BOX

16

FOLDER

169

Police, Dept. of-Civil Service

1913

MUNICIPAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

299 BROADWAY, 11TH FLOOR.

OFFICE OF CHIEF EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, March 13, 1913. 191

Plumbers
3/16/13

To
His Honor, The Mayor:

S i r : -

In response to your letter of the 4th instant, accompanying copy of letter of Mr. Albert de Roode to the Hon. Emory R. Buckner, Counsel to the Aldermanic Investigating Committee, together with certain recommendations made by him as to the personnel and civil service features of the Police Department, I have the honor to report as follows:

Mr. de Roode recommends:

1. That the eligible list for Patrolman should not continue for longer than the one year minimum prescribed by law and that examination for Patrolman should, so far as practicable, be held regularly each year.

In answer to this recommendation: The attached schedule shows the dates, number of applications and other particulars regarding examinations for Patrolman since February 1, 1906. It appears from this schedule that the longest time that has elapsed between these examinations is one year and four months and the shortest time one year and one month. The eligible lists resulting from these examinations have lasted from one

year and one month to one year and four months. Actual conditions practically agree with the recommendations made by Mr. de Roode. There is nothing to indicate that any advantage would be gained by terminating a list from one month to four months earlier than is the present practice.

Mr. de Roode recommends:

> 2. That promotion lists in the Police Department should not continue for more than one year and, so far as practicable, promotion examinations should be held regularly each year.

In answer, I beg to state that no reasons are advanced in the recommendation that promotion lists should not continue for longer than one year. Practically the same persons would be examined and there is nothing, in my judgment, in the way of argument or experience to indicate that the result would be different in a second examination than in the first.

The following concrete example is presented of what the change would mean in the work of this Commission: An examination for promotion to the rank of Sergeant is now being held at the Grand Central Palace to cover three days, March 12, 13 and 14. This is the only hall in the City large enough to accomodate the applicants for this examination.

The rent of the hall is $200. a day. If it is necessary to use electric light during the examination the cost is $22.50 an hour. The examination lasts from 9:30 A. M. until 4:30 P. M., or, seven hours. As it is generally necessary to use artificial light, the cost for light will be $155.50 a day. The cost of rental and light per day is, therefore, $355.50, or, $1,066.50 for three days.

There were 5,042 applicants for examination for Sergeant of whom 4,062 have been notified to appear. There are four subjects of examination. There will, therefore, be approximately 16,000 papers to be rated out of the examination. This number is given owing to the fact that there are comparatively few absentees from examination for promotion in the Police Department. Assuming that thirty-five papers will be rated a day- a fair estimate, in my opinion - there will be approximately 460 days of the time of examiners, at $10. a day,or $4,600. for the rating of papers. The cost of Monitors and Examiners assigned on the days of the examination will be approximately $450. a day, or, $1350. for the three days. The cost of the actual examination will therefore be over $7,000., which does not include the amount expended in the preparation of questions, stationery used in the examination, postage and clerical service in connection with the receipt of applications, the preparation of eligible lists,etc.

Then there is the question of appeals from the ratings of examiners in this examination, -a very important matter in which the time of one Commissioner is given up largely to the business of hearing appeals on the reports of examiners after examination of the appeal and a re-examination of the candidate's papers, the candidate appealing being present, so that he may thoroughly appreciate the deficiency of his answers, on which his appeal is usually denied. I regard this as one of the best phases of Civil Service work, because a candidate is made to understand

that he is fairly dealt with and the Commission usually receives his admission that he has obtained in ratings all that he was entitled to. Incidentally, I may say that there is always a large number of appeals out of promotion examinations in the Police Department. The hearing of appeals out of an examination as large as that for Sergeant covers a great deal of time and necessitates the employment of a large part of the time of Commissioners and Examiners in dispatching this work. It would be fair to assume, therefore, that the entire cost of the examination will approximate between $12,000. and $15000.

In addition, there would be required examinations for promotion to the ranks of Lieutenant and Captain.

