

Conclusion:

The Tribunal should note that my Month 6 & 7 PER to Month 11 PERs where everyone else seemed to chip in were filled with false allegations, biasness and prejudice. However, in order for it not to appear so readily apparent some of the sections were documented as 'Meeting the Requirements'. Hence, if what I have asserted appears to be true then no credibility should be attached to them.

Furthermore, if what I have asserted happens to be true then the basis of the Respondent's defense to my application is futile. Counsel for the Respondent is attempting to justify my termination based on:

- 1) Bad PERs.
- 2) The charge under the Highway Traffic Act.
- 3) The Professional Standards Bureau investigation into the allegation of me associating with criminals.

The latter two were found and shown to be made in bad faith and dismissed through their independent adjudication processes. Now if, with respect to the PERs, the first four PERs (Month 1 & 2 to Month 5) were done with a degree of fairness that one could work with in rectifying any deficiencies and the rest of the PERs were found to be lacking in credibility then Respondent's defense to my application is vain and without substance.

With the three defenses removed what is left is a course of action or behavior along with comments by the Respondent that is filled with racial prejudice and hatred to the point that it blinded the participants to how blatant they were in violating the Ontario Human Rights Code, Ontario Public Service on valuing diversity and their own Police Orders.

In reflection I see that I was never given a single positive documentation (233-10) during my entire time at the Peterborough County OPP Detachment though circumstances and incidents existed that warranted a few. In fact it is quite clear that I was made out to be a misfit, incompetent recruit and an "Undesirable" and to place something positive in such a person's file would be to defeat the purpose of creating a case where I would be terminated.

One has to marvel about the "truthfulness" of Sgt. Flindall's statement,

- ***'PC Jack going to be afforded every opportunity to succeed'***
- ***'rest is up to him'***

They were such convenient comments to actually disguise the truth. It was never up to me.

Some of the current definitions of the word **mafia** are:

- Any tightly knit group of trusted associates.
- A closed group of people in a particular field, having a controlling influence.
- Any small powerful or influential group in an organization or field; clique.

An actual **mafia**, so to speak, was in control and was surreptitiously orchestrating a plan to terminate me. They had already:

- Branded me as a psychopathic or crazy Russian prior to commencing my employment at the Peterborough County OPP Detachment,
- Had an OPP's psychiatrist do an examination of me based on their superstitious and extremely prejudiced beliefs (because I was Russian, from the middle east and served in the Israel Defense Forces and supposedly killed many people – though I have never even aimed my service firearm at anyone),
- Humiliated me with a derogatory nick name "Crazy Ivan" about my heritage,
- Humiliated me by being referred to as an incompetent recruit,
- Poisoned my work environment,
- Deprived me of regular performance evaluation meetings,
- Deprived me of developmental opportunities,
- Turned many members against me,
- Managed to have many members keep an eye on me and report back to one person (Sgt. Flindall),
- Deliberately omitted to document me positively when incidents warranted positive documentation,
- Falsely charged me under the Highway Traffic Act,
- Fabricated two fraudulent PERs,
- Falsified my refusal to sign them,
- Falsely accused me of being involved with criminals (the OPP's use of the term '*Undesirable*' is in itself extremely derogatory because no human being is undesirable for it goes against the dignity of an individual to be referred to as such and it also contravenes the Human Rights Code not to mention the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that talks about valuing the dignity of all Canadians),
- Criticized my accent (PC Moran's question to me, '*Can you speak with a Canadian accent?*' and PC Filman's comment in my Month 4 PER (Exhibit 18), '*PC Jack is aware that he has a thick accent*':
Specific example:
PC JACK is now patrolling on his own. His communication skills are improving greatly. PC JACK is aware that he has a thick accent and makes an effort to speak clearly and consisely.
- Accused me of not asking enough questions and when I did ask accused me of answer shopping.

It is a proven fact by now that nearly everything that I disclosed in good faith and with the best of intentions to police officers at the Peterborough County OPP Detachment was used by them against me:

- I showed them my registered vintage firearms – I was labeled "Crazy Ivan" who had killed (shot) people.
- I showed them my digital A/V portable recorder – I was accused of spying on them.
- I showed them an old photograph of me with the people I barely knew, but was eager to fight against – I was accused of associating with them.

Furthermore, I was accused of:

- Deception,
- Playing mind games,
- Dislike of women,
- Disrespectful relationships,
- Harassing and inappropriate behaviour,
- Lack of personal accountability,
- Not being a team player,
- Lack of decisive insight,
- Lack of self-awareness,
- Lack of self-confidence,
- Inability to multitask,
- Inability to plan and organize,
- Poor knowledge of statutes,
- Poor flexibility,
- Poor resolution skills,
- Poor analytical skills,
- Poor driving skills,
- Poor oral skills,
- Poor written skills,
- Poor communication skills,
- Poor radio communication skills,
- Poor time management skills,
- Poor attitude towards learning,
- Poor deportment.

In light of those accusations I am surprised I was not accused of being Lamia (Greek: Λάμια – a child-eating daemon in ancient Greek mythology) and a KGB spy all at the same time!

I am amazed at how careless the Respondent was in its pursuit to drive me out by all means possible. Indeed, people who are driven by hatred are blind.

Why on God's Green Earth did the Respondent offer me employment in the first place? I could have been and most probably would have been hired by either York Regional Police service or Halton Regional Police service since both of the services invited me for an interview and where I would have certainly put my multicultural and linguistic skills to use. Even if they had not hired me I could have been working elsewhere and living a normal life. Alas, OPP hired me first and totally ruined me as after the termination of my employment with the OPP, no organization, let alone police services, wanted to have me aboard. The OPP turned me into an "Undesirable" (OPP's term) as it appeared that the resumes I was sending out in search for a job disappeared in an abyss. Even Brinks would not get back to me

The Tribunal may wonder how evil the Respondent must have been in order to target me in such a systemic, malicious and treacherous manner. In reviewing all of the disclosure from the Respondent it is amazing how much time was spent documenting in careful detail all my actions to justify my forced termination. I am astounded at how much energy and resources the Respondent expended on me in order to get rid of me. It would have been easier for the Respondent to just approach me and state:

‘We think you are a crazy Russian who the OPP made a mistake in offering employment. We cannot stand the sight of you because you do not fit in. Furthermore, you stand out like a sore thumb with that thick Russian accent of yours and because you cannot speak like a normal Canadian we would like you to sign this letter of resignation.’

On the contrary I, an educated individual (a University professor), was brought down to my knees and executed by the mafia.

The Ontario Public Service should be proud of the OPP for being its effigy in demonstrating the OPS’ values and respect for the dignity of a Canadian citizen – one seeking employment in a supposedly respectable profession where he could maximize his skills in serving people of Ontario.

Main article: *Police corruption*

Police corruption is a specific form of [police misconduct](#) designed to obtain financial benefits, other personal gain, or career advancement for a police officer or officers in exchange for not pursuing, or selectively pursuing, an investigation or arrest.

One common form of police corruption is soliciting or accepting [bribes](#) in exchange for not reporting organized drug or prostitution rings or other illegal activities. Another example is police officers flouting the police [code of conduct](#) in order to secure convictions of suspects — for example, through the use of [falsified evidence](#). More rarely, police officers may deliberately and systematically participate in [organized crime](#) themselves.

Where corruption exists, the widespread existence of a [Blue Code of Silence](#) among the police can prevent the corruption from coming to light. Officers in these situations commonly fail to report corrupt behavior or provide false testimony to outside investigators to cover up criminal activity by their fellow officers.^[9]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Police_corruption

Police misconduct refers to inappropriate actions taken by [police officers](#) in connection with their official duties. Police misconduct can lead to a [miscarriage of justice](#) and sometimes involves [discrimination](#). In an effort to control police misconduct, there is an accelerating trend for civilian agencies to go beyond review to engage directly in investigations and to have much greater input into disciplinary decisions.^[1]

Types of misconduct include, [false confession](#), [false arrest](#), [falsified evidence](#), [false imprisonment](#), [intimidation](#), [police brutality](#), [police corruption](#), [political repression](#), [racial profiling](#), [sexual abuse](#), [surveillance abuse](#) and off-duty misconduct.^[4] Others include:

- Noble cause corruption, where the officer believes the good outcomes justify bad behavior^[5]
- Selective enforcement (knowledge and allowances of violations by friends, family and/or acquaintances unreported)
- [Abuses of power](#) (using badge or other ID to gain entry into concerts, to get discounts, etc.)
- [Lying](#) under oath (blatant lies under oath and/or to other authorities to cover wrongdoing)
- Influence of drugs and/or alcohol while on duty
- [Violations by officers of police procedural policies](#)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Police_misconduct

Assembling the Puzzle Together

Now that I have assembled the puzzle together the picture is clear. After the two ride-alongs in August 2008 with two Peterborough County OPP officers – PC Marc Gravelle and PC John Pollock – I was labeled crazy Russian and was not welcome at the Peterborough County OPP Detachment by members who were local to Peterborough. Despite my first accountable supervisor (Sgt. Robert Flindall) and my first coach officer (PC Shaun Filman) treating me like a leper I managed to stay afloat for a few months due to being proactive at studying the job on my own, receiving help from those who were willing to assist me and relatively light workload compared with the busy summer period. When the busy summer season began, instead of helping me, some officers, primarily Sgt. Flindall's "number one" officer PC Payne, started deliberately targeting and 'drowning' me. After I sought help from the Ontario Provincial Police Association, Sgt. Flindall launched an annihilation campaign against me in an open manner. Sgt. Flindall must have gotten the confidence to do so after those e-mails:

(August 20, 2009) (Volume 1, I-28):

From: Flindall, Robert (JUS)
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2009 12:02 PM
To: Campbell, Ron (JUS)
Subject:

A question for you when you're not busy - What has been the view of region in regards to PC Jack? Are they all with anything we've done/not done - aka are we in any shit? Or are they satisfied with everthing that's hap

Robert Flindall
Sgt. 9740

(August 20, 2009) (Volume 1, I-28):

From: Campbell, Ron (JUS)
Sent: August 20, 2009 1:36 PM
To: Flindall, Robert (JUS)
Subject: RE:

I have no idea. No one has mentioned anything to me. Ron

When A/Supt. Borton attempted to rescue me by moving me away from under Sgt. Flindall's and his minions' direct targeting, Sgt. Flindall discredited and maligned me (i.e. falsely charged me under the HTA, fabricated my two PERs, falsified my refusal to sign them, fabricated PSB investigation against me, further poisoned my work environment by spreading negative rumors about me) and then I was thrown into Sgt. Flindall's next-door neighbor and subordinate officer PC Richard Nie's hands to finish me off. PC Nie was particularly skilled in terminating minority probationary officers and he carried the plan to the tee. Please note that Sgt. Flindall, PC Payne and PC Nie are all local to Peterborough. That is it.

