



1200 Wilmette Avenue  
Wilmette, IL 60091

**NOTICE OF MEETING  
OF THE  
BOARD OF FIRE AND POLICE COMMISSIONERS**

**MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015 AT 6:45 P.M.  
VILLAGE BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM OF WILMETTE VILLAGE HALL  
1200 WILMETTE AVENUE, WILMETTE, ILLINOIS**

***AGENDA***

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Public Comment**
- III. Approval of Minutes**
  - a. January 6, 2015**
- IV. Police Sergeant Promotional Process – Set Minimum Passing Score**
- V. Other Business**
- VI. Adjournment**

Terrence Porter, Chair

If you are a person with a disability and need special accommodations to participate in and/or attend any Village public meeting, please notify the Village Manager's Office at (847) 853-7509 or TDD (847) 853-7634. For additional information please call (847) 853-7511, the Village Clerk's Office.

---



# VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue  
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

## MEETING MINUTES

### BOARD OF FIRE AND POLICE COMMISSIONERS

January 6, 2015

8:00 A.M.

Village Board Conference Room, Village Hall

---

Members Present: Terrence Porter, Chair  
Todd Ehlman, Secretary

Members Absent: Senta Plunkett, Vice-Chair

Staff Present: Mike McGreal, Deputy Fire Chief  
John Prejzner, Assistant to the Village Manager

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Porter called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Board members Ehlman and Porter were present.

#### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Ehlman moved to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2014 Board of Fire and Police Commissioners meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Porter. No further discussion occurred on the motion. Voting yes: Commissioners Ehlman and Porter. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

#### III. AUTHORIZE THE PROMOTION OF A FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC TO LIEUTENANT/PARAMEDIC

John Prejzner, Assistant to the Village Manager, stated that the Fire Department currently has a vacancy for a Lieutenant/Paramedic and that Mr. Michael Isaacson is the highest ranked candidate on the Lieutenant Eligibility Register. Mike McGreal, Fire Chief, stated that staff recommends Mr. Isaacson's promotion.

Commissioner Ehlman moved to authorize the promotion of Michael Isaacson from

1/6/15

DRAFT

Firefighter/Paramedic to Lieutenant/Paramedic. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Porter. No further discussion occurred on the motion. Voting yes: Commissioners Ehlman and Porter. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:05 a.m., Commissioner Ehlman moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Porter. No further discussion occurred on the motion. Voting yes: Commissioners Ehlman and Porter. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

The meeting was thereafter adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Prejzner  
Assistant to the Village Manager



**To:** Board of Fire and Police Commissioners  
**From:** John Prejzner, Assistant to the Village Manager  
Brian King, Police Chief  
**Date:** January 22, 2015  
**Subject:** 2015 Police Sergeant Promotional Process – Minimum Passing Score

---

## Background

A Police Sergeant Promotional Process is currently underway to establish a new eligibility register as required by the rules and regulations of the Board of Fire and Police Commissioners (BOFPC). Candidates for the process were required to submit applications by December 30, 2014 and staff received nine applications. On January 15, 2015 a written examination was held at which eight applicants were present.

## Discussion

As stated in the BOFPC Rules and Regulations, the Board must establish a minimum passing score at or above 70%. Historically, a minimum passing score of 70% has been used. Once the minimum passing score is established, the test results with the candidates' names will be revealed.

The results for the written exam were compiled by McCann and Associates and sent to staff and Selection Works. A summary of the results are in the table below. For comparison purposes, the results from the 2012 and 2010 examination are also shown.

Year	# of Candidates	Average Score	Highest Score	Lowest Score	# of Scores ≥ 70%
2015	8	75.1%	81%	62%	6
2012	17	70.1%	85%	52%	10
2010	8	72.5%	82%	59%	6

More details regarding the written examination process and analysis of the scores can be found in the attached Score Report from McCann and Associates.

## Other Examinations

In addition to the written examination, candidates are also evaluated based on the following categories/examinations: merit and efficiency rating, seniority, assessment center, leadership evaluation, and oral interview.

The merit and efficiency rating is awarded by the Police Chief. The Chief has asked each sergeant to rate the candidates based on the last 12 months of service. The points are awarded based on evaluating the following categories: supervisory dimension for police sergeant, the candidate's last twelve months of work product which includes traffic stops, citations, arrests, and reports. The candidates were each invited to submit a two page memo or resume to staff for consideration. This process is currently underway and the results will be distributed to the Commission when they are available.