Besides the additional expense to the Commission under the proposed recommendation, a great part of the time of the Examiners would be occupied in the preparation and rating of examinations in the Police Department alone. All candidates for examination would lose at least two days a year under the proposed recommendation; one for the physical examination and the other for the mental examination. In an examination in which there was a large number of candidates, such as the examination for Sergeant, at least six months would elapse from the time applications were filed until the eligible list was promulgated. It would be necessary, therefore, to begin to receive applications for a new examination within five or six months from the date of the promulgation

of a list. Assuming that 10,000 men in the Police Department were being examined each year, - apart from the great expense and practical difficulties, which, from my point of view, are unwarranted on any facts before me or within my experience,- it is worth noting that 20,000 days of police duty would be lost to the City, or all of the time of 50 men for each of the 365 days of the year. It might be that the benefits to be derived would offset all of the objections referred to, which, I am perfectly willing to admit, are not insurmountable. In order to have a profitable consideration of the subject I would suggest that Mr. de Roode be requested to submit a statement showing the benefits to be derived should his recommendations be adopted.

Mr. de Roode recommends:

> 3. That more scrutiny should be paid to the fitness of appointees during the probationary period and the investigation as to their character should be made jointly by the Civil Service Commission and the Police Department during this period.

In answer to this recommendation I beg to state that the character of all candidates for Patrolman is at present searchingly investigated by this Commission previous to certification for appointment. Such investigation is supposed to be completed at this time.

In accordance with the provisions of Rule XI., paragraph 2, the period of probation for the position of Patrolman is six months, during which time the Police Department may make such further investigation as it wishes, previous to permanent appointment. Further investigation by this Commission during

the probationary period would appear to be unwise and unnecessary under present conditions.

From my point of view there would be considerable objection to having an investigation of character made jointly by the Police Department and the Civil Service Commission. Formerly, the Police Department made the investigation into the character of candidates for Patrolman. This work was subsequently transferred to the Civil Service Commission and I believe that it can be done more thoroughly and impartially by the Civil Service Commission than by the Police Department. I believe that the Police Department should not want to divide responsibility in so important a matter with the Civil Service Commission and that the best results can be obtained by adhering to the present practice than by making the change suggested by Mr. de Roode.

When the Civil Service Commission certifies a man for appointment to the Police Department, it means that that man has passed a most searching medical and physical test; that he has passed a good mental test for intelligence and judgment and that his character, after careful scrutiny, is good. During his probationary period it is the particular duty of his superior officers in the Police Department to watch over him and note his good and bad points and, if he prove deficient, it seems to me that these superior officers must be the best judges. When the Civil Service Commission turns the candidate over to the Police Department, its work is done. It has neither the facilities nor the opportunities to pass upon the merit or demerit of this

candidate to the same degree as the Police Department, in which nearly all his time is spent during such probationary period.

Mr. de Roode recommends:

> 4. That a probationary period should be prescribed for promotion, or provision should be made for reduction in grade upon the basis of service record.

In answer to this recommendation I beg to state that a probationary period in promotion examinations would, first of all, necessitate a change in the present law. The same statement applies to the recommendation for reduction in grade upon the basis of service record. The matter, therefore, does not properly come within the province of this Commission. The theory of civil service is that a man is promoted as the result of an examination in which fitness is tested as concerns physical and mental qualifications, efficiency and conduct (the efficiency and conduct being rated on his service in the department) and a superior officer should not be allowed, except for the best of reasons, to reverse that judgment. I can see wherein a probationary period for promotion might result in great abuse on the part of superiors who, for whim or grievance might demote men, making conditions in the department more serious than under the present practice regarding promotions. On the other hand, a man demoted who has obtained his promotion from a high place on an eligible list as a result of examination, is, in my judgment, apt to prove a poor policeman and to have little interest in his work. If he were demoted for reasons that were not of the best his demotion ought to have a demoralizing effect upon the men in the department.

