



VCJC Entrance Test Working Group Meeting Minutes August 9, 2022 (12:30-1:30)

Meeting Date and Time: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 12:30PM – 1:30PM

Meeting Location: This meeting was via Microsoft Teams

Members Present: Jon Murad, Wilda White, Roger Marcoux, Steve Coote

Members Absent: Tom Mozzer, Justin Stedman **Others in Attendance:** Lindsay Thivierge, Chris Brickell, Ken Hawkins

Call to Order 12:35 PM

No Additions or deletion to the agenda

Approval of prior meeting minutes

Motion made to accept the prior meeting minutes from 7/12/22 by Roger Marcoux, 2nd Steve Coote.

Wilda White amendment to strike the first bullet point and change to we want to ensure they are legally defensible, accept Roger Marcoux, 2nd Steve Coote.

PT Recommendation Compilation

We have a statement to recommend the PT change to the Council based on information provided from each member regarding why a change is recommended and what led to this change.

Review with legal to ensure current law supports recommendation for gender based physical fitness standards.

Pending no issues this recommendation will be presented to the Council on the 17th.

PT Standards for Level II

Expecting everyone to meet this standard is not feasible. We would lose applicants, experience, and LEO needs would be impacted. For example: Sheriffs—Court security—They are not used in a physical capacity and it would hurt the ability for agencies to provide services. This may be suitable for Level II officers who are used for patrol. The Fitness test is a barometer for academy success for fitness so this wouldn't make sense to implement as a standard for Level II who does not have a fitness standard.

It should be up to the agency to run a fitness program if needed.

Rule 16 does say the LI, LII, LIII this is critical to bring up to Rules committee to remove from Rules language.

Marcoux will reach out to Rules Chair to discuss changing the fitness requirement to only encompass LIII.

Discussion around Proposed Rule Change for Passing Rate

What is passing? Current rule states 70%. This should be determined by the test, applicant pool, and any number of variables that may be identified.

Generalize 70% to passing rate determined by the Council (Marcoux reach out to Rules Chair)

Discussion around Proposed Rule Change for Polygraph

Should passing be added to Polygraph?

This is hard to determine what passing means.

How much is the Council going to be a part of employment practices?



VCJC Entrance Test Working Group Meeting Minutes August 9, 2022 (12:30-1:30)

There is not standardization for polygraphs—is this something we want to discuss at a later date. Push this to a future date to look at further standards and discussion around Polygraph.

Written Entrance Exam - proposal to the Council

Summary to be submitted to the Council to include a recommendation of the LEAB written entrance exam. Chief Murad will put something together to have ready for the Council meeting on the 17th.

MMPI Recommendation to the Council—

Before continuing with a recommendation the working group discussed issues around disparity in the test.

Although other tests have been reviewed the working group is content with this one

Ask the company—have you had any lawsuits around disparity?

The test is so new there is little to no research on it there is disparity—the MMPI does have disparities—our recommendation is not contingent on this information but rather reassess if the test has any disparities.

Because the test is relatively new we review in a few years to evaluate that it is not having a disparate impact on the hiring and retention of law enforcement officers in the State.

We have no information that there are disparities of any kind in MMPI-2RF at the moment.

Because this recommendation would result in a rules change to language around psychological inventory it was proposed that this issue move to the Rules committee before presenting full change to the Council.

Next Meeting Agenda:

Invite Evan to next meeting or a future meeting to discuss possible rule changes prior to Council voting approval.

Open Discussion: No open discussion

Motion to adjourn made by Roger Marcoux, 2nd Steve Coote all in favor.