Seniority is awarded at a rate of 1% per 1 year of service with a maximum of 5%. All but one candidate received the full 5% (candidates only had three years of service as Police Officer). The results are below:

Last Name	Fire Name	Hire Date	Seniority Points
Cavanagh	Connor	3/28/2011	3
Clark	Michael	7/27/2009	5
Falk	John	12/17/2001	5
Mercado	Alex	1/5/1999	5
Neubauer	Christopher	9/21/2007	5
Przekota	Christopher	7/27/2009	5
Rizzo	Nicholas	3/21/1994	5
Sweet	James David	12/11/2000	5

The testing process also includes an assessment center and psychological leadership evaluation administered by Dr. Dennis Selvig of Personnel Strategies to those candidates that pass the written test. The assessment center is an evaluation of the candidates' behavior and capabilities using multiple exercises. Of these two examinations, only the assessment center is scored and the passing score, as set by the BOFPC rules, is 70% (no separate meeting of the Board is necessary to receive the scores).

Candidates that pass the written examination and complete all previously mentioned aspects of the testing process will be interviewed by the Board, with the interviews being scored. The weighting of the scores used to compile the final list is below:

- Written Examination 30%
- Assessment Center 30%
- Oral Interview 20%
- Merit and Efficiency Rating 15%
- Seniority 5%

As done with other examinations, Selection Works will standardize all of the test scores and compile them using the weighting shown above. Standardization of the scores is done in order to evaluate all graded aspects on an equal scale and avoid over- and under-weighting.

Once the list is established, promotions will be awarded from the list as vacancies arise. Staff anticipates that a final list will be established by the end of March 2015. The list will remain in force for two years from the date of posting.

**Documents Attached**

1. Score Report for written examination

January 22, 2015

**SCORE REPORT**

to Mr. John Prejzner  
Assistant to the Village Manager  
Village of Wilmette, Illinois

on the Police Sergeant Written Examination  
Administered on January 15, 2015

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

This material is confidential and proprietary information belonging exclusively to McCann Associates, L.L.C. and/or any of its subsidiaries and affiliates ("McCann"). Disclosure, dissemination or duplication of these materials is strictly forbidden without the express prior written authorization of McCann Associates. This material is not to be viewed or shared with employees, consultants, clients, or others that are not subject to our non-disclosure and non-competition agreement. This material is subject to immediate return to McCann upon demand notwithstanding.

In accordance with your instructions, we prepared the above promotional examination. Of the nine expected candidates, eight candidates appeared and participated in the examination. The test monitoring proceeded in accordance with procedures outlined in the Monitor's Instructions.

## CONCEALMENT OF IDENTITY

Merit system and civil service laws and procedures, where applicable, require the concealment of the candidates' identities during the scoring process and before a minimum passing score is determined. Even in the absence of such legal requirements, it is important to do so. The minimum passing score can then be determined without being influenced, or creating the impression that it could have been influenced, by anyone's knowledge of the candidates' identities.

An identification slip and envelope were used to conceal the identity of each candidate. The identification slip is the only document in the entire examination process that shows both the candidate's name and identification number. Throughout our scoring process and throughout this report, candidates are identified only by number. After the candidates entered their names on the identification slip, they signed it and sealed it in an envelope. We strongly recommend that the identification envelopes not be opened until after you have reviewed this report and made a final decision regarding the minimum passing score.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEST ADMINISTRATION

We provided standardized instructions for test administration and monitoring. Their use should help create a friendly, helpful test environment that reduces any remaining disadvantages of test unfamiliarity and thereby contributes to reducing adverse impact. At the same time, the instructions should achieve standardized test administration, so all candidates are tested under similar conditions.

## NATURE OF THE TEST

All of McCann Associates' written tests are specifically developed for our clients to be job-related to the important and critical work behaviors (WB's) of the job. Documentation of the specific Job Analysis methodology used is on file at McCann Associates. It can be provided if additional documentation of the content validity of the test is necessary.

Our tests consist of five-choice, multiple-choice questions. These questions conform to a job-related examination plan and are appropriate and relevant to the work behaviors of the job.