Mr. de Roode recommends:

> 7. That more thorough and adequate service or efficiency records should be kept under the supervision of a central board in the Police Department, subject, so far as they affect promotion examinations, to the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

In answer to this recommendation I beg to state that no plan or scheme for keeping such records has been outlined by Mr. de Roode. It is impossible, therefore, to pass definitely upon the practicability of adopting the recommendation. Some years ago a system of efficiency records was adopted for the Police and Fire Departments which was somewhat similar to that required in the case of other employes in the Competitive Class. The plan, however, was based entirely upon theory and did not take into account actual conditions in the Police Department. It was never used in promotion examinations and was finally abandoned for the reason that it was plain, under its provisions, no benefits would be derived and it was possible that grave injustice might be done.

It should be remembered that the official conduct of members of the uniformed police force is regulated by certain Rules, for violation of which charges are preferred. In the absence of charges it must be assumed that the conduct and efficiency of members are satisfactory. If charges are brought against members of the force, a trial is given, at which the charges are either upheld or dismissed. In the case of proven charges, a certain percentage is deducted from the record of candidates in promotion examinations. If a candidate is

rewarded officially for meritorius service, his conduct is deemed to be above the average and he receives credit for such rewards in these examinations.

The present system has not been criticized, to the best of my knowledge, by candidates in examinations.

It should be borne in mind that the members of the police force are assigned to different duties. The vast majority are assigned to precinct duty in uniform. Some, however are assigned to plain clothes duty in the Detective Bureau and others are detailed for work of a special character, as in the Departments of Parks and Bridges, the Sanitary Squad of the Health Department, the Tenement House Department, etc. The conditions of employment in precincts throughout the several boroughs are dissimilar.

If Mr. de Roode can devise a more thorough and adequate service record than the present method, it would, of course, be deserving of the greatest consideration, provided it could be shown that the plan was not based entirely upon theory.

Several schemes for rating records for promotion examinations have been devised,but upon investigation based upon knowledge of actual conditions, have been found to be without value and impracticable and tend to defeat the very ends for which they were formulated. I can conceive of no scheme of service record for promotion examinations that can be as reliable as the present plan of rating a man on the actual conditions of his service in the department and I should prefer, from a civil service point of view-

anxious to get not only the best but the most just result out of an examination - to take the record of a policeman as it now stands in the books of the department from the day of his entrance on the force to the present, with his fines and penalties, his rewards and medals dealt out to him, by the present method of trial or hearing. I think it would be extremely dangerous, in the matter of the service record for a policeman, to rely on the private judgment of a superior officer or board. It certainly opens up, in my view, the way to great abuse. The service record to-day, if it contains demerits, is made after a trial at which the officer has been served with charges and has been given an opportunity to defend himself. In case of reward, a commendation or medal is given after inquiry by the proper superior officers of the Police Department. The present practice, so far as I am aware, meets with the approval of the men in the department. I feel sure that if the present system were not the best that could be devised, its deficiencies would have been plainly pointed out long before this. That it does satisfy the members of the department is the best recommendation.

Mr.de Roode recommends:

> 8. That service as Patrolman should be for a period of five years only, except where aPatrolman has been promoted or attained a place on a promotion list or where the service record of a Patrolman comes up to the standard prescribed from time to time.
>
> In other words, only those persons shall be retained as Patrolnen after five years who have shown themselves fit for higher positions or whose record shows that they are capable of superior service as Patrolmen.

In answer to this recommendation, I beg to state that it is my judgment that a Patrolman may do excellent service in the

ranks and still not be fitted for command. It is a well known and recognized fact that some of the most efficient Patrolmen have never been able, under the present system, to obtain a higher rank in the department. However, a Patrolman who has not shown himself capable of superior service may be dismissed from the department on charges under the present Rules.

The other recommendations in the memorandum of Mr. de Roode do not concern civil service but are rather connected with the administration of the Police Department and require changes in the law to carry them into effect. As to those recommendations which concern police administration I take it that you do not desire my opinion.

Very truly yours,

Jana Gallagher

President.

PATROLMAN

Date of receipt of applications--	Feb. 1 to March 31, 1906.
No. of applications received-----	5815.
Date of examination----------	Sept. 12, 1906.
No. notified for mental---------	1937.
Date of List----------	Jan. 12, 1907.
No. on list----------	1459.
No. appointed from list---------	1312.
Date of last appointment---------	April 2, 1908.