So much for the Ontario Public Service and the policies of the Ontario Provincial Police with respect to valuing diversity, treating everyone with dignity and putting public interests above private interests.

Before OPP

At the OPP

Trent University Computing & Information Systems' pamphlet (Exhibit 07d, page 1):

Exhibit 69 and Exhibit 70:



WICK NAME
"CRAZY IVAN"

Mr. Jack had a nickname of Crazy Ivan. He was called this by members.

Trent University Computing & Information Systems' pamphlet (Exhibit 07d, page 3):

Schedule 'A', page 56:

"Trent University was more than a solid formal education; it was an experience. The faculty and staff of Computing & Information Systems provided unfailing support and encouragement throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies ... and I enjoyed every moment. For an international student like me, it really was a dream come true."

Michael Jack, B.Sc. (Honours), M.Sc.

The discriminatory and the differential treatment that I endured during my probationary period at the Peterborough Detachment surpassed everything negative that I had experienced in my lifetime. I was discriminated against, harassed, bullied, humiliated, belittled, subjected to unreasonable demands and unsubstantiated criticism, oppressed and retaliated against for standing up for my rights or otherwise mistreated at work. All of the above negatively affected my mental and physical health, feelings and self-respect and further resulted in the loss of dignity. I experienced anxiety, loss of concentration, stress, sleeping disorders and muscle pain in a variety of areas all of which were provoked by the poisoned work environment. The amount of stress I experienced also brought on chronic fatigue syndrome towards the end of my employment with the OPP. It took me over a month after the resignation to merely regain my physical health.

Once again the Promise of the OPP stands out in stark contrast to the aforementioned:

Maintain an open mind, try to be impartial and non-judgmental; be aware of and manage my personal biases or attitudes, e.g. stereotypes

Support colleagues, especially those who may feel vulnerable or at a disadvantage because of their employment status, e.g. new recruits, volunteer, civilian, contract; or background, e.g. race, gender, ethnicity

Be thoughtful about both what I say and "how" I communicate, i.e. sensitive to inadvertent or subtle messages, terms or labels; avoid potentially hurtful rumours and gossip; maintain confidentiality

Somehow my case reminds me of two Hollywood movies:

- Philadelphia (1993) www.imdb.com/title/tt0107818
 - When a man with AIDS is fired by a conservative law firm because of his condition, he hires a homophobic small time lawyer as the only willing advocate for a wrongful dismissal suit.
- Flash of Genius (2008) www.imdb.com/title/tt1054588
 - Robert Kearns takes on the Detroit automakers who he claims stole his idea for the intermittent windshield wiper.

I associate myself with Tom Hanks' character in the movie Philadelphia because since I was not like everybody else at the Peterborough County OPP Detachment I was terminated.

I associate myself with Greg Kinnear's character in the movie Flash of Genius because a few officers from the Peterborough County OPP Detachment stole my life and just like Robert Kearns pursued his lawsuit against people who stole his idea and ruined his life, I will be pursuing my case against people who ruined my life.

Anticipated evidence of Mr. Michael Jack (Schedule A):

On January 13, 2010, I applied to YRP (Exhibit 79) and the very next day received a phone call from the recruiter, Gary Crawford (#419), advising that I was not eligible to apply since I had not completed my probationary period with the OPP, even though I had my Ontario Police College diploma (with 91.6 average and 100% on the Ontario Police Fitness Award) and was not applying as an experienced officer. Gary Crawford further said, "I will be shocked if any other police service hired you". When I heard that I was not eligible to even apply for a position of a Constable, I felt like I was a criminal. I invested a lot of work into getting the job of a police officer, studying at the Ontario Police College, training at the Provincial Police Academy, and working very hard in the 11 months on the road with the OPP (Exhibit 47a, Exhibit 47b, Exhibit 47c, Exhibit 47d) and

after all that I was a tainted meat – one that was not even eligible to apply with other police services. A couple of days later, after I had somewhat recovered from the shock, I contacted Cst. Tapp. With Cst. Tapp's help I have been working on preparing my case and my application to the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario.

Between January, 2010 and July, 2010 I corresponded with the Ontario Power Generation (Exhibit 82 and Exhibit 78b), Toronto Police Service (Exhibit 78a, Exhibit 80, Exhibit 81, and Exhibit 83), Peel Regional Police Service (Exhibit 84), Durham Regional Police Service and Halton Regional Police Service (Exhibit 85). Though the Ontario Power Generation, Toronto PS and Halton PS allowed me to apply for a position of Nuclear Security Officer and Constable as a new applicant, respectively, they all turned me down in the early stages of the hiring process (Exhibit 80, Exhibit 82, Exhibit 83, and Exhibit 85).

Effect of Discrimination

The discriminatory and the differential treatment that I endured during my probationary period at the Peterborough Detachment surpassed everything negative that I had experienced in my lifetime. I was discriminated against, harassed, bullied, humiliated, belittled, subjected to unreasonable demands and unsubstantiated criticism, oppressed and retaliated against for standing up for my rights or otherwise mistreated at work. All of the above negatively affected my mental and physical health, feelings and self-respect and further resulted in the loss of dignity. I experienced anxiety, loss of concentration, stress, sleeping disorders and muscle pain in a variety of areas (Exhibit 50, Exhibit 51, Exhibit 52), all of which were provoked by the poisoned work environment. The amount of stress I experienced also brought on chronic fatigue syndrome towards the end of my employment with the OPP. It took me over a month after the resignation to merely regain my physical health.

It was the duty of Ins. Johnston, S/Sgt. Campbell, Sgt. Flindall, Cst. D'Amico, Cst. Filman, Cst. Payne, Cst. Brokley, Cst. Nie and other involved OPP officers to ensure that I worked in a harassment-free environment and to build me up. Instead, they did just the opposite. They breached their duty. Furthermore, their leadership represents the core values and ethics of the Ontario Provincial Police (Exhibit 87, Exhibit 88, and Exhibit 89) and its commitment to the fundamentals and goals of the Ontario Public Service (Exhibit 90a). Yet further, in doing so they did not uphold the Ontario Public Service pledge to provide a workplace environment free of violations under Ontario's Human Rights Code (Exhibit 90b and Exhibit 90c).

To date I have difficulty focusing on tasks. I do not sleep well. My mind is crowded with memories of discrimination, harassment, belittling, and accusations of incompetence and wrongdoing that I was subjected to at the Peterborough Detachment of the OPP. Ever since the day of my forced resignation from the OPP my life has been a silent nightmare and I have been trying to learn how to live with what happened to me. I have been unable to gain related employment because of what was done to me. For me, just knowing that justice will be done, is paramount for my dignity. I know that the only way I will ever be able to move on in my life and have a future is if I can find out why this happened to me. I believe the only way I can ever know why this happened is to have all the truth come out in a public inquiry. I want to bring my private misfortune into the public realm for personal, legal and political resolution. I am convinced that if I am successful in my legal action then my ordeal and my struggle might reduce the possibility of somebody else having to go through what I did. My priority right now is to clear my name, get to the bottom of the case and make sure this does not happen to any other minority within the OPP in the future. A victory for me will be a victory for many.

More Discriminatory Incidents:

In January 2010 I got in touch with Cst. Tapp and I disclosed my experience at the Peterborough Detachment during the year of 2009. Cst. Tapp told me of his experiences at the Peterborough Detachment and how he was before the Humans Rights Tribunal of Ontario in a hearing stage (Exhibit 95). He told me about another minority officer Al Chase, an African Canadian who had been discriminated against and a fired on the last day of his probationary period. Mr. Chase filed a complaint with the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (Exhibit 62) after which the OPP negotiated a settlement prior to the matter being set for a hearing (Exhibit 48). Cst. Chase was coached by Cst. Nie co-incidentally and was on the same shift as Cst. Tapp. Cst. Chase was being criticized for occurrences and lack of documentation of facts. Having been complemented on his own thoroughness and documentation of facts, Cst. Tapp completed one of Cst. Chase's domestic occurrences (SP06146942) on July 30, 2006 (Exhibit 63). Cst. Nie was deliberately not made aware of the actual author since Cst. Tapp typed the occurrence under Cst. Chase's logged in computer in the Constables' office. Interestingly, Cst. Nie criticized this occurrence as well.