The time limit is designed so that all candidates will have sufficient time to answer all of the questions on the examination without being rushed. Except in unusual circumstances, the candidates should be able to answer the questions within the time limit.



Ten of the questions on the examination were developed from the Massachusetts Police Law Program In-service Manual, a document that served as the "legal reference" for the questions appearing on the examination as "Legal Knowledge" questions. These questions were created by a test developer at McCann Associates and reviewed by an editor. These questions were not reviewed by anyone within the Police Department prior to their appearance on the exam.

## REFERENCE LIST

On the basis of the examination plan developed for a specific rank, we provided you with a reading list of recognized reference sources. We have taken steps to guarantee that each knowledge question in the examination is referenced to one of the books on the reading list. If your test includes reading and/or table comprehension or deductive reasoning-type questions, they are not referenced. The material the candidates need to answer these questions is contained within the question.

## CANDIDATE STUDY GUIDE

It is our understanding that a member of your staff downloaded a copy of our Candidate Study Guide from our website so that one copy could be given to each candidate before the test. Candidates tend to fear the unknown. The Candidate Study Guide will help to eliminate this fear and reduce any disadvantage arising out of unfamiliarity with the testing process. The Guide contains suggestions on how to best answer the questions, as well as samples of the various question formats and specific instructions on how to deal with each format. It also contains sample questions and answers. Copies of the instructions to candidates (reprinted from the front and back covers of the examination booklets) are included in the Guide.

## MINIMIZING ADVERSE IMPACT

Our staff item writers are sensitive to words, word patterns, and emotional issues that can possibly create adverse impact. We avoid using uncommon words and complicated and unnecessarily long sentences. All of the questions have been put through a number of quality control checks. All newly written questions are edited separately by two senior staff members. Item analysis is carefully scrutinized, which allows us to discover unsuspected ambiguities and correct the question for future use. All questions are eventually reviewed by candidate populations through our candidate Post-Test Review procedure. Most of our questions have been submitted to various Technical Review Boards. These Subject Matter Experts review the questions to make sure that the key answer is considered to be the best answer and that the wrong choices are considered to be wrong answers.

## SCORING METHOD

The candidate answer sheets were optically scanned directly into our computerized scoring program. The instructions on the test booklet explain to the candidates that if two answers to a question (a "double") are marked, both are considered wrong. Failing to mark any answer (an "omit") is also considered wrong. Candidate answer sheets are put through our optical scanner twice. In the first run, the scanner is programmed to stop whenever it detects an omit or doubly-recorded answer. These conditions are verified by the operator to make sure the condition was not caused by a poor erasure. In the second (verification) run, the optical scanner's discrimination level is increased to make sure that candidates do not get credit for recording two answers to a question.

## ITEM ANALYSIS

Using a technique called "item analysis," we made a statistical analysis of the candidates' answers to each question. This item analysis is based on the assumption of internal consistency, using the split-quarters method, which counts the number of candidates in each quarter who chose the right and wrong choices to each question. There is always the possibility that local practices, regulations, or other conditions may cause a question to be ambiguous in any specific examination. Item analysis points out such problems.

As a result of the item analysis and subsequent review of the questions, we decided that no change to the key answers was necessary.

## RELIABILITY

One of the statistical measures that psychologists use to evaluate a test is the coefficient of reliability. The coefficient of reliability measures the stability of the test scores. A test would be perfectly reliable if a substantial group of candidates took the test, then took the same test at a later date, and the candidates' scores the second time were the same as their scores the first time. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (K-R 20) essentially compares all possible combinations of splitting the test in half, and eliminates the effect of chance arrangement of questions.

Reliability coefficients are stated on a scale of +1.00 to 0. A coefficient of +1.00 means that the test scores are perfectly reliable, and a coefficient of 0 means that the scores are not reliable. Coefficients above +.80 are very good, and above +.70, wholly acceptable. It is not unusual for the reliability coefficient to be a somewhat low number when the candidate group is small and when the range of scores is narrow (homogeneous). When this occurs, both factors contribute to a lower K-R 20 rating.

## STANDARD DEVIATION

Standard deviation is a statistical measure of the extent to which scores are dispersed or spread out. A large standard deviation is a desirable result, since the purpose of the test is to distinguish between levels of ability in different areas measured by the test.