PATROLMAN

Date of receipt of applications--	Sept. 16, to Oct. 12, 1907.
No. of applications received-----	3665.
Date of examination----------	January 22, 1908.
No. notified for mental---------	1448.
Date of List----------	April 3, 1908.
No. on list----------	989.
No. appointed from list---------	829.
Date of last appointment---------	April 5, 1909.

PATROLMAN.

Date of receipt of applications---	Nov. 4 to Dec. 5, 1908.
No. of applications received-----	3263.
Date of examination----------	April 13, 1909.
No. notified for mental---------	1099.
Date of List----------	May 24, 1909.
No. on list----------	754.
No. appointed from list---------	628.
Date of last appointment---------	May 24, 1910.

PATROLMAN

Date of receipt of applications--	August 23 to Dec. 31, 1909.
No. of applications received-----	1997.
Date of examination----------	May 10, 1910.
No. notified for mental---------	756.
Date of list----------	June 18, 1910.
No. on list----------	638.
No. appointed from list---------	565.
Date of last appointment---------	Sept. 11, 1911.

PATROLMAN

Date of receipt of applications---	February 7 to Nov. 2, 1910.
No. of applications received------	3020.
Date of examination----------	August 1, 1911.
No. notified for mental---------	1327.
Date of list----------	Oct. 2, 1911.
No. on list----------	1039.
No. appointed from list----------	923.
Date of last appointment----------	Dec. 24, 1912.

Present eligible list January 30, 1913.

PROMOTION TO CAPTAIN-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Nov. 2, 1899.
Date of List---------	Nov.24, 1900.
No. of Applications Filed	173.
No. Notified for Mental	173.
No. on list----------	116.
No. promoted---------	18.
Last promotion-------	Feb.19, 1901.

PROMOTION TO CAPTAIN-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Nov. 15, 1901.
Date of List---------	June 6, 1902.
No.of Applications Filed	203.
No.Notified for Mental	202.
No. on list----------	93.
No.promoted----------	72.
Last promotion-------	Oct. 31, 1905.

PROMOTION TO CAPTAIN-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Oct. 17, 1906.
Date of List---------	Dec. 1, 1906.
No. of Applications Filed	439.
No. notified for mental	381.
No. on list----------	326.
No. promoted---------	35.
Last promotion-------	April 14,1910.

PROMOTION TO CAPTAIN-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Nov. 21 & 22, 1910.
Date of List---------	January 20, 1911.
No. of applications filed	422.
No. notified for mental	390.
No. on list----------	190.
No. promoted---------	36.
Last promotion-------	February 20, 1913. (List still exists)

PROMOTION TO SERGEANT-POLICE DEPT.

Date of Examination--	May 3 & July 29,	1902.
Date of List---------	Sept. 12,	1902.
No. of applications filed		2196.
No. notified for mental		1845.
No. on list----------		257.
No. promoted---------		253.
Last promotion-------	May 6,	1904.

PROMOTION TO SERGEANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Dec. 29,	1903.
Date of List---------	April 26,	1904.
No. of applications filed---		2321.
No. notified for mental--		2058.
No. on list----------		979.
No. promoted---------		351.
Last promotion-------	April 22,	1908.

PROMOTION TO SERGEANT-POLICE DEPT.

Date of Examination--	May 19,	1908.
Date of List---------	Jan. 13,	1909.
No. of applications filed		3352.
No. notified for mental		3195.
No. on list----------		1784.
No. promoted---------		405.
Last promotion	Jan. 13,	1913.

PROMOTION TO LIEUTENANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Nov. 17, 1899.
Date of List---------	Dec. 26, 1900.
No. of Applications Filed	278.
No. Notified for Mental	278.
No. on List----------	225.
No. promoted---------	59.
Last promotion-------	Feb. 19, 1901.

