

# Development and Validation of Selection Process

Promotional Exam for Q060 Police Lieutenant



## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
List of Tables.....	5
Introduction .....	8
Section I: Project Background.....	9
Users of the Promotional Testing Results.....	9
San Francisco Police Department.....	9
San Francisco Police Department – Q060 Lieutenant Job Class.....	9
Project Dates and Locations.....	9
Section II: Problem and Setting.....	11
Section III. Job Analysis.....	12
Job Analysis Definition .....	12
Purpose of a Job Analysis .....	12
Job Analysis Process .....	12
Step 1: Review of Background Materials.....	13
Step 2: Create Job Analysis Plan .....	13
Step 3: Conduct Job Analysis Interviews and Observations .....	14
Step 4: Develop and Administer the Job Analysis Questionnaire.....	16
<i>Development of the Job Analysis Questionnaire.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) Composition.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Task Statement Rating Scales.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Job Duty Areas Comprising Task Statements.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Knowledge Rating Scales.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Knowledge Areas Comprising Knowledge Statements.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Skill and Ability Rating Scales.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Skill/Ability Areas Comprising Skill and Ability Statements.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Percent of Job Covered Rating.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Relative Importance of Job Duty Areas.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Development of the Linkage Analysis Questionnaire (LAQ) .....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Skill/Ability Linkage.....</i>	<i>22</i>

<i>Skill/Ability Linkage Rating Scale</i> .....	24
<i>Knowledge Linkage</i> .....	24
<i>Knowledge Linkage Rating Scale</i> .....	24
<i>Administration of the Job Analysis Questionnaire and Linkage Analysis Questionnaire</i> .....	25
<i>Sample Information</i> .....	25
<i>Demographic Breakdown</i> .....	25
<i>Data Compilation and Analysis</i> .....	26
<b>Step 5: Job Analysis Results</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<i>Analysis of Task Statements</i> .....	26
<i>Using the Job-Relatedness Matrix to Review Tasks</i> .....	29
<i>Task Statement Results Summary</i> .....	30
<i>Analysis of Knowledge Statements</i> .....	35
<i>Knowledge Statement Results Summary</i> .....	36
<i>Analysis of Skill and Ability Areas</i> .....	38
<i>Skill and Ability Results Summary</i> .....	40
<i>Percent of Job Covered Results</i> .....	43
<i>Relative Importance of Duty Area Results</i> .....	43
<i>Analysis of Linkage Ratings</i> .....	44
<i>Linkage Matrix Results</i> .....	44
<i>Linkage Results and Summary</i> .....	46
<b>Section IV: Selection Procedure and Its Content: Assessment Center</b> .....	<b>48</b>
Introduction to the Assessment Center.....	48
Development of the Assessment Center .....	49
Components of the AC .....	50
<i>Community Meeting</i> .....	51
<i>Field Operations Exercise</i> .....	52
<i>Hot Call Tactical</i> .....	52
<i>In-Basket Presentation</i> .....	52
<i>Sergeant Meeting</i> .....	52
<i>Highly Structured Subordinate Meeting</i> .....	53
Weighting of Each AC Component Dimension.....	53

Weighting of Each AC Component.....	55
Development of Rating Criteria for Dimensions.....	56
AC Exercise Validation Process.....	57
<i>Exercise Modified Content Validity Ratio (CVR)</i> .....	57
<i>Exercise Fidelity Ratings</i> .....	58
<i>Exercise Differentiation</i> .....	59
<i>Exercise Criteria Differentiation</i> .....	59
<i>Rating Criteria</i> .....	60
Administration of the AC and the Rating Process .....	63
<i>Test Preparation Guide</i> .....	63
<i>Assessor Training</i> .....	63
<i>Administration of the AC</i> .....	65
<i>Ratings and Scoring Process</i> .....	65
Section V: Q060 Lieutenant Assessment Center Results .....	65
Section VI: Contact Information .....	67
Section VII: Accuracy and Completeness.....	68
Section VIII: References.....	69

## List of Tables

Table 1. Project Plan Timeline for the SFPD Lieutenant Promotional Process .....	9
Table 2. Job Analysis Plan.....	14
Table 3. Questions Used During Job Analysis Interviews .....	14
Table 4. Job Analysis Interview Demographics .....	16
Table 5. Scales Used for Rating Job Tasks on the JAQ .....	17
Table 6. Job Duty Areas and Associated Number of Task Statements.....	18
Table 7. Scales Used for Rating Knowledge Areas .....	18
Table 8. Organization of Knowledge Area Statements.....	19
Table 9. Scales Used for Rating Skill and Ability Areas .....	20
Table 10. Organization of Skill/Ability Statements .....	21
Table 11. Percent of Job Covered Rating Scale .....	21
Table 12. Composition of Skill/Ability Areas included in the LAQ.....	23
Table 13. Scale Used for Linking Skill and Ability Areas on the LAQ .....	24
Table 14. Scale Used for Linking Knowledge Areas on the LAQ.....	24
Table 15. Participant Demographics for JAQ Survey Type.....	25
Table 16. Percent Essential Categories.....	28
Table 17. Job-Relatedness Decision Matrix: Essentiality by Relevance .....	29
Table 18. Job Task Percentages and Number of Tasks by Zone Categorization.....	31
Table 19. Job Relatedness Decision Matrix .....	32
Table 20. Summary of Task RUP Categorization .....	32
Table 21. Abbreviated Rank-Ordered RUP Tasks .....	33
Table 22. Summary of Knowledge Differentiation Categorization.....	37
Table 23. Summary of Knowledge RUP Categorization .....	37
Table 24. Abbreviated Rank-ordered RUP Knowledge Areas .....	38
Table 25. Summary of Skill/Ability Differentiation Categorization.....	41
Table 26. Summary of Skill/Ability RUP Categorization .....	41
Table 27. Abbreviated Rank-ordered RUP Skill/Ability Areas.....	42
Table 28. Results from Relative Importance of Duty Area Ratings .....	43
Table 29. Skill/Ability Linkage Matrix .....	45
Table 30. Knowledge Linkage Matrix .....	45
Table 31. Final Skill/Ability Area Analysis/Linkage Study Results .....	46

Table 32. SME Panel - AC Development.....	49
Table 33. Job Duty Areas Sampled by Each Exercise Component.....	50
Table 34. AC Component X Assessment Dimension.....	51
Table 35. Relevance Rating Scale .....	53
Table 36. Average Exercise Dimension Relevance Ratings.....	54
Table 37. Average Dimension Weight x AC Component .....	55
Table 38. Relative Importance of KSA Cluster Results .....	56
Table 39. Final Exercise Weights .....	56
Table 40. Test Exercise-Job Analysis Linkage Meetings .....	57
Table 41. Modified Content Validity Ratio Scale .....	58
Table 42. Average Exercise Content Validity Ratio Results .....	58
Table 43. Exercise Fidelity Rating Scale .....	58
Table 44. Average Exercise Fidelity Results .....	59
Table 45. Exercise Differentiation Rating Scale .....	59
Table 46. Average Exercise Differentiation Results.....	59
Table 47. Exercise Criteria Differentiation Rating Scale.....	60
Table 48. Average Exercise Criteria Differentiation Results.....	60
Table 49. Criteria-Dimension Relevance Rating Scale .....	60
Table 50. Criteria-Exercise High Performance Rating Scale.....	61
Table 51. Criteria-High Job Performance Rating Scale .....	61
Table 52. Criteria-Required Upon Promotion Rating Scale.....	61
Table 53. Summary of Criteria Validation Results .....	62
Table 54. Demographics of Assessors for 2016 Q060 Lieutenant Assessment Center .....	63
Table 55. AC Rating Scale.....	65

## List of Appendices

Appendix A: Final Task Analysis Results .....	70
Appendix B: Complete Rank-ordered RUP Tasks .....	84
Appendix C: Knowledge Analysis Results.....	91
Appendix D: Skill/Ability Analysis Results.....	93
Appendix E: Complete Rank-Ordered RUP Skill/Ability Areas .....	96
Appendix F: Weighted Skill/Ability Linkage Matrix.....	97
Appendix G: Weighted Knowledge Linkage Matrix .....	98

## **Introduction**

This report will show how all critical aspects of the target job are considered in the development and administration of a defensible and reliable selection process. This report as an example is based specifically on the recent selection process for Q060 Police Lieutenant conducted by Industrial Organizational Solutions, Inc. [IOS]. The report is organized in accordance with current federal documentation standards adopted by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Justice (“EEOC”, 1978). The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures are intended to establish a uniform federal position in the area of prohibiting discrimination in employment practices on grounds of race, color, religion, sex or national origin (Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines, 1978; 43 FR 38295, [August 25, 1978]). Adherence to Uniform Guidelines (“EEOC”, 1978) mandates strict documentation of all employment selection procedures and that this information is compiled in a formal technical report in order to permit direct evaluation of the validity of such methods (Section 60-3.15, Uniform Guidelines, 1978; 43 FR 38295, [August 25, 1978]).

The report will present an example of the documentation required by the Uniform Guidelines (“EEOC”, 1978) for the assessment centers developed for the sworn ranks in the Police and Sheriff Departments of the City and County of San Francisco. The report is organized into eight sections, in accordance with the sections dictated in the Uniform Guidelines (“EEOC”, 1978) for reports documenting the content validity of a selection procedure. The report outlines the efforts in developing the assessment center for the SFPD Q060 Lieutenant position.

## **Section I: Project Background**

The following section details the intended end-users of the Q060 promotional process, as well as the context in which the job analysis and validation study were conducted. As such, this section includes identification of the position for which the SFPD testing process is intended to select, the timeframe in which the study took place, and the location of the process.

### **Users of the Promotional Testing Results**

The intended users of this promotional assessment process are those personnel from SFPD and/or the City of San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR herein) selecting for the rank of lieutenant, from those individuals seeking promotion to the rank of lieutenant.

### **San Francisco Police Department**

The City of San Francisco contracted IOS to develop and implement a promotional process for the rank of lieutenant in the SFPD that would be based on data from a job analysis, directly job-related, and meet all federal and professional standards. The SFPD has approximately 1,870 full duty officers assigned to the city. The SFPD is divided into six bureaus: Administration, Airport, Chief of Staff, Field Operations, Professional Standards and Principled Policing, and Special Operations Bureau. The department has 10 stations across the city and serves an estimated population of 883,305, according to the U.S. Census.

### **San Francisco Police Department – Q060 Lieutenant Job Class**

Class Q060 Lieutenants are assigned to stations, to the San Francisco Airport and other assignments throughout the city. According to the Class Specification, the definition of the position is:

“The Lieutenant in the San Francisco Police Department is a mid-level position assigned to the Office of Operations, Office of Administration, or the Office of the Chief of Staff. Essential functions of the position include: directing and coordinating field operations, incidents and events; managing, administering, and documenting station activities; conducting, coordinating, and documenting administrative investigations; training and evaluating personnel; analyzing and formulating operational plans and priorities; interacting with internal and external individuals, organizations, and departments; managing, coordinating, and evaluating investigative operations. Lieutenants routinely perform other law enforcement duties.”

### **Project Dates and Locations**

Table I shows the project outline, including major project steps and dates.

Table I. Project Plan Timeline for the SFPD Lieutenant Promotional Process

<b>Project Step</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
---------------------	----------------

Job Analysis Questionnaire Development, Administration, and Results	July – August 2019
Assessment Development Kickoff Meeting	September 2019
Assessment Development & Validation	September – November 2019
Assessment Center Administration	December 17-18, 2019
Assessment Center Rating	January 6-10, 2020
Candidate Scores Sent to SF DHR	January 2020
Technical Report Sent to SF DHR	February 2020

The job analysis study was completed onsite in San Francisco. All meetings between IOS and the SF DHR were held via conference call. The assessment center was administered at the City and County of San Francisco Employment Test Center in San Francisco, California. Ratings by assessors also took place at the Test Center. All further work, including development of the assessments, printing of materials, scoring of candidate data, and technical report writing were conducted at I/O Solutions in Oak Brook, IL.

## **Section II: Problem and Setting**

The purpose of this project was to develop a custom lieutenant promotional process for SFPD that was fair and objective. The assessments were developed with the current legal guidelines regarding employee selection in mind. The Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 have prompted test users and test developers to carefully examine testing procedures to make sure they conform to current legislation. According to the 1991 Civil Rights Act, it is legally permissible to administer and act upon the results of any test as long as it is job-related and consistent with business necessity. This same principle is applied to any other measures used to make a testing decision, including the use of an assessment center for such purposes. The testing process described herein was developed according to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (1978); the American Psychological Association (APA) Division 14, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology's *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (2003); and the APA, American Educational Research Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education's (Joint Committee) *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999). As previously stated, the purpose of this project was to provide the SFPD with fair and objective assessment processes for the rank of lieutenant which complies with local, state, and national legislation affecting the selection of personnel.

### **Section III. Job Analysis**

This section provides a description of the SFPD lieutenant job analysis study, as well as a summary of the results.

#### **Job Analysis Definition**

Job analysis refers to collecting data about observable job behaviors, and delineating the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics needed to perform the job (Harvey, 1991). To collect this information, subject-matter experts (SMEs herein; supervisors or incumbents of the targeted job class) discuss and evaluate important aspects of the targeted positions.

#### **Purpose of a Job Analysis**

The purpose of a job analysis for SFPD was to determine important aspects of the particular job position of Q060 Lieutenant, such as the work behaviors, knowledge, skills, abilities and physical abilities [KASOs] applicable to the position and the job-relevant tasks that employees in that position are expected to perform. Information regarding the frequency and importance of each aspect of the job position is collected and can be used to determine appropriate personnel testing content; therefore, a job analysis serves as the foundation of test development.

The job analysis is also essential to meeting the legal requirements of personnel testing. *The 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* set forth that content-valid employment tests should have data supporting that the content of the test is representative of the important aspects of the job position (“EEOC”, 1978). These guidelines were established to lay out a framework for fair and equal hiring practices and are supported by the following federal agencies: the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice. The *Uniform Guidelines* emphasize that there should be little difference between test content and knowledge needed to perform the job (“EEOC”, 1978). The job analysis is the documentation needed to demonstrate content validity of personnel tests.

#### **Job Analysis Process**

The job analysis conducted to study the Q060 Lieutenant position involved several critical steps. These steps are summarized below, and explained in more detail in the following sections.

- 1) **Review of background materials**: The first step was to gather and review any relevant existing information on the job. This included existing job descriptions, class specifications for the rank, and any internal department manuals or guidelines.
- 2) **Job analysis plan**: This step involved determining the scope of the project, including the appropriate number of interviews to conduct and questionnaires to distribute, as well as a timeline for the project.

- 3) Job analysis interviews: In this step, incumbents of the rank being studied were interviewed for detailed information about the job, including specific tasks performed; KSAOs required; and the structure of positions within the organization.
- 4) Job analysis questionnaire (JAQ): The interviews and previous job analysis information were used to determine which tasks, duties, and KSAOs should be included in the questionnaire(s). The questionnaire(s) was distributed to incumbents, who rated the:
  - importance and frequency of the tasks performed
  - extent to which tasks are performed upon promotion to the job
  - importance of each KSAO area
  - extent to which KSAOs are required upon promotion to the job
  - extent to which possessing KSAOs is related to successful performance on the job
  - relative importance of the duty areas
  - percentage of the job covered by the questionnaire
  - linkage between job duties and required KSAO areas
- 5) JAQ data analysis and interpretation: The data from the questionnaire(s) were analyzed to determine which KSAOs are most essential (and thus most appropriate for testing) based on their importance, whether they are required upon promotion, and the importance of associated/relevant job duties.

#### Step 1: Review of Background Materials

First, IOS reviewed existing job-relevant information and materials in order to gain a preliminary understanding of the lieutenant rank. This material included the previous job analysis conducted for the SFPD lieutenant rank, and existing job analysis documentation gathered for similar projects.

#### Step 2: Create Job Analysis Plan

Next, a job analysis plan was developed, which outlined the proposed schedule of the job analysis interviews, and job analysis questionnaires to be returned for analysis. This plan indicated the targeted number of SMEs within the SFPD. Demographic data were obtained from IOS' project contact to ensure a representative sample of the SFPD. In determining the appropriate sample, IOS considered department size, total number of incumbents, gender, race, tenure, age, and assignments within the SFPD. The job analysis plan was submitted to DHR, and the SFPD was then responsible for scheduling personnel for the interviews.

IOS communicated the following guidelines to the department regarding the scheduling of incumbents for the interviews and questionnaires:

- When possible, schedule minority group members and over-sample these groups
- When possible, schedule female members and over-sample this group
- Participants should come from a variety of precincts and assignments
- All shifts should be represented in the interview sample

The job analysis plan is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Job Analysis Plan

<b>Job Analysis Plan</b>	<b>Suggested Number of SMEs</b>
Recommended Interviews	10-12 lieutenants
Recommended Job Analysis Questionnaires	All lieutenants invited to participate

Step 3: Conduct Job Analysis Interviews and Observations

The third step required IOS personnel to conduct job analysis phone interviews. The goal of the job interviews was to collect information about tasks and KSAOs that are performed while on the job. An interview protocol was developed containing several questions that IOS job analysts used to guide the interviews. See Table 3 below for the questions that were used for the interviews.

Table 3. Questions Used During Job Analysis Interviews

<b>Main questions used during interviews/observations:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please begin by summarizing the major functional responsibilities of your job. Stated otherwise, describe what you are responsible for and what you do in 30 seconds or less.</li> <li>2. Describe a typical day on the job. I realize there is no such thing as a typical day, but it helps me and people I interview to discuss the position from the perspective of a typical OR a very recent day. I was hoping you could describe what you do from the very beginning of your shift to the end of your shift. More detail is better so please feel free to explain.</li> <li>3. Describe in detail the primary or most important duties that you perform daily.</li> <li>4. Describe the equipment or technology that you use regularly to perform your job.</li> <li>5. How do you determine what to do when you show up for your shift?</li> <li>6. What would you describe as the most critical tasks you perform in your position?</li> <li>7. What are the non-critical tasks that are part of your position?</li> <li>8. What tasks do you perform that are unique to your position?</li> <li>9. What are the toughest elements of your work?</li> </ol>

**Main questions used during interviews/observations:**

10. What are your administrative and paper work responsibilities?
11. What knowledge, skills and abilities do you feel are important to successful performance in your position?
12. What knowledge, skills and abilities do you feel are required upon promotion into your position?
13. What are the most difficult knowledge, skills, and abilities to master in your position? Describe why.
14. What do you want me to know about what it takes to do your job successfully that you have not yet shared?
15. Critical Incident Technique utilized, if time remained in the interview:
  - Please discuss an incident in which your actions directly contributed to a positive outcome or discuss an incident in which you observed how another supervisor's actions directly contributed to a positive outcome
  - What led up to the incident?
  - Describe the steps that you took in responding to this incident and specifically what tasks you performed.
  - Describe specifically what you did that was so effective.
  - How did you perceive the consequences of your behavior during the incident?
  - What was the outcome? Were the consequences within your control?

Interviews were conducted July 23-26, 2019 by IOS representatives. A total of 12 interviews were conducted for the rank of lieutenant. The interviews were conducted with incumbents. Interviews took approximately 45 minutes to complete. The interviewees came from a variety of department assignments and divisions. Table 4 presents the demographics of the incumbents who were interviewed.

Table 4. Job Analysis Interview Demographics

		Interview Sample	
		N	%
<b>Race</b>	Caucasian	3	25%
	Hispanic	3	25%
	African American	3	25%
	Asian	3	25%
<b>Gender</b>	Male	8	67%
	Female	4	33%

Step 4: Develop and Administer the Job Analysis Questionnaire

*Development of the Job Analysis Questionnaire*

A job analysis questionnaire (JAQ) was developed based on information gathered during the job analysis interviews, previously developed questionnaires for the rank, and previously developed questionnaires for the rank in similarly sized departments developed by IOS on past projects. Task statements used in previous job analyses for the rank and from other departments/locations, deemed by the IOS consultant to be applicable in the SFPD were retained (often with some revision). After reviewing notes taken throughout the job analysis interviews, additional task statements were developed. The statements were selected or written to summarize all aspects and activities completed by the SFPD lieutenant rank.

A group of 3 lieutenant incumbents from the SFPD reviewed the drafted task and knowledge lists before finalizing the JAQ. This review