The standard deviation is useful when interpreting scores. A very large group of candidates will approximate the normal curve; in other words, 31% of all candidates will have scores that are higher than one-half standard deviation above the mean (the average score of the candidate group). For example, if the average score for a large group of candidates is 90 and the standard deviation is 12, 31% of all candidates will have scores higher than 96. Similarly, approximately 16% of all candidates will have scores that are more than one standard deviation above the mean. A similar prediction using the standard deviation can be made for any other score and any other percentage of candidates.

## TABULATION OF SCORES

The Comparison of Average Scores Table shows, separately for each knowledge and ability area (subtest), the average score for your candidates, the standard deviations, and the norms. Average scores and the norms are expressed both as raw scores (the number of questions answered correctly) and the percentage scores.

If the test has been administered previously, this table also presents the same information from the most recent test administration. If the number of questions in each subtest was the same, complete information is shown. If not, only total test score data is shown.

The Basic Score Data tables, attached to this report, show both the total raw score and the individual subtest scores for each candidate. Each subtest is identified by its code number, for example, "V-1." The first table lists the candidates' scores in total score order, from highest to lowest. The second table lists the scores by the candidates' identification number.

## NORMS

We have norms available for the questions used in this examination, based upon their previous administration to promotional candidates nationwide. The norms are developed in terms of the average score attained by all candidates tested. The item norms are averaged, both individually for each subtest and for the total test. The norms are shown in the Comparison of Average Scores Table and are presented in terms of

both the average raw score and the average percentage score attained by all candidates.

### THE LIMITS OF OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

The minimum cutoff score recommendation in this report is based on the written test scores of candidates. This examination evaluates the knowledge and/or abilities involved in successful performance of the duties of the position. The test does not attempt to predict other important factors such as emotional stability, physical health, motivation, drive, judgment, the ability to apply knowledge, and interpersonal relationship abilities. Physical health and mental health should be continually evaluated. Interpersonal relationship abilities and judgment can be evaluated by Formal, Structured Oral Interviews and by behavioral-based tests using video technology. Motivation and drive are best evaluated during a probationary period.

When using our recommendations, these other behavioral dimensions cannot be overlooked. A serious deficiency in any of these untested traits can offset a high score on the written test. Similarly, unusual strengths in these factors might be a reason for regarding a candidate, whose test scores are marginal, more highly than our recommendations.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

The average score of 75.1% is 5.0% above the average score attained by the group of candidates that tested in 2012. It is also 7.0% above the 68.1% test norm, indicating that the candidates, as a whole, are well above average when compared to all candidates tested nationwide. We have calculated that the examination administered this year was of approximately equal difficulty as the tests administered in both 2012 and 2010.

The candidates scored above average across all of the subtests. While the top score of 81 is 4 points lower than the top score in 2012, it is still a good score. This year, however, no candidate scored below 60%; in 2012, two candidates scored below this level, and one candidate scored 59% in 2010. If any of these candidates also tested in the previous test administration, their scores have likely increased this year.

## COMMENTS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CANDIDATES

### Candidates 46842 and 46844

These candidates have scored 81 and 80, to attain first and second rank, respectively. These are very good scores that are more than 10% above the test norm. These candidates scored identically on "Legal Knowledge," "Supervisory Knowledge," and "Deductive Reasoning." While their scores on "Deductive Reasoning" were just above the test norm, these candidates scored very well on "Supervisory Knowledge," indicating that they have a good understanding of the role and duties of a first-line supervisor. In all, these candidates have an above average level of knowledge of the concepts and skills assessed on this examination.

### Candidates 46843, 46839, and 46841

These candidates have each answered 78 questions correctly. These are good scores in that they exceed the 68.1% test norm by about 10%. These three candidates attained the strongest scores of the testing group on "Deductive Reasoning," with perfect or nearly perfect scores on this subtest. On the remaining subtests, these candidates generally scored close to the expected norms.

### Candidate 46838

This candidate has scored acceptably, with a raw score of 75%. Apart from a minor weakness on "Technical Police Knowledge," this candidate scored at least 1 point above the expected norm scores across the other four subtests. Moreover, on "Legal Knowledge" and "Deductive Reasoning," this candidate slightly exceeded the performance of the top candidate. We feel this candidate also deserves active consideration for promotion, bearing in mind any additional untested factors.