PROMOTION TO LIEUTENANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Oct. 1, 1902.
Date of List---------	Dec.19, 1902.
No. of Applications Filed	275.
No. Notified for Mental	269.
No. on List----------	94.
No. promoted---------	91.
Last promotion ------	July 1, 1903.

PROMOTION TO LIEUTENANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	March 4, 1903.
Date of List---------	Aug. 20, 1903.
No. of Applications Filed	180.
No. Notified for Mental	171.
No. on List----------	82.
No. promoted---------	66.
Last promotion-------	Oct. 6, 1905.

PROMOTION TO LIEUTENANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Sept. 12, 1905.
Date of List---------	Nov. 11, 1905.
No. of Applications Filed	380.
No. Notified for Mental	366.
No. on List----------	195.
No. promoted--------	185.
Last promotion------	June 23, 1909.

PROMOTION TO LIEUTENANT-POLICE DEPARTMENT

Date of Examination--	Nov. 22, 1909.
Date of List---------	April 20,1910.
No. of Applications Filed	526.
No. Notified for Mental	511.
No. on list----------	142.
No. promoted---------	116.
Last promotion-------	Feb.20, 1913. (Still in existence)

NEW YORK April 10, 1913.

Hon. William J. Gaynor,
Mayor of the City of New York,
City Hall, New York City.

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the Civil Service Reform Association, I would respectfully ask that you should refuse to accept for the City Assembly Bill Printed No. 1117 (Introductory No. 289), introduced by Mr. Ingram, which has passed both branches of the legislature.

This bill amends section 1543-a of the New York charter by giving to the police commissioner or the fire commissioner the "power in his discretion to rehear the charges upon which a member of the uniformed force of the police or fire department, as the case may be, has been . . . reduced from the position or rank theretofore held by him."

Under the provisions of section 1543-a the police commissioner or the fire commissioner already has the power, with the consent of the Mayor, to grant a rehearing in cases of dismissal from the uniformed force. The proposed amendment, therefore, adds to this power of rehearing by including not only cases of dismissal, but also of reduction in position or rank.

Such legislation would, in our opinion, be detrimental to the discipline of the departments. The bill would give the commissioners power to take up cases of men reduced in rank or position without regard to the length of time which has elapsed since the reduction was made, provided application is made within one year of the passage of the bill. In the lapse of years the evidence upon which the man was reduced may have completely disappeared and the witnesses may have died or moved away. The passage of this bill would permit rehearings in such cases as this.

No class of civil employees except veterans are as well protected today against unjust removal and unfair discipline as policemen and firemen. They are entitled to a trial before removal or reduction can be made and may seek a review from the courts. To have the action of a commissioner in disciplining a member of the uniformed force for violation of regulations of the department reviewed by his successor in office, who may be of the opposite political party, could not fail to injure the discipline of the department.

Respectfully yours,

Robt. W. Belcher

Secretary.

April 11, 1913. d

Dear Mr. Curran:

Since the hearing on bills yesterday, the police force has had its side of the argument put before me on the bill allowing a rehearing in cases of reduction of rank as well as of dismissal. There is much in what you say. It might be well to do away with all rehearings by the Commissioner, inasmuch as a hearing may be had in the courts. But so long as the method of a rehearing by the Police Commissioner shall remain, I see no objection to allowing a rehearing also in cases of reduction in rank.

Very truly yours,

Mayor.

Hon. Henry H. Curran,
Chairman Finance Committee,
Board of Aldermen,
New York City.

★124-2-13(B) 15000

MUNICIPAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

HR

299 BROADWAY, 11TH FLOOR.

COMMISSIONERS.

FRANK GALLAGHER, PRESIDENT.
RICHARD WELLING.
ALEXANDER KEOGH.

FRANK A. SPENCER, SECRETARY.
JOHN F. SKELLY, ASST. SECRETARY.

NEW YORK, July 8th, 1913. 191___

Hon. William J. Gaynor,

Mayor.

Sir:-

A letter was handed to me today signed by Henry Bruere, Esq., Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research, stating that you requested that he make inquiry as to the reasons for the falling off of the number of applicants for admission to the examinations for Patrolman, Police Department and requesting that he take the matter up with me.