In mid-August 2010, I accidentally came across an article in the National by Peterborough Examiner newspaper (Exhibit 86). On the front page it discussed the Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a consequence of an exposure to a psychologically traumatic event such as military combat, sexual assault, disasters, or other horrific events. The article further noted PTSD's symptoms:

- Nightmares
- Severe anxiety
- Flashbacks
- Isolation
- Depression
- Suicidal tendencies
- Aggression and frustration that can impact the person's social, family and work-related interactions

I concurred with that article for by August 2010, I suffered from all of those symptoms. Having been turned down by various employers I was unable to find a job. Furthermore, I was alone in Canada; totally lost and hopeless; my goals were shattered; I was blackballed; my name was tainted and I was extremely depressed. Thoughts of various forms of suicide swarmed through my mind while I lay in bed unable to move. Furthermore, despite having a solid knowledge of the adverse effects of alcohol on one's condition, especially its depressant effects on the central nervous system, I started drinking heavily. In reflection I now realize to what extent I had degenerated emotionally and psychologically (Exhibit 51 and Exhibit 52).

On August 28, 2010, at approximately 3:00 am in a heavy state of alcoholic impairment, I purchased online a plane ticket to Israel to escape it all. If I had not, I fear I would not have survived for long in Canada on my own (Exhibit 51 and Exhibit 52).

On October 19, 2010, I accidentally ran into a Peterborough OPP Cst. Kevin Duignan in a Tim Hortons coffee shop in Peterborough. In a brief confidential conversation that followed he disclosed to me that some officers at the Peterborough Detachment after learning that I was Russian and before I even reported to the Peterborough Detachment (while I was still going through the training at the Ontario Police College and the Provincial Police Academy) nicknamed me the "Crazy Ivan" (Exhibit 69). When I asked him if he would be willing to testify about it he said he would. He further stated that there had recently been a management review at the Peterborough Detachment conducted by some S/Sgt. from Orillia and that he told him about the way I was mistreated. Yet another thing he disclosed to me was a rumor about a "mutiny" on Sgt. Robert Flindall's platoon. Apparently the officers revolted against Sgt. Flindall and his "number one" officer Cst. Jennifer Payne because of the way they were being managed. He did not tell me if he knew what the outcome was.

On November 26, 2010, I accidentally run into yet another Peterborough OPP Cst. Paul MacNeil in a Trent University athletics complex weight lifting room. In a conversation that followed he told me that what happened to me was a "raw deal" and that I should do something about it. He further disclosed to me that there had been another OPP officer who had been coached by Cst. Nie a few years ago, Harry Allen Chase, who was a great guy that had also been let go. He said that every officer who had been coached by Cst. Nie had either been dismissed from employment or transferred to another coach officer. He said that he was sorry about what happened to me because I was just unlucky to get into the wrong hands. When I told him that I had gotten to know Harry Allen Chase and that I had learned his story after my dismissal from employment and that I was pursuing legal action against OPP he said he would be glad to be a witness in my case. Among other things he also mentioned that Sgt. Flindall and Cst. Payne were too close and were favoring each other.

In January, 2012, while assisting Cst. Tapp in preparing my case I received a statement from Sgt. Jason Postma (Constable and Acting Sergeant at the time I was at the detachment) via e-mail. In the statement Sgt. Postma indicated that I had a nick name of "Crazy Ivan" and I was called this by members of the Peterborough Detachment (Exhibit 70):

Mr. Jack had a nickname of Crazy Ivan. He was called this by members. I came to understand the nickname was associated to Mr. Jack because of his large gun collection.

In light of this revelation one might wonder why the Respondents have declared in their response to the application to the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario that they have no knowledge of me bearing a nick name of "Crazy Ivan".

1. As will be discussed in more detail below, the Respondent denies that it discriminated against, or harassed, the Applicant during his employment with the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) on the basis of race, ancestry, place of origin, citizenship, ethnic origin or association. The Respondent's decision not to extend an offer of permanent employment to the Applicant was solely based on performance issues which were unrelated to a protected ground under the *Human Rights Code*.
28. Paragraph 14 – The Respondent is not aware of any officers calling the Applicant "Crazy Ivan" and denies that allegation.
31. Paragraph 19 – The Respondent denies that that Applicant was subjected to unwanted comments, jokes and harassment or that his workplace was poisoned.
32. Paragraph 19(1) – As previously noted the Respondent denies that the Applicant was called "Crazy Ivan".
54. Paragraphs 58 to 60 – The Respondent denies that racialized individuals or individuals who were born in countries other than Canada are subjected to differential treatment at the Detachment or within the OPP more broadly.
55. Broadly speaking, the Respondent denies:
 - the Applicant's claims that he was subjected to discrimination and harassment;
 - the Applicant was subjected to differential and derogatory treatment based on a protected ground;
 - it failed to take appropriate action to address any inappropriate conduct on the part of its employees in relation to the Applicant;
 - it reprisal against the Applicant through negative PERs;
 - the laying of a charge against the Applicant under the *Highway Traffic Act* was discriminatory or harassing;
 - the initiation of a complaint under the *Police Services Act* was discrimination or harassment; and
 - there has been any systemic discrimination as set out in paragraphs 58-60 of Schedule A to the Application.

It is evident that many have been lying. So much for the integrity and professionalism of some OPP officers!

Anticipated evidence of Mr. Michael Jack (Schedule A):

For almost eight years that I studied and worked at Trent University, which is a multicultural environment comprised of students and faculty from all over the world, there has not been a single incident where I felt I was discriminated against or harassed based upon my strong Russian accent, place of origin, ethnic origin, racial status, creed, or the fact that I was not originally from the Peterborough area. I was valued and appreciated for my work ethic, initially as a student (Exhibit 7d, page 3) and then as an instructor in the Computer Science department (Exhibit 10a). During my time at Trent University it never dawned on me that outside of the University boundaries in the Peterborough area I would encounter a differential treatment. I did not know what I was getting myself into when I was posted at the Peterborough Detachment. Not only did I have no opportunities at the Peterborough Detachment to apply my multilingual, multicultural and computer skills (which were the very reasons I chose the occupation of a police officer based upon the suggestion of a Police Chief that my skills constituted great assets in modern policing), but I was also subjected to the acts of racial harassment and racial discrimination because I was highly educated, was not a local, was not a Roman Catholic, was a Russian Jew and to top it off spoke with an accent.

OPP's policies dictate that OPP deeply embraces the principle that a diverse population is best served by a similar diversity of police officers and that it seeks to hire as police constables people representative of the cultural and racial diversity of the province they serve.

OPP further states that each OPP employee and volunteer appreciates the vital role he/she plays in protecting the fundamental rights of all people in Ontario. As such, each commits to always put the interests of the public and the OPP's Vision and Mission before any personal and private interests, and to demonstrate pride in his/her profession and the OPP through personal conduct that reflects a belief in OPP values and ethics (Exhibit 87 - The Promise of the OPP).

Furthermore, the Ontario's Human Rights Code (Exhibit 90b and Exhibit 90c) stipulates:

Racism is a broader experience and practice than racial discrimination. It is an ideology that either directly or indirectly asserts that one group is inherently superior to others. Racism can be openly displayed in racial jokes and slurs or hate crimes, but can also be more deeply rooted in attitudes, values and stereotypical beliefs. In some cases, these are unconsciously held and have evolved over time, becoming embedded in systems and institutions, and also associated with the dominant group's power and privilege.

Racial discrimination is a legally prohibited expression of racism. It is any action based on a person's race, intentional or not, that imposes burdens on a person or group and not on others, or that withholds or limits access to benefits available to other members of society in areas covered by the Code. Race only needs to be one factor in a situation for racial discrimination to have occurred.

Racial discrimination can often be very subtle, such as being assigned to less desirable jobs, or being denied mentoring and development opportunities. It might also mean being subjected to different management standards than other workers.

Racial harassment is a form of discrimination. It includes comments, jokes, name-calling, display of pictures or behaviour that insults you, offends you or puts you down because of your race and other related grounds.

Racial harassment can happen when someone: makes racial slurs or jokes, ridicules or insults you because of your racial identity, calls you names because of your race, colour, citizenship, place of origin, ancestry, ethnic background or creed.

Racial harassment means that someone is bothering you, threatening you or treating you unfairly because of your race, colour, ancestry.

Racial harassment may also be connected to where you were born, where you lived before moving to Ontario, your religious belief, your ethnic background, citizenship, or even your language.

It is against the law for anyone to harass you, insult you, or treat you unfairly for any of these reasons.

The Ontario Human Rights Code (the “Code”) protects you from racial harassment or discrimination.

Your rights are protected where you work, live, or get a service. The Code also protects you from discrimination when you sign a contract or join a union, trade or vocational association.

These kinds of behaviour are wrong even when they are not directed towards you, because they hurt people and make them feel uncomfortable. They can make living and working together very difficult.

Racial harassment can have a bad effect on, or “poison”, the places where you live, work or receive services. Even if the harassment is not directed at you, it can still poison the environment for you and others.

How do you know if the environment is poisoned? One way is to look at the effect of negative comments or actions. For instance, if certain racial slurs or actions make you or others feel uncomfortable in the workplace or fearful of returning to work, this could indicate that the work environment is poisoned.

The person who is harassing you could be: your employer or co-worker.