### Candidates 46836 and 46840

The two remaining candidates have scored 69 and 62, respectively. A score of 69 is a very marginal score and nearly matches the 68.1% test norm. A score of 62 is unacceptable but not terribly low. Both candidates scored below the test norms on "Supervisory Knowledge" and "Deductive Reasoning." Candidate 46836 also scored below the test norm on "Technical Police Knowledge," while Candidate 46840 also scored below the test norm on "Investigative Knowledge." However, with some additional preparation, these candidates can and will likely improve their scores during future test administrations.

## MINIMUM CUTOFF SCORE RECOMMENDATION

It is our understanding that the Village of Wilmette uses a fixed 70% passing standard for its promotional examinations, so no recommendation is necessary. Utilizing a raw score cutoff of 70 will pass six of the eight candidates. The six candidates who scored above this cutoff also all scored meaningfully higher than the two candidates below this cutoff.

As always, it is a pleasure to be of service to the Village of Wilmette. If we may be of any further assistance in interpreting the contents of this report or the recommendations contained herein, please call.

Respectfully submitted,  
McCann Associates

Comparison of Average Scores  
of 8 Candidates  
in Wilmette, Illinois

on the Written Examination for Police Sergeant

	Technical Police Knowledge	Investigative Knowledge	Local Legal Knowledge	Supervisory Knowledge	Deductive Reasoning	Total Test Score
Variable	V-1	V-2	V-3	V-4	V-5	V-6
Number of Questions	20	20	20	25	15	100
<u>Your 8 Candidates</u>						
Average Raw Score	14.1	15.0	15.4	18.8	11.9	75.1
Average Percent Score	70.6%	75.0%	76.9%	75.0%	79.2%	
Standard Deviation	1.7	2.1	1.7	2.8	2.7	6.5
<u>Norms</u>						
Average Raw Score	13.9	13.4	13.1	17.2	10.6	68.1
Average Percent Score	69.5%	66.9%	65.3%	68.7%	70.4%	
<u>Your 17 Candidates in 2012</u>						
Average Raw Score	13.8	14.1	14.6	17.0	10.5	70.1
Average % Score	69.1%	70.3%	73.2%	68.0%	70.2%	
Standard Deviation	1.4	2.1	1.8	3.2	3.7	8.4
<u>Norms</u>						
Average Raw Score	14.2	13.2	13.8	16.7	10.9	68.9
Average Percent Score	71.1%	66.1%	69.2%	66.8%	72.7%	

NOTE: Due to rounding, the sum of the subtest scores may not exactly equal the total score.

Basic Score Data in Score Sequence  
 Police Sergeant – Wilmette, Illinois  
 January 22, 2015

Subtest Code	Name	Number
V-1	Technical Police Knowledge	20
V-2	Investigative Knowledge	20
V-3	Legal Knowledge	20
V-4	Supervisory Knowledge	25
V-5	Deductive Reasoning	15
	Total Test Score	100

Subtest	V-1	V-2	V-3	V-4	V-5	Total Raw Score
Number of Items	20	20	20	25	15	100
46842	15	18	16	21	11	81
46844	17	15	16	21	11	80
46843	14	17	12	20	15	78
46839	13	14	16	21	14	78
46841	15	15	14	19	15	78
46838	12	15	17	19	12	75
46836	12	15	17	15	10	69
46840	15	11	15	14	7	62



Basic Score Data in ID Sequence  
 Police Sergeant – Wilmette, Illinois  
 January 22, 2015

Subtest Code	Name	Number
V-1	Technical Police Knowledge	20
V-2	Investigative Knowledge	20
V-3	Legal Knowledge	20
V-4	Supervisory Knowledge	25
V-5	Deductive Reasoning	15
	Total Test Score	100

Subtest	V-1	V-2	V-3	V-4	V-5	Total Raw Score
Number of Items	20	20	20	25	15	100
46836	12	15	17	15	10	69
46838	12	15	17	19	12	75
46839	13	14	16	21	14	78
46840	15	11	15	14	7	62
46841	15	15	14	19	15	78
46842	15	18	16	21	11	81
46843	14	17	12	20	15	78
46844	17	15	16	21	11	80