I had noticed, prior to the receipt of this letter, certain statements in the civil service papers to the effect that the number of applicants for this position had decreased, particularly because of the initial salary paid. These statements are not in accord with the facts. I enclose a tabulation which I caused to be prepared showing the number of applications received for Patrolmen from 1905 to 1913; the number of candidates passing the medical, physical and mental examinations and other data of interest in this connection. You will note that between January 2, 1912 and February 1, 1913, applications were opened for two examinations for Patrolmen.

In the first examination 3,229 candidates made application and in the second 3,032 candidates. This means that, practically within a year, we have had applications from 6,261 candidates for this position. Each of these examinations, so far as the number of applications received is concerned, compares favorably with the examinations held in 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910. The number is lower than for the years 1905 and 1906, but, if we take the two examinations together, they having both occurred practically within a year, we will find that the number is in excess of any year from 1905 down to 1912.

I understood from Mr. Stover, who presented the letter from Mr. Bruere, that it is the intention of the Bureau of Municipal Research to report the information to you.

Very truly yours,

Frank Parsons

President.

YEAR.	RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS.				MED. & PHYSICAL RESULTS.			MENTAL EXAMINATION RESULTS.			DATE OF EXAMINATION.	DATE OF ELIGIBLE LIST.	TIME TAKEN IN RATING PAPERS.	REMARKS	
	Number Filed.	Opening Date.	Closing Date.	Length of Period.	Notified.	Failed.	Passed.	Notified.	Failed.	Passed.				Minimum Age.	Birth Requirements
1905	6,191	Feb. 15	Mar. 15	28 days	6,191	3,808	2,383	2,383	1,212	1,171	June 1,1905	Aug.24,05	85 days	21	None
1906	5,815	Feb. 1	Mar. 31	59 days	5,815	3,878	1,937	1,937	478	1,459	Sept.12,06	Jan.12,07	123 days	21	None
1907	3,665	Sept.16	Oct. 12	27 days	3,665	2,217	1,448	1,448	461	987	Jan.22, 08	Apr. 3,08	73 days	21	None
1908	3,263	Nov. 4	Dec. 5	32 days	3,263	2,164	1,099	1,099	345	754	Apr. 13,09	May 24,09	42 days	23	None
1909	1,997	Aug. 23	Dec. 31	141 days	1,997	1,241	756	756	118	638	May 10,10	June 18,10	40 days	23	Certificate Required.
1910	3,020	Feb. 7	Nov. 2	269 days	3,020	1,693	1,327	1,327	291	1,036	Aug. 1,11	Oct. 2,11	63 days	21	Certificate Required.
1911	NO. APPLICATIONS RECEIVED DURING THE YEAR.														
1912	3,229	Jan. 2	Feb. 15,	45 days	3,229	1,993	1,236	1,236	172	1,064	Oct. 24,12	Jan.30,13	101 days	21	Certificate Required.
1913	3,032	Feb. 1	Mar. 19,	47 days	3,032	2,210	822	822	IN COURSE OF RATING.		June 23,13			*	Certificate Required.

* Minimum age 21 years at time of Mental Examination, and 29 years at time of filing application.

TELEPHONE 5860 BARCLAY

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

261 BROADWAY, NEW YORK August 12, 1913.

Honorable William J. Gaynor,
Mayor, New York, N.Y.

My dear Mr. Mayor:

As you requested, we have made an examination of the number of applications filed for the position of patrolman to learn whether a decrease has occurred in the number of applications,and,if occurring, what is the explanation of it.

We find that the number of applications has not varied greatly since 1903 except in the years 1905, 1906 and 1909. In 1913, 1912, 1910 and 1908 the figures were approximately the same, being in the neighborhood of 3,000. This is shown on the attached statement entitled: "Applications for Position of Patrolman made to the Civil Service Commission."

We have concluded from our examination that the falling off from 3,263 in 1908 to 1,997 in 1909 wasdue

(1) to increase in minimum height from 5 feet, 7 inches to 5 feet, 8 inches (reduced in 1910 to 5 feet 7½ inches).

