	②	③	④
C)	DFC Cooke schedules a meeting with Captain Kelly to work together to complete the used materials reimbursement process.	①	②	③	④
D)	DFC Cooke assigns Captain Kelly responsibility for the reimbursement process.	①	②	③	④

In the Boston Deputy Fire Chief Example 2 listed on the previous page:

- Option A is considered Highly Ineffective (1; very likely to worsen the situation) because DFC Cooke is dismissive of the Captain's offer to help, which is likely to negatively impact the relationship with the Captain as well as keep DFC Cooke from learning important information from the Captain. Further, as the DFC is a new Chief and only recently assigned to this Division, he is likely to make errors in the financial reimbursement process if not advised by the experienced Captain.
- Option B is considered Ineffective (2; Likely to worsen the situation) because, although DFC Cooke is respectful in his interaction with the Captain, the DFC ultimately does not take the opportunity to learn important information from the Captain. This failure to learn may lead to errors during the reimbursement process.
- Option C is considered Highly Effective (4; Very likely to improve the situation) because the DFC takes advantage of the opportunity to sit down with the experienced Captain and learn from the Captain's advice. By showing a willingness to learn from the experienced Captain, the DFC is likely to not only develop a positive relationship with the Captain, but this will also equip the DFC to be able to conduct the financial reimbursement process correctly.
- Option D is considered Effective (3; Likely to improve the situation) because the DFC is ensuring the financial reimbursement process gets done correctly by the experienced Captain, but the DFC does not take the opportunity to learn the correct process himself.

## **CONCLUSION**

We hope that this Guide gives you a better understanding of what to expect for the Situational Judgment Test (including the logistics and scoring procedures) and provides you with some suggestions for preparation. The suggestions provided here are not exhaustive; we encourage you to engage in additional preparation strategies that you believe will enhance your chances of performing effectively on the Situational Judgment Test.

**BEST OF LUCK!**