



**Summary of Proceedings
Public Hearing**

*Joint Select Committee on Local Authorities, Service Commissions and Statutory Authorities
(including the THA)*

Held on Wednesday February 08th, 2017

[10:25a.m. to 11: 57 a.m.]

Subject Matter: Inquiry into the Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Police Service Commission

Objectives of the inquiry

The objectives of the inquiry are:

- **To evaluate the performance of the Commission in executing its mandate.**
- **To determine whether the resources, systems and procedures of the Police Service Commission are sufficient to allow it to operate efficiently.**
- **To determine the challenges affecting the operations of the Commission and the possible solutions for alleviating these challenges.**

Venue: A.N.R Robinson Meeting Room (East), Level 9 Office of the Parliament, Tower D, the Port of Spain International Waterfront Centre, 1A Wrightson Road, Port of Spain.

Committee members

The following committee members were present:

- i. Ms. Ramona Ramdial, MP (Vice-Chairman)
- ii. Mrs. Jennifer Baptiste-Primus
- iii. Mr. Nigel De Freitas
- iv. Mr. Daryl Smith, MP

Witnesses who appeared

The following officials of the Police Service Commission and the Service Commissions Department appeared before the Committee:

Police Service Commission

Dr. Maria Therese Gomes	Chairman, Police Service Commission
Mr. Dinanath Ramkisson	Member, Police Service Commission
Ms. Anastasius V. Creed	Director of Personnel Administration
Ms. Natasha Seecharan	Legal Adviser, Service Commissions Department
Ms. Margaret Morales	Executive Director, Human Resource Management
Mrs. Caminee Baboolal	Senior Human Resource Adviser
Mr. Alfred Gray	Assistant Director, Research & Evaluation

Key Issues Discussed

The following are the key subject areas/issued discussed during the hearing:

- i. The relevance of the criteria applied to evaluate the performance of the Acting Commissioner of Police (CoP) and Deputy Commissioners of Police;
- ii. A Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant was hired in 2015 to restructure the Performance Evaluation process. This exercise is expected to be completed in 2017;
- iii. The reasons the performance benchmarks of the CoP generally low the unacceptable crime situation;
- iv. The delay in the Performance Appraisal of the current CoP (Ag.) and the Deputy Commissioners for the years 2015 and 2016;
- v. The operational difficulties confronting the Commission including staff shortages and a lack of minor equipment and office supplies;
- vi. The Chairman of the Commission informed the Committee that contract staff does not receive training because it is assumed that they would have the requisite qualifications and experience for the position;
- vii. The failure of the PSC to include “Strategic Leadership” as a performance indicator in the Performance Appraisal Scheme of the Acting CoP;
- viii. Challenges with filling the Financial Analyst position at the Commission;
- ix. Whether any new dimensions of performance will be applied to evaluate the performance of the CoP and Deputies for the years 2015 and 2016.
- x. The factors that contribute to delays in performance reviews;

- xi. The need for the PSC to conduct performance reviews in a timely manner to afford the person under review the opportunity to improve;
- xii. The approach used to interpret the significance of the overall grades awarded to the Acting CoP and his Deputies in the 2014 Performance Appraisal;
- xiii. Whether the PSC applies any incentives or sanctions based on the performance of the Acting CoP and DCsoP;
- xiv. Whether the criteria for performance targets of the Executive of the Police Service are benchmarked against standards/benchmarks established for similar office holders in other jurisdictions e.g. Canada;
- xv. The challenges of assessing the CoP based on international standards ;
- xvi. The need to modify the curriculum at the Police Training Academy;
- xvii. The need for more collaboration, between the PSC and the Ministry of National Security particularly in relation to the exchange of information;
- xviii. The Commission’s perspective on the definition of the term “serious crime”;
- xix. Training plans in 2017 for both the PSC and the TTPS;
- xx. Whether the \$2.5Mn recruitment exercise should be revamped to make it more cost effective;
- xxi. An update on the recruitment of the a Project Manager to coordinate the process of recruiting a “permanent” CoP;
- xxii. The justifications for granting the Commission its own account and a separate vote;
- xxiii. The potential benefits of having a full-time Chairman and Deputy Chairman;
- xxiv. The composition of the Appeals Tribunal of the PSC;
- xxv. The implications of the delay in the implementation of the amendments to the PSC Regulations;
- xxvi. Current salaries of the staff assigned to the PSC’s Secretariat;
- xxvii. The justification for recruiting four (4) State Counsels for the PSC;
- xxviii. Approximately 200 matters were submitted to the Appeals Tribunal from 2012 to present;
- xxix. The PSC’s response to the criticisms levied by the Police Welfare Association;
- xxx. The approach taken by the Director of Personnel Administration to establish Public Service positions in the PSC.

View the Hearing

The hearing can be viewed on our YouTube channel via the following link:

<https://youtu.be/tLicSZKQYgw>

Contact the Committee’s Secretary

You may contact the Committee’s Secretary at jsclascsa@tparliament.org or 624-7275 Ext. [2283](tel:624-7275)

Committees Unit

February 08th 2017