

**INTERDEPARTMENTAL  
MESSAGE**

STO-201 REV. 11/96  
(Stock No. 6938-01)  
wds

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**

Obtain "STATE EMPLOYEE SUGGESTION" forms from, and send your ideas to: Employee's Suggestion Awards Program. 165 Capital Avenue Hartford, CT 06106.

To	NAME, TITLE Members of the Police Commission	DATE: 09/25/10
	AGENCY, ADDRESS Colchester	
From	NAME, TITLE Thompson, J.T. Sgt.	
	AGENCY, ADDRESS Troop K Residents	PHONE: 537-7500

SUBJECT: Monthly Report

Sirs,

1. Enforcement Statistics: See attached.

2. Matters of Serious Discipline:  
N/A

3. Hiring

Two new hires are currently in the Academy. Candidate Dimauro has signed her conditional offer of employment and the background investigation is ongoing. Assigned to Ofc Edwards. We are awaiting results of one test and the return of fingerprint cards from SPBI.

4. Policy

The "Rules and Regulations" must be brought current to parallel the A&O Manual.

5. Overtime:

Overtime is being utilized on an as-needed basis. It is noted that not all overtime assignments can be filled with officers and a number of vacancies on shifts have occurred in the past month. It should be noted that due to budgetary constraints, the State Police has also limited the amount of overtime that can be utilized by the Resident Trooper, specifically in a patrol capacity.

6. Vehicles and Equipment:

PD1 2008 Black and White- 28806- MDT for CAD- Camera is operational-VG

PD2 2003 Ford Exp-32266-MDT for CAD-Camera is operational-Good Condition

PD3 2009 Black and White-2115-MDT (work order submitted and expected by 09/28)-  
Working on the camera. New Condition.

PD4 2009 Black and White-3348-MDT (Work order submitted)-camera not used. New  
Condition.

---

**INTERDEPARTMENTAL  
MESSAGE**

STO-201 REV. 11/96  
(Stock No. 6938-01)  
wds

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**

Obtain "STATE EMPLOYEE SUGGESTION" forms from, and send your ideas to: Employee's Suggestion Awards Program. 165 Capital Avenue Hartford, CT 06106.

PD6 2004 White-60429-MDT operational-camera not op.-Fair Cond.

PD7 2005 White-39923-MDT-Camera operational-Good Cond.

PD8 2006 White-38922-Good Cond.

PD9 2008 Black and White-23008-MDT/Camera Operational-Excellent condition.

Two MDTs arrived today and Marc Tate will be contacted re: installation.

Sgt. J Thompson



Resident Trooper Supervisor, Colchester

## Gina Santos

---

**From:** Gregg Schuster  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2010 10:03 AM  
**To:** Gina Santos  
**Subject:** FW: Sergeants Promotion Issue

\*\*\*\*\*

Gregg Schuster  
First Selectman  
Town of Colchester  
127 Norwich Avenue  
Colchester, CT 06415  
860.537.7220

---

**From:** Glenn Morron [mailto:glennmorron@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 17, 2010 8:55 PM  
**To:** Gregg Schuster  
**Cc:** Don Phillips; Rob Parlee  
**Subject:** Sergeants Promotion Issue

Gregg,

The Police Commission met Friday, October 15, to discuss and consider promotion of one of the three candidates to the position of sergeant. The immediate issue the Commission faced was the lack of direction or clarity with respect to how - that is, what criteria, the Commission should use when considering the qualifications of the candidates with respect to the promotion.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement states in pertinent part:

"All promotional examinations shall be comprised of three (3) phases: Written test, oral test and performance evaluation. The weight of each phase shall be as follows: Written test: forty-five (45) percent; Oral test: forty-five (45) percent; and Performance evaluation: ten (10) percent."

There is no criteria for determining how the performance evaluation should be done.

The Commission discussed ways it could perform an objective, measurable and defensible performance evaluation. It reached a unanimous decision on a procedure. However, the Commission recognizes your role as the town's de facto chief personnel officer and would very much appreciate and value your review and input on the Commission's procedure prior to its undertaking the performance evaluation.

The Commission has agreed to use the most recently completed performance evaluations in each of the candidate's personnel file, which were completed in August, 2010 and covered the period August 2009 to August 2010. Those evaluations were conducted by the resident trooper supervisor. It will score each candidate on each of the categories (with two exceptions to be discussed below) as follows:

1. Each subsection of each category will be given a score of: 5 for excellent/superior, 3 for very good, and 1 for satisfactory. The subsections of each section will be added, and then divided by the number of subsections to come up with a value, the maximum of which will be 5. For example, if a section has four subsections, and the total of each of the subsections adds up to 14, the value given for the total section would be  $14/4$ , or 3.5.

2. Once each of the section has a value, each of the values will be added to get a total score. There will be either be a total of 8 or 9 sections (depending on whether the candidate had been evaluated on the "other" category on the performance evaluation), so the maximum total value that a candidate could achieve would be 40 or 45. Once the total value is determined, it will be converted to a score based on a total of 100. For example, if the candidate has a value of

30 out of a possible 40, his value would be converted to a score of 75.

There was significant discussion about fairness, objectivity and defensibility of this system or procedure with respect to two categories: special skills (i.e. certifications, such as firearms training) and performance. On one of the candidates evaluation, the category of special skills was left completely blank. It could have been marked as "not observed," but was not. Two of the commissioners are aware that the candidate does have training/certificates that should have been noted, but were not. As a result, the Commission has determined that the this category should not be in its performance evaluation of the three candidates. With respect to the category of Performance, a similar issue was raised. One of the candidates was not evaluated similarly to the other two; rather than having an evaluation of superior, very good, satisfactory (or other evaluation), a reference was made to review comments made by the evaluator. It is difficult for the Commission to extrapolate from those comments how the officer's performance would have been rated. Any such conclusion by the Commission would involve subjectivity on the part of the commissioners. Indeed, the comments themselves could also be fairly said to be subjective, adding to the challenge or problem of achieving objectivity in the Commission's performance evaluation. To cure this problem, the Commission has decided to also exclude from its performance evaluation the category of Performance.

The Commission agrees that both categories relate to important and useful criteria and, but for the issues outlined above, would have been helpful in its performance evaluation and determining a final score for each candidate. Nonetheless, the Commission concluded that its ultimate goal of achieving fairness, objectivity and defensibility of its procedures and system of completing the candidate's performance evaluations required that these two categories be eliminated from consideration.

We would very much appreciate your assistance and guidance in reviewing this procedure/system. If you agree that the evaluation process is acceptable, we will proceed immediately to completing the performance evaluations and issuing the scores for each of the candidates, which will then lead to the announcement of the successful candidate. If you have any suggestions or comments that you wish us to consider with respect to revising the process, or if you believe that the process should be reviewed by town counsel for further consideration, we will consider any such revisions you may suggest or await any opinion or advise from town counsel before proceeding.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Regards,  
The Police Commission