- *The word **Ivan** is slang for a **Russian** and the word **Crazy** is self-explanatory. In nick naming me “Crazy Ivan” prior to arriving at the detachment the OPP was actually telling the detachment that a Crazy Russian was arriving. Consequently that nick name ignited a flame of Racism whereby detachment members were referencing me as a Crazy Russian thereby poisoning my work environment.*
- *This Racism permeated the whole of Peterborough OPP Detachment to the point of officers feeling comfortable to falsely accuse me without the fear of reprisals.*
- *This Racism culminated to the point whereby my performance evaluations were deliberately manipulated to portray negativity so that my Employment would be in jeopardy and I would be forced into signing a resignation.*

- *This Racism that I was subjected to negatively affected my abilities to seek similar employment from other Police Services since I was constantly advised that I had never successfully completed my probationary period with the Ontario Provincial Police.*
- *This Racism that I was subjected shattered my goal of sponsoring my family from Israel.*
- *This Racism I was subjected to ruined me physically, mentally, emotionally, psychologically and financially.*
- *As a result of the overall Racism that I experienced at the OPP I left Canada and returned to Israel.*

Dear reader, given the entire statement above, was I treated fairly by the OPP? Was the OPP in line with their policies and guidelines? If other officers were not subjected to similar treatment that I was, can I be mistaken or faulted for having the perception that I, a highly-educated and hard-working minority and a member of a marginalized group, have been singled out and harshly targeted by some officers at the Peterborough Detachment?

Please take a minute to visit the OPP's website pages at:

<http://www.opp.ca> and <http://www.opp.ca/ecms/index.php?id=19>

Do you see the cultural and racial diversity of police officers the OPP so much prides itself on having? Alas, the reality appears to be different.

Further to this, are you familiar with a Stanford Prison Experiment? If not, I encourage you to visit the www.prisonexp.org website and take an hour or so to educate yourself about how normal people's psychology and behavior can be altered in a matter of only a few short days. I, on the other hand, had to live and work for a period of almost a year in a workplace environment where I was discriminated against, harassed, bullied, humiliated, belittled, subjected to unreasonable demands and unsubstantiated criticism, being made to feel like a marionette and oppressed and retaliated against for standing up for my rights. No wonder at one point I asked Cst. Nie for permission to go to the washroom.

In anticipation of giving evidence,

Michael Jack

*michaeljack2@trentu.ca
mikhailjacques@gmail.com*

Before OPP:

Dr. Brian G. Patrick – my professor, academic supervisor and colleague who knew me for 7 years:

It is a rare occasion when one has the opportunity to support, without equivocation, the application of someone who fully demonstrated the qualities of industry, perseverance, maturity, discipline, and scholastic ability. Michael Jack meets and exceeds these criteria.

When Michael arrived at Trent University in January 2001, he plunged into his studies with extraordinary enthusiasm and dedication. He literally absorbed course material, seeking to understand every minutiae of each subject. Consequently, Michael's academic performance in computer science and mathematics was outstanding. With an overall average above 90%, Michael earned a prestigious postgraduate scholarship from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada which he held throughout his two-year tenure as a graduate student at Trent University. Two accomplishments at Trent, however, bear further recognition.

In his final year of undergraduate study, Michael was also part of a software engineering team that was entrusted to design and implement a scheduling/booking system for the Department of Athletics at Trent University. With his drive, natural leadership abilities, and excellent communication skills, the project met its deadlines, satisfied its requirements, and was, in my view, the most well-rounded and well-prepared final-year project since my arrival at Trent in 2001.

Michael is by far the hardest working student that I have had the opportunity to watch firsthand. And his work ethics extend to all facets of his life. Everything Michael sets out to do is tackled to the very best of his abilities. Nothing is left undone or left to chance. He views obstacles as opportunities to improve himself. He sets very high standards and pursues life with integrity and unabashed honesty. He is able to size up situations objectively and see through the masks of others.

employee of Intel Corporation. There, he perfected his English and is now fully trilingual in Russian, Hebrew, and English. His written and oral writing abilities in English are superb and indeed, exceed most native speakers of the language.

Michael is well-read and extremely fit. He is outgoing and generous. And over the years, I have developed a great deal of respect for Michael and his life goals. He would be a wonderful asset for any organization and I wish him every success.

Dr. Richard T. Hurley – my professor, academic supervisor and colleague who knew me for 7 years:

As an instructor, I had the great pleasure in having Michael in many courses (both undergraduate and graduate) and I have no difficulty in stating that he was the best student I had seen in many years (his marks in all of my courses were in the 90s). It was not just his academic ability which set Michael apart from other high-achieving students, it was his work ethics. He went above and beyond the course requirements and produced work that far exceeded expectations. Another area which distinguished Michael was that it was quite apparent that he truly wanted to learn new material; he had a thirst for knowledge.

several of my course on numerous occasions. His maturity, clarity, and professionalism was well received by the students. As a result, the Program had no reservations in allocating courses for Michael to teach. He has taught our first-year software engineering course on two occasions, a

second-year course in digital logic and a second year course in computer architecture. The feedback from the students has been positive and the Program would not hesitate to assign him future courses if he so desires. One of the strongest comments made by Michael's students is that he went out of his way to provide support in and out of the classroom. Michael had a real desire to see his students succeed at the same time ensuring that they received a quality education. Unfortunately, Michael's association with Trent is limited to a part-time basis as he does not have a Ph.D. which is a requirement for a full-time position.

As a undergraduate student, a graduate student, and now a part-time lecturer, Michael is a tremendous asset to our Department. I have no doubt he will excel in whatever he chooses to do and I am pleased to provide my highest recommendation to Michael Jack.

Mr. Brian Hircock – my professor, academic supervisor and colleague who knew me for 7 years:

I have had the pleasure of knowing Michael Jack since the fall of 2001. In that time I have had dealings with him on three levels: as an undergraduate student, as a graduate teaching assistant and finally as a teaching colleague.

As an undergraduate student, Michael would rank in the top 3 students out of the hundreds that I have taught over the last 10 years. He was always more than prepared and always did more than what was asked of him. On the rare occasion when he had a problem understanding a concept he would come to me for clarification, which illustrates his desire to learn a topic completely. In his fourth-year software engineering project course, he assumed a team leadership role and led his team to a very successful conclusion.

projects. I was always confident that any task that I gave Michael would be well done and I never had to give it a second thought. In the seminars, I would tell Michael the articles that he should read and then he would lead classroom discussions on the topics. He showed a great skill in being able to read between the lines in the articles and then to be able to pass this knowledge along to the students.

As a teacher, Michael has proven that he can develop courses independently and that he has excellent time management and organizational skills. He has taken it upon himself to rewrite existing course notes to his standards and to try and develop courses in which the students have the best opportunity to succeed. He has proven that he can deal with students in a fair and ethical manner.

In conclusion, I highly recommend Michael Jack. He has shown me that he has the desire, dedication, and ability to succeed and I would trust him with any task given him. I am positive that Michael will be successful in any future endeavour.

Mrs. Sofie Andreou – my professor, colleague and friend who knew me for 6 years:

Michael has demonstrated his strengths, values and character to me on many different levels over the past six years. His relationship to me has evolved over time from student and employee to a loyal friend.

University on a part time basis. Michael happened to be in the first class I taught at Trent in the fall of 2002. Michael was clearly the leader of his peers in that class. Everyone, including myself, would look up to Michael when complex issues were identified in class. Michael, as the rest of the

course I created for the University and he again showed leadership in class as well as outstanding pride in his work. His assignments and projects would be in the order of 200 pages while those of his peers were 20 pages. The qualities of his projects have yet to be matched, 6 years later.

Michael quickly earned my trust, which was/is difficult to do. We had him house-sit and pet-sit many times. We would not trust just anyone in our house or with our pets. I remember the first time Michael came over to our house to deliver a project (we were on 5 acres at the time) and our dogs were not friendly to strangers. At the time I thought Michael would be arriving, I went outside to gather the dogs, a Rottweiler and a Staffitire Bull Terrier. Much to my surprise I found Michael and the two dogs playing and rolling on the ground like puppy mates. Dogs are very good judges of character. At least, these two were. I had never seen them accept a person as they did to Michael.

In closing, I would recommend Michael highly, as he takes himself and his work very seriously. His work ethic is unparalleled, and his dedication, pride and loyalty are unwavering. Michael is a very loyal and caring person. He is someone who can always be counted on.

Mr. William T. Hunter – my friend who knew me for 7 years:

This is the background to our friendship with Michael and I can only say how impressed we are with his accomplishments. You will know that his academic record is exemplary. He has worked diligently at improving his English and his written skills now surpass most native-speaking students of my acquaintance. He has an enquiring mind and reads diligently in a number of fields and is anxious to discuss the issues raised. He is highly disciplined and was extremely focused on his studies, and has continued to apply the same energy to his teaching duties. With respect to his hobby of guns he is fastidious about knowing the rules and following them. And of course he is extremely fit.

It has been a great pleasure for us to get to know Michael and we would certainly recommend him most highly for any position for which he might apply.

Mr. Andre Melaney – my landlord who knew me for 7 years:

Michael is extremely clean, organized, and diligent. I'd say "immaculate" would be the right choice of a word to describe his living environment. He is dedicated to anything and everything he sets out to do and has a positive attitude to everyone he meets. He has never caused any problems, never defaulted on his rent payments. Whenever I ask him to help me, he is right there right away. Over the years he has been helping us to maintain the property and he has personally renovated half of the house.

Mr. Cody Harding-Calder – Trent University gym buddy who knew me for 6 years:

students. The fall of 2002 marks the time to which I had the pleasure of meeting Michael Jack. To this day, it is without question that I have not yet met one individual who has demonstrated his level of dedication to physical health, education, family and friends. I believe the personal character which Michael displays is certainly unique, (mostly due to his level of dedication) he naturally embodies the idealizations to which most may only aspire to become.

Consistently over the past six years I have admired Michael's highly regimented schedule. He is absolutely incomparable in his level of efficiency; I would often find him exercising while also reading a textbook, typically regarding this time as his "break" between twelve hour days of work, reading and writing. Regardless to how busy Michael may be, he always reserves some time to teach other members on proper exercise, and engage in the occasional scholarly debate.

Without reservation I highly recommend Michael for this position, and truly believe he deserves the opportunity to demonstrate what I consider his unmatched level of qualification. Please feel free to contact me if you should have any further questions regarding this letter. Cody Harding-Calder

Mr. Bill Byrick – Trent University's Athletics Complex director who knew me for a year:

I am pleased to submit a report on the software design project successfully completed this past academic year for the Department of Athletics and Recreation by a team lead by Michael Jack. I

Overall Comments: The group was very focused, professional and dedicated. They were also flexible in making changes and then adapting to the changes as time and needs arose.

Mr. Jonathan A. Corret – my trainer at the Intel Corporation in USA who knew me for just over a year:

supervising new hire technicians. It was in this job capacity that I met, trained and worked with Michael Jack. In totality, I spent roughly 14 months working with Michael in both New Mexico and Portland, Oregon.

Michael was assigned for training to our facility in New Mexico from the Intel plant in Jerusalem. Although he was quite young at the time of his assignment, I was immediately impressed with his maturity and dedication to learning his job tasking. I'm sure that this assignment was a daunting task for this young man as he also had to hone his English language skills, English being a 3rd language for him.

Michael soaked up knowledge like a sponge, and then proceeded to complete all his assigned performance objectives in a thorough, competent, and complete manner.

tool set for coordination of installation, and production readiness testing. Despite the long hours and the grueling compressed schedule, Michael performed well. His desire to learn and excel never flagged, and he always questioned job aspects that he didn't understand.

Because of this extended exposure to Michael's work ethic, I am happy to recommend him to any future employer. I am sure that he will be a thorough and competent employee in whatever job capacity he is retained.

At the OPP:

Work Improvement Plan for PCS066 – Month 8 (Volume 3, W-6):

Probationary Constable: Badge:	PC Michael JACK 12890	Accountable Supervisor: Badge:	R FLINDALL 9740
--------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------

1) Personal accountability - PC JACK has difficulty accepting responsibility for his actions where these actions have either been deemed inappropriate or deficient. One of the priorities of the 2008-2010 OPP Strategic Plan is effectiveness. A key strategy in achieving positive outcomes in this area is to hold ourselves accountable through ongoing evaluation in Performance Management. By showing an unwillingness to accept responsibility for his actions and blaming others, PC JACK has difficulty in learning from his mistakes in order to better prepare himself for the future.

2) Federal Statutes - PC JACK scored well in his OPC federal statutes component, however he has difficulty in putting book knowledge into practice while completing investigations. PC JACK has investigated many federal statute offences in his time at the Detachment but he has had difficulty in some procedures such as forgetting to read an accused their Rights to Counsel, speaking with another officer's accused without reading a supplementary caution or identifying key facts in issue in a case to substantiate the offence.

In regards to a Break and Enter PC JACK investigated, PC JACK disagreed with other senior officers and his Sergeant about the charges which were laid. Instead of speaking with his coach officer or Sergeant, PC JACK questioned officers on other shifts that were not present and voiced his disagreement with the charges laid. In this case, as well as answer shopping, it appears that PC JACK has let his opinion of the people involved sway his opinion of what charges should be laid rather than relying on what elements of an offence had been completed.

3) Resolution - PC JACK investigated a stand by to keep the peace during this period in which he attended alone. PC JACK did not realize that he was unable to resolve the matter. One of the involved parties in the matter realized this fact and called for a back up officer for PC JACK. Understanding ones strength and weaknesses is important in achieving a positive outcome during any call for service. This includes requesting assistance from fellow officers when dealing with difficult situations.

4) Follow-up - As indicated in previous evaluations, PC JACK had shown proper followup skills and kept a running list. An investigation came to light during this evaluation period, that PC JACK had been investigating over a period of several months. It was learned that PC JACK had not completed even the simplest of followup tasks, such as obtaining witness information and contact information, nor taken any statements to help substantiate the allegations.

5) Listening Skills - PC JACK has been identified as having poor listening skills. PC JACK had been told on a number of occasions that he was not to complete transcriptions of video statements. During a Criminal Harassment investigation, PC JACK was preparing court documents for the arrest of the suspect. PC JACK was given very specific instructions from his Sergeant on what to complete and what not to complete. It was confirmed with PC JACK that he understood. Instead of following the instructions given to him by his Sergeant, he completed the tasks that he felt should be done. As a result, he placed the lives of his victim and witnesses at unnecessary risk.

6) Planning and organization - PC JACK is a very organized person. He usually comes to work with a pre-written task list. However, it is viewed that PC JACK cannot multitask. He has difficulty prioritizing calls for service as well as what needs to be done on his list.

Part of the issue is that PC JACK will go too far in his investigations, completing tasks that don't need to be done or over investigating. PC JACK has difficulty in identifying what is a non-reportable incident and investigating it as such. This can be seen in numerous instances such as typing a statement verbatim that didn't have to be completed or contacting and taking statements from witnesses that have no relevant information to provide.

7) Provincial Statutes - Although, for the most part, PC JACK has been able to identify the elements of most provincial statutes he was not able to identify the elements associated with the Mental Health Act.

8) Self confidence - During this evaluation period, PC JACK has been involved in numerous situations which has required either disciplinary action or instruction on how to complete tasks properly. It has been found that PC JACK does not take criticism well and will avoid that person for a period of time.

9) Respectful relations - During this evaluation period, PC JACK was involved in a break and enter investigation which was assisted by fellow officers including his Sergeant. Facts in issue were substantiated in the matter however, PC JACK felt the charges should not be laid. Instead of speaking with his coach officer or Sergeant, PC JACK spoke with officers on another shift. Instead of providing the officers the full details of the case, he with-held information causing these officers to provide advice in a certain manner. It subsequently came to light to these officers that he had manipulated the information and themselves. This has caused a significant level of distrust in PC JACK by his fellow officers.

10) Radio Communications - PC JACK sounds confident in his radio use and is not an issue. PC JACK however does not follow proper radio protocol by notifying his dispatcher as to his daily activities and his whereabouts. He has also been found to often not answer his radio when the dispatcher is calling him. This was pointed out to him one day by a senior officer and was directed to call the dispatcher as they had been looking for him. This senior officer was met by an upset PC JACK who told the officer that he would call the dispatcher when he wanted to.

Detachment Commander's Comments:

Constable Jack is experiencing difficulty in a number of operational areas. Close supervision of this officer is recommended at this time to ensure the identified Work Improvement Plan is followed and the areas of concern rectified.

PC Richard Nie – my second officer who knew me for ONE MONTH prepared his first evaluation of my performance (PCS066 - Month 9):

ATTITUDE TOWARDS LEARNING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has an obvious desire to learn and is willing to attempt any task given to him. He seeks input, direction, and advice on every task that he performs. His body language shows his disgust when he makes a mistake or has to be corrected on something and he appears overly frustrated. He struggles with trying to put every situation into a mold or template that he can follow and then being disappointed when things don't go exactly as planned. He also places blame on the situation or individuals involved rather than accepting ownership for his own mistakes.

On 10SEP09, PC Jack was completing a report from a stolen vehicle. He advised that he needed assistance locating the address as he had never been shown how to search for one before and link it properly. He was questioned as to how this was possible with eight months on the job as this would have been taught in Orillia or his first occurrence at detachment. He brought up another occurrence of his and showed the address which had not been entered correctly. He was explained how to correct it and he placed the blame on another officer for showing him the wrong way. It was apparent that he knew how to enter the address, but was checking to see if his new coach would show him something different. When confronted on this, he then advised that it was his mistake and he had been shown properly saying he was embarrassed and was not trying to be untruthful.

FEDERAL STATUTES

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

As with Provincial Statutes, PC Jack appears to have a working knowledge of the offences that he has encountered this month. His difficulty lies with converting that book knowledge into practice on the road. He appears very hesitant with making the choice to proceed with an arrest or a charge. Of the situations that were encountered this month, there was only one that resulted in an arrest.

On 23SEP09 he was dispatched to an unwanted person call. Upon arriving at the residence he began speaking with the complainant who had met PC Jack previously. The complainant was seeking advice on what options he had and also what he wanted the officers to do. After some time the complainant brought the unwanted person to the door. It was apparent quickly that due to his intoxicated state that he could not stay at the residence with the complainant. Up until the point that the suspect started to walk away from PC Jack, he made no indication as to how he was going to resolve the situation. As the suspect started to leave, the coach officer told PC Jack to arrest the male and he would be coming with police. At the time of the arrest, search, or transport to detachment, the male was never read his rights to counsel. When this was discussed afterwards with PC Jack, he advised that he didn't do it because he didn't think he had to for a Prevent Breach of Peace arrest, and then said it was because his coach pressured him to proceed quickly with the arrest. As the issue of forgetting rights to counsel and caution was raised in prior evaluations, it appears that this stills needs some correction as it happened on the first arrest with the new coach officer.

POLICE VEHICLE OPERATION

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack appears to be a very nervous driver and lacks confidence. He drives safely but causes concern with some of his habits. PC Jack relies heavily on his GPS unit. On more than once instance PC Jack has missed a turn going to a call because he has passed it before his GPS told him to turn. When approaching intersections, he will often slow to almost a complete stop even when the light is green. When questioned about this he advised that his father taught him to be safe. He often travels at approximately 10km/h below the posted speed limit, which creates long lines of traffic behind the cruiser and also confusion on the part of the public with what he is going to do. When patrolling, if his coach starts a conversation or begins to teach or correct a problem, he will immediately lift his foot off the gas and drive slow. His inability to multitask is also shown by the fact that he will not focus on the things around him if he is distracted by something like a conversation. PC Jack also completed a driving assessment this month which has required him to have some remedial work done.

On 18SEP09 PC Jack was returning to his patrol zone from a call. He was involved in a discussion with his coach about the call when a youth on the sidewalk rode his bicycle out front of the cruiser. PC Jack had to brake and then observed the youth do a circle on the road in front of him and then proceed back onto the sidewalk. The youth had no helmet or light and it was also well after dark. When questioned as to why he didn't stop to speak with the youth, PC Jack advised that he wasn't thinking in a police officer mind set – he was told that he was working the full 12 hours and that he needs to be able to multitask – just because he is talking doesn't mean he can't stop to deal with an offence.

TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has written 5 provincial offence notices during this time frame. According to RMS, for this month he had 21 calls for service of which 10 were reportable incidents. PC Jack is often content on staying at the detachment to complete paperwork. He has difficulty prioritizing his tasks to allow for more enforcement. He will get focused on one task or assignment and not be able to think about proactive things until he has the first completed. He is being taught to use the community policing offices to complete his work as opposed to wasting time by driving all the way back to the detachment after each call.

ORAL

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack is making concerted efforts to improve in this area. He speaks very slowly and methodically at calls so that the person he is speaking with understands what he is asking. He is professional and polite with individuals. He needs to work on sorting through the information he is given to ask more detailed questions to get the answers he needs. He attempts to use templates for questioning and follows a format. This covers the basic points but he misses relevant points pertinent to each individual case by doing this.

On 18SEP09, PC Jack was sent to his first sudden death call. He was unable to gather basic information right at the beginning from the park owner to relay to the Sergeant who was on his way. The park owner had no idea what PC Jack was initially asking until his coach stepped in to clarify. It was explained to him how he needed to sort through all of the details to pinpoint the main details to relay to other officers so the call could be completed efficiently.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack uses proper language and codes on the radio. His struggles involve the actual use of the radio. Though he continues to work at this, PC Jack seems to forget at times to update the dispatcher with what he is doing and where he is going. He also has trouble with listening to the radio when he is distracted by a conversation or task. His coach will remind him at times that he is being called and he hasn't heard because he is doing something else.

On 18SEP09 PC Jack was dispatched to a collision and then was sent to a sudden death. PC Jack requested that another officer attend to do his first call. It was pointed out to him that if he had been listening to what his shift was doing, he would have realized that there were no other officers available as they all had their own calls already.

DECISIVE INSIGHT

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has a lot of difficulty in this area. He is very intelligent person and is extremely book smart. His struggle comes when he attempts to convert this book knowledge into practical use on the road. PC Jack attempts to fit every incident into a mold or proforma that he can follow in future calls. As long as the call plays out identical to the one he experienced before, he does a good job. When the situation changes, PC Jack runs into trouble as he attempts to do things from the way he has memorized before.

On 19SEP09 PC Jack observed a pedestrian walking down the road carrying a cup. PC Jack's first reaction was to say that he thought the man was drunk. His reasoning was that it was at night and he was hiding a cup. He proceeded to stop the cruiser (half in a live lane with no emergency lights) and speak with the male. The male was going for a walk with his Tim Horton's coffee. PC Jack was very awkward with his approach and it caused the male to look at his coach officer for clarification as to why he was stopped. The male actually asked if he was doing something wrong. The minute he realized it was a coffee cup and the male wasn't intoxicated he should have changed his approach away from interrogation to a friendly chat, which he was unable to do.

ANALYTICAL THINKING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack does well at parts of this category, but in others he lacks. He is a very methodical and systematic thinker, and tries to make patterns and proformas to handle his calls. The problem lies in translating these to the individual situations he is dealing with. He has trouble connecting the dots or piecing together the key elements to develop a solution. He gets so focused on patterning himself after the way he did things before that he cannot adapt to the current set of circumstances.

For example, in the incident mentioned earlier involving the youth on the bicycle, PC Jack would take the constructive criticism and take it to mean that he should stop every youth on a bicycle without a helmet and no light. He has trouble deciphering between what procedures are set in stone and which ones are flexible. In this example, PC Jack was reminded that the instruction did not mean to stop every single youth on a bike now, that heading to an alarm call would take precedence over something like that.

RESOLUTION

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has trouble determining what is the most appropriate solution to a problem he faces. He either states that he does not know what to do and waits to be told, or he shows a lack of confidence in trusting his decision is correct.

At a stand by keep the peace call on 15SEP09 PC Jack was unable to reach either the complainant or the homeowner at the time of the call. He decided to attend the residence and determined that no one was home. He then proceeded to call the dispatcher and have her call the complainant to attend and gather her belongings. The coach officer stopped this and asked PC Jack why he would have someone come to get their belongings alone without being able to ensure they didn't take the homeowners' property. He blamed his lack of judgement on other officers he worked with saying he thought he had seen them do that before at a stand by. When he was asked to explain the circumstances of that call, it was clear that it was not a similar incident and he agreed that the details were different.

PERSONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

In contrast to saying that he is making attempts to improve, PC Jack shows no ability to accept responsibility for his actions. He will work at improving the deficiencies, but he never will accept that it is his fault - he will always blame his issues on another officer or individual.

From the first day with his new coach officer, it was evident that this was going to be a problem area. PC Jack requested help with completing a vehicle record search on MTO. He advised that he had never done this before, which was a surprise given he was at the 8 month mark on the road. He was shown where to locate the form and advised to attempt to fill in the blanks. He then brought it back for review and there were two minor errors pointed out. Upon hearing this, PC Jack advised that when another officer showed him before how to do the form that he said it was okay the way he had done it. PC Jack was advised immediately that answer shopping was one of his problem areas and it would not be tolerated. He was advised that he could not set up his coach or other officers by asking questions that he already knew the answers to just to point out that he had been taught differently. He was also told that lying and blaming other officers was unacceptable. PC Jack apologized and said it wouldn't happen again.

Since that day, it has been daily that something will come up where PC Jack attempts to ask questions that he already knows the answer to. On 19SEP09 he asked his coach how to sign a ticket because he didn't know the correct way to sign. He advised on 15SEP09 that he did not know how to start off his notebook as he had never been taught. It was explained in both instances to him that it couldn't be true that he hadn't been shown these basic tasks. It was pointed out again that it was clear that he was not being truthful just to see if this coach officer would give a different answer so that he could blame the other officer. He was told that his coach officer was not going to play games with him and PC Jack smiled. It was apparent that PC Jack knew that his coach officer had figured out what he was attempting to do.

FLEXIBILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has difficulty under stressful situations. He is very good at staying focused on one specific task, but he has trouble adapting to multiple things. When he is confronted with more than one task at once, his decision-making tends to break down and other things falter such as his driving.

On 09SEP09 at the start of shift PC Jack was advised of a pending threats call. He was asked to call the dispatcher for details. Upon returning to his coach, he advised that there were three calls outstanding and he had taken details on a stolen vehicle. He was advised to call back and get all three call details, and then prioritize which one to deal with first. He returned to advise that the threats call was not in his zone. It was explained how with only three day shift officers working for the first hour of the day, he would be taking calls in every zone. After 45 minutes he still had not contacted the complainant for the threats call which was obviously the most important call.

RESPECTFUL RELATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has the first part of this category covered well. He is polite and cooperative and has the ability to be compassionate to those in need. Unfortunately, he has not gained the trust of his coworkers with his decision to answer shop. As mentioned previously, PC Jack continually asks questions that he appears to know the answers to already. It appears that he is well aware of the fact that he is doing this as he has chuckled sometimes when his coach officer has pointed it out to him. He respects the skills and expertise of his partners, however has shown that he will blame another officer rather than admit a mistake.

SELF-CONFIDENCE

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack does not show a lot of confidence in doing his job. When accepting criticism he often goes quiet and appears angry. He then takes time to formulate a response which always entails placing the blame on another officer for causing his error. He has been encouraged to trust his instincts in making decisions instead of solely relying on his coach for the answers.

On 02OCT09 at a family dispute call, PC Jack got to a point in the investigation that it was clear that he did not know what to advise that complainant. Instead of admitting to the complainant that he didn't know what to do, he continued to attempt to resolve things by giving answers that were not correct. He ultimately stopped himself by directing the complainant to talk to his coach instead because he was the more senior officer. It was explained to him that people appreciate the fact that some of us are learning a job and that honesty works best in gaining the trust of the public.

PC Richard Nie – my second officer who knew me for TWO MONTHS prepared his second evaluation of my performance (PCS066 - Month 10):

ATTITUDE TOWARDS LEARNING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack continues to show a desire to learn and accepts new tasks. He still struggles with trying to put every situation into a mold or template that he can follow and then being disappointed when things don't go exactly as planned.

On 16OCT09, PC Jack was completing a series of traffic stops on Highway 28. Discussions about vehicle position and safety took place after each stop. As one issue would be corrected a new one would come up. It appeared he was having great difficulty in assessing where to stop a vehicle and how to do so safely. PC Jack described it as "too much to consider all at once".

FEDERAL STATUTES

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack continues to appear to have a working knowledge of the offences that he has encountered this month. He still has difficulty converting that book knowledge into practice on the road. He is still very hesitant with making the choice on how to proceed with a course of action.

On 17OCT09 PC Jack attended a vehicle rollover with three suspicious youths involved.

Upon arriving at the scene, PC Jack approached the first officer on scene who was speaking with the three youths. At one point he approached the vehicle with the other officer while his coach spoke with a passenger alone. There was an obvious odour of burnt marijuana in the vehicle. At no time did PC Jack indicate that he had noticed the smell or decide to proceed with anything. After watching his coach separate one passenger, he then proceeded to do the same with the other. When his coach approached him to check on things, he advised that he had not had any discussions with the passengers in regards to drugs. After some questioning by his coach the drugs were discovered and dealt with appropriately.

POLICE VEHICLE OPERATION

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still appears to be very nervous and lacks confidence while driving. He drives safely but causes concern with some of his habits.

On 09OCT09 he attended a collision scene and was so excited upon his arrival that he parked the cruiser directly on top of the evidence at the scene. His only focus was getting to the scene although he knew another officer was already there. He was unable to process all of the events taking place at this minor scene to come to the appropriate solution when he arrived. When driving decisions are discussed his response is often "too many things happening at once, I couldn't concentrate".

On 26OCT09 PC Jack conducted a traffic stop on County Road 1 which is an 80km/h highway. He stopped the cruiser partially into a live lane. He said he was doing this for an offset – when questioned he agreed he was not trained to do this on highway stops. While approaching the vehicle on the same stop, he appeared nervous and began touching various radio buttons and the light bar, then rolled down window completely – said he was unsure why he rolled down the window – all took place while approaching vehicle and trying to turn around.

ORAL

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still needs to improve in this area. He speaks professionally and in an appropriate manner however still needs to work on sorting through the information he is given to ask more detailed questions to get the answers he needs. His use of templates for questioning is still causing him to miss relevant points specific to each individual case. When dealing with fellow officers, for some reason he will omit information given to him when he is asking for help or direction from another.

On 17OCT09 PC Jack attended a threats call. He began the initial investigation with the complainant and determined the male was scared to attend his residence because of the suspect. He questioned properly about the type of threat however did not take it the step further to assess the living arrangements at the house. After his coach clarified the information with the complainant, it was determined that everything was fine as they lived in an apartment building.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

The issues identified in this category are still present. PC Jack uses proper language and codes on the radio but things fall apart under pressure. He forgets at times to update the dispatcher with what he is doing and where he is going. He still has trouble with listening to the radio when he is distracted by a conversation or task.

On 27OCT09 PC Jack was at a collision scene and missed hearing a call on the radio while he was talking to an involved driver. When questioned if he heard the call, he advised that he was busy talking to the driver so he didn't hear anything.

DECISIVE INSIGHT

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

This category has shown no improvement as well. The comments from last month still apply - unless the situation is identical to one that he has experienced before, PC Jack struggles with coming to a decision about what to do.

On 12OCT09 PC Jack was attending a domestic dispute call to back up another officer. The female caller had advised there was an unwanted male at her residence, had been drinking,

and was refusing to leave. There was also information about someone being placed in a headlock. PC Jack chose to drive at less than speed limit, with no lights or sirens. He said that he felt getting to call minutes sooner would not help as the "headlock" and domestic were already over. It was discussed with him about the risks at domestics, etc and then he chose to use his emergency equipment. Once at the domestic, he spoke with the victim and did not even check whether she had been assaulted or not – he appeared unsure how to handle the information she was giving him.

ANALYTICAL THINKING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still struggles at piecing things together at his calls. He still is very methodical and systematic in his approach but has trouble sorting out the information.

On 17OCT09 PC Jack assisted at a call with some intoxicated males. By the end of it, he had to drive one of the males to his residence. PC Jack was planning to drop him off at the end of his driveway and let him walk to his house. Then he said he would be polite and drive him to the door. His coach officer explained the need to ensure there was someone home to look after the boy. PC Jack then admitted that he did not interid on making sure the intoxicated male was looked after by his parents.

RESOLUTION

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still has trouble determining what is the most appropriate solution to a problem he faces. He still either states that he does not know what to do and waits to be told, or he shows a lack of confidence in trusting that his decision is correct.

On 17OCT09 at the start of the shift, PC Jack advised there was a traffic complaint to go to but it was ten minutes old - a vehicle was tailgating and passing unsafely. He then said he had to do a log-on sheet because dispatch didn't have one and had asked for one. He then headed to shift briefing and appeared very stressed. He informed OIC Postma that the log-on was not done – he was advised to leave it for now and it would be sorted out by Postma as 4 people were off. PC Jack just sat there and stared at the table appearing frustrated. When briefing was over he advised of another traffic complaint which involved threats - someone gave another person the finger. He was asked if there was a plate and description and he confirmed there was so it was suggested that they leave and look for the vehicle. He got upset saying that he had to do the log-on and raised his voice at his coach - he was told to relax as it was not a big deal, he could just ask someone else to do the log-on sheet. Within 30 seconds PC Postma walked back in and asked PC Jack to do the log-on before he left if he had the time and told him three times what to log people on as including himself. PC Jack became frustrated and started muttering things under his breath about being asked to do two things at once. He finished the log-on and walked outside. His coach then took a call from PCC and the dispatcher said the log-on was all messed up – people were logged on as different zones and numbers as what she had been told by Postma verbally earlier. His coach corrected the errors and spoke with PC Jack – he again became quite angry advising that he heard Postma's instructions but no one can be expected to handle three things at once – his coach explained that a log-on sheet and two traffic complaints were minor tasks, and that he wasn't doing them at the same time, he just needed to prioritize them – he said it was impossible and that he couldn't be expected to start assessing and formulating a plan for one thing and then have to switch to another – he was told to take a breather and start over. He said he had no idea what to do so he and his coach sorted out what he had heard with the traffic complaints. His coach then called back to dispatch to confirm and there were more details that he had left out. It was explained to him about why he has difficulties listening, hearing, etc because he only gave partial information to his coach. It was explained to him that if he can't handle more than one thing at a time then to tell his coach and he will make sure that he is only given one thing to do until he can handle more

PERSONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack willingly admits to having problem areas and understands the identified concerns. He has shifted somewhat in his approach in that instead of placing blame on another officer, he suggests his problems arise from the circumstances he is placed into. If a problem is detected or questioned, he will now say it is due to being forced to think when he is tired or not feeling well. If he has several things to do at once he will say that he can't be expected to do three things at once and that is why things fall apart.

FLEXIBILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack struggles the minute the situation becomes stressful. Given a template to follow, he does well at completing one task at a time. When asked to multitask, everything falls apart.

On 27OCT09 there was a call on the radio where night shift was looking for a stolen vehicle – PC Folz advised he had two people under arrest at Airport Road by the train tracks – PC Jack was advised of the information and he told his coach he had heard. He did not appear to be in any type of hurry to assist his coworkers – PC Jack was told by his coach they would be attending and PC Pitts confirmed he was leaving at the same time. His coach had to repeat the location to PC Jack three times prior to even leaving the parking lot. He was encouraged to move faster so he could help his partners and all it did was slow him down. He appeared very confused and could not deal with the lack of information on the call – he wanted more details than just “go there to help the officers”. As the pressure was increased, his stress increased, and everything just slowed down. Since he did not have a detailed set of facts to start off with, it caused PC Jack to become confused, frustrated, and upset over what to do with the call.

RESPECTFUL RELATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still has the first part of this category covered well. He is polite and cooperative and has the ability to be compassionate to those in need. He has made an effort to avoid answer shopping and deals almost exclusively with his coach unless instructed otherwise. His biggest challenge this month has been with information sharing. On two different occasions he got into situations involving Sergeants and his coach in which he did not give complete information to the Sergeant to make an informed decision.

On 21OCT09 PC Jack started early and was working in the office. Near the end of the day a collision came in and the dayshift Sergeant asked PC Jack to attend as he was available. He neglected to inform the Sergeant that he was not to attend calls alone. When discovered by his coach and discussed with the Sergeant, a lack of trust developed again from the lack of full disclosure.

SELF-CONFIDENCE

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still shows limited confidence with what he is doing both at calls and at the office. He is constantly encouraged to make a decision instead of relying on others to give him the answers. He has trouble with this though because he is afraid of making a mistake.

In the example discussed under Resolution, PC Jack lost his composure and got to the point that he told his coach that he did not know what to do. Until he was told to relax and start the day over fresh, he was unable to begin anything as he was too overwhelmed with prioritizing his calls.

PC Richard Nie – my second officer who knew me for THREE MONTHS prepares his third evaluation of my performance (PCS066 - Month 10):

ATTITUDE TOWARDS LEARNING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has always shown a desire to learn. He has yet to change from trying to put every situation into a mold or template that he can follow. Unfortunately, as a result of this he continues to get disappointed when things don't go exactly as planned.

On 09NOV09 PC Jack was processing a male party that he had arrested for impaired driving. After the breath tests had been completed but prior to release, the accused asked if he could lie down in the cells. PC Jack was unable to make the decision himself and asked his coach officer for permission. PC Jack then allowed the accused to go into the cells and lie down without removing his jacket, belt, or shoes with laces. When this was pointed out to him, PC Jack said something about already searching the accused when he had arrested him. As is evident from this example, PC Jack continues to make mistakes on basic tasks and has not learned from these mistakes.

FEDERAL STATUTES

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack continues to have a working knowledge of the offences that he encounters. He still has difficulty converting that book knowledge into practice on the road. He continues to be very hesitant with making a choice on how to proceed with a course of action.

On 10NOV09 PC Jack attended a family dispute call. A son of the complainant was on probation for domestic assault had gotten into a fight with his grandpa, then came to the family residence and was arguing with his father and brothers. PC Jack spoke with the involved parties – he removed the father from the kitchen (more like a suspect than a victim) and then spoke with him in living room. After he was done, PC Jack sat for a minute and then asked the father's permission to speak with his coach officer. The father appeared very confused as to why PC Jack would ask this. At no point did PC Jack ask about the status of the grandpa and whether or not he was injured. Upon going outside to discuss PC Jack advised he was going to arrest the male for breach of probation for not keeping the peace. This was concerning to his coach officer as PC Jack had just been reprimanded for doing the exact same thing on his previous shift. He had been given direction about not laying this type of charge as the courts would not proceed with them. PC Jack was asked how he could be doing this again with the same charge – he was asked if he hadn't learnt something from the previous call and said he needed to think for a moment. It was clear that PC Jack was uncertain what to do with the occurrence. His coach officer had to tell him his options and then have him decide. PC Jack also told the father that they could have a no alcohol condition placed on their son. His coach told PC Jack that he needed to correct this statement because he had told them incorrect information. PC Jack denied saying it this way but just prior to leaving the father asked how they could get the condition added that PC Jack had talked about – PC Jack's coach explained to the complainant that the information was incorrect and they apologized.

ORAL

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has not shown improvement in this area. He speaks professionally to others however still needs to work on sorting through the information he is given. He needs to focus on asking more detailed questions in order to get the answers he needs. His use of templates for questioning has caused him to miss relevant points specific to each individual case. When dealing with fellow officers, for some reason he will omit information given to him when he is asking for help or direction from another.

On 28NOV09 PC Jack was stopped along the side of County Road 6 when an elderly male parked behind him and approached PC Jack on the drivers side. The male advised that he had seen PC Jack pull out of Little Chipmunk Drive and that he had friends who are in Florida and he looks after their house. He wanted to make sure the police weren't at their home for something that was wrong. PC Jack was trying to tell the male to move in front of the cruiser for his safety but the male did not understand and continued with his story. It was clear that everything was fine and the male started to walk back to his car when PC Jack told him to wait so he could talk him. His coach officer told PC Jack that everything was fine and PC Jack said he didn't have all the details about what was going on. His coach officer told PC Jack to just let the male leave but PC Jack proceeded to exit the cruiser – he came back shortly and said that he just wanted to move the male between or in front of the cars because it was safer as he had been taught. His coach agreed that this was correct however because he was unable to explain what he wanted in the first place to the man, the man had already given PC Jack all the information. PC Jack had made the situation worse – in 20 seconds his coach explained to PC Jack everything that the man said. PC Jack had not heard any of this because he was so focussed on trying to have the man move instead of ending the whole situation quickly.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack has no trouble using the proper codes and pays close attention to how he speaks on the radio. His troubles begin when he is under pressure. He forgets at times to update the dispatcher with what he is doing and where he is going. He still has trouble with listening to the radio when he is distracted by a conversation or task.

On 24NOV09 and 02DEC09 while at busy collision scenes, at times PC Jack missed responding to calls from his dispatcher while in the process of completing other tasks.

DECISIVE INSIGHT

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

This category has shown no improvement as well. The comments from previous months still apply - unless the situation is identical to one that he has experienced before, PC Jack struggles with coming to a decision about what to do.

On 13NOV09 PC Jack had a vehicle approach him within his lane of traffic. PC Jack appeared very nervous, he recognized the car was in his lane but just moved over and let it go by. It was like he knew he wanted to do something but couldn't decide what to do. His coach officer told him to turn around immediately and stop the vehicle. While doing this his coach officer noticed the car turn into a driveway. This was pointed out to PC Jack and he made a turn directly towards the ditch, about 150ft short of the driveway. When the cruiser tires touched the gravel shoulder PC Jack stopped, then drove up the shoulder until he reached the driveway.

ANALYTICAL THINKING

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still struggles at piecing things together at his calls. He still is very methodical and systematic in his approach but has trouble sorting out the information.

On 23NOV09 PC Jack came upon a disabled motor vehicle on County Road 2. PC Jack stopped to ask the driver if she was okay and she stated she had someone coming. PC Jack did not make any inquiries about the vehicle or what she was stopped for, just drove away. It was explained by his coach officer that the situation could now result in an abandoned vehicle. Checks later in the day revealed that the vehicle was in fact abandoned. This could have been prevented had some basic questions been covered off and thought through at the time.

RESOLUTION

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still has trouble determining what is the most appropriate solution to a problem he faces. He still either states that he does not know what to do and waits to be told, or he shows a lack of confidence in trusting that his decision is correct.

The example used under Federal Statutes is applicable in this category as well. Though he knew from one shift prior that he was not to follow one course of action, PC Jack chose to use the exact same course of action again. PC Jack gave incorrect information and advice to the complainant, and also waited for his coach officer to provide the solution to him.

PERSONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack willingly admits to having problem areas and understands the identified concerns. However, he still has trouble accepting personal ownership for them. At first he would blame another officer, then he would suggest that his problems arise from the circumstances he is placed into. If a problem is detected or questioned, he will now say it is due to being forced to think when he is tired or not feeling well. If he has several things to do at once he will say that he can't be expected to do many things at once and that is why things fall apart.

FLEXIBILITY

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack struggles the minute the situation becomes stressful. Given a template to follow, he does well at completing one task at a time. When asked to multitask, everything falls apart.

On 19NOV09 PC Jack met with Sergeant Butorac and his coach officer for a progress review. PC Jack discussed some of his struggles and advised that he felt he would be fine if he was by himself and not under the pressure of being with his coach. It was re-iterated to him that stress and pressure were parts of the job and he needed to be able to perform under these situations as well. PC Jack commented how he forwards emails and work to his house so he can work on them without distraction claiming that there is always too much going on around him at the office and pressure to be out on the road. The example mentioned under Decisive Insight is useful here as well - when things got stressful in that situation, PC Jack drove the cruiser directly towards the ditch as opposed to the driveway of the residence.

On 24NOV09 PC Jack attended a collision scene in which a truck had gone off the road into a ditch. PC Jack advised he wanted to gather all the information and that he had all the documents. He was told to go sit in the cruiser and complete forms while his coach would assist with removal of vehicle. He was also told to call the sergeant in regards to the ministry of environment (MOE). After some time, he was checked on by his coach officer for an update. PC Jack advised that the MOE had called but he told them to call back as he had no information and was busy with statements. His coach officer confirmed with him that he already knew about the spill as they had discussed this prior to him starting his reports. PC Jack and his coach officer then switched spots so PC Jack could be near the actual scene. PC Jack was indecisive with what he needed to do and claimed he misunderstood instructions on where to park cruiser to the block road, etc. He was also talked to about why he wouldn't interrupt his coach to change positions as the MOE call was more important than a witness statement.

RESPECTFUL RELATIONS

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still has the first part of this category covered well. He is polite and cooperative and has the ability to be compassionate to those in need. His biggest challenge has been with information sharing and trust.

On 19NOV09 PC Jack had a meeting with Sergeant Butorac and his coach officer..

In this meeting PC Jack advised that he had concerns over what was being written for examples in evaluations. He advised that perhaps examples were being used that he didn't agree with in order to protect against any future problems. PC Jack felt that all examples were negative and positive things were not documented enough. He was assured that only his interests were at hand in both his Sergeants and coaches attempts to help him pass.

SELF-CONFIDENCE

Does Not Meet Requirements

Specific example:

PC Jack still shows limited confidence with what he is doing both at calls and at the office. He is constantly encouraged to make a decision instead of relying on others to give him the answers. He struggles with this though because he is afraid of making a mistake.

On 27NOV09 PC Jack conducted a traffic stop on County Road 8. There was a motor vehicle that was driving 55km/h in an 80km/h zone for over 5 minutes. His coach officer observed the vehicle to be weaving as well. It took all this time for PC Jack to then ask if he should stop the vehicle. PC Jack was told that it would have been stopped 5 minutes ago if his coach officer was driving.

One thing is plainly evident in the excerpts from my 3 PERs prepared by PC Nie's that I have presented:

The skill of the terminator was further honed to be used once again in the not too distant future by virtue of S/Sgt. Campbell request for my chronology so that it could be used for a similar situation in Parry Sound.

(December 16, 2009) (Volume 2, N-37):

From: Campbell, Ron (JUS)
Sent: December 16, 2009 7:38 AM
To: Nie, Richard (JUS)
Subject: Re Chronology

Rich I was hopeful I could have a copy of the final chronology for Mike Jack. We may be starting on a similar one in Parry Sound tks and Merry Christmas. Ron

MAFIA!!!