(2) to increase in minimum age limit from 21 to 23 years, reduced now again to 21 years.

(3) to birth certificate requirement put in force in 1909. The effect of this requirement has worn off due to increased familiarity and consequent preparation to meet it.

(4) to competition of requests for applications for position of fireman, 4,505 applications for position of fireman being received in the same year; examination held August 4th-6th.

Table 2 of the number of failures shows that since 1908 failures in the physical examination have been in the following percentages of the total number of applications received:

1908.....	.663
1909.....	.621
1910.....	.558
1912.....	.617
1913.....	.728

and the failures in the mental examination for the same period were:

1v

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

261 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

Hon. W. J. G. #2. -8/12/13.

1908.............	.105
1909.............	.059
1910.............	.96
1912.............	.053

It will be seen that there is not much variation in the percentage of failures with the exception of physical, which increased notably in 1913. We have made a detailed analysis of the various aspects of this question and should be very glad to furnish you any further information that you may care to have with respect to it. We believe, however, that there is no evidence that a serious condition exists such as you thought existed, and which you afterwards said Commissioner Gallagher said did not exist.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Bruère

Director.

Enc. 1.

B-S

APPLICATIONS FOR POSITION OF PATROLMAN made to the CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Year	No. of days Applications were open	No. of Applications	Falling off in Applicants from 1905	from 1906	from 1907	from 1908	from year preceding	
1903	31) 112)	4303) 1970)						
1904								
1905	28	6191	376				82	(from 1903)
1906	59	5815	376				376	
1907	27	3665	2526	2150			2150	
1908	32	3263	2928	2552	402		402	
1909	141	1997	4194	3818	1668	1266	1266	
1910	269	3020	3171	2795	645	243		(gain 1023)
1911								
1912	45	3229	2963	2586	436	34		(gain 209) over 1910
1913	47	3032	3159	2783	633	231	197	

Date of Examination	Time between Examinations. Years	Months
June 10, 1903		
October 20, 1903	[illegible]	4 plus
June 1, 1905	1	8 plus
September 12, 1906	1	3 plus
January 22, 1908	1	4 plus
April 13, 1909	1	3-
May 10, 1910	1	1-
August 1, 1911	1	3-
October 24, 1912	1	2-
June 23, 1913		8

GHS
7/22/13

Number of Failures in Examinations

for Patrolmen

Year	No. of applications	Med. and physical	Number failed examinations	%	Mental	%	% of those taking mental examination who failed
1905	6191	3808	.615 +	1212	.195 +	.508 +
1906	5815	3878	.666 +	478	.082 +	.753 +
1907	3665	2217	.605 +	461	.125 +	.318 +
1908	3263	2164	.663 +	345	.105 +	.314 +
1909	1997	1241	.621 +	118	.059 +	.156 +
1910	3020	1693	.558 +	291	.096 +	.219 +
1911						
1912	3229	1993	.617 +	172	.053 +	.139 +
1913	3032	2210	.728 +			

GHS/G
7/23/13

TELEPHONE 5860 BARCLAY

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

261 BROADWAY, NEW YORK October 28, 1913

Julian B. Beaty, Esq.,
City Hall,
New York City.

Dear Sir:-

Mr. Harold C. Todd has applied for a position on the staff of this bureau and has given your name as reference. We would be greatly indebted to you if you would supply us with the following information concerning him:

(1) How long and in what capacity have you known him?

(2) Has he good social qualities?

(3) Does he carry an undertaking to a conclusion?

(4) Is he an effective public speaker?

(5) Before what kind of an audience would he make the best impression?

(6) Has he administrative ability?

(7) Has he habits of accuracy?

(8) Does he write good English?

(9) Is he the kind of man who, with training, would make a good secretary to a chamber of commerce, director of a bureau of municipal research, or city administrator?

Is he adaptable?

Are his modes of thought pretty well crystalized, or will he take training readily?

Very truly yours,

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
Per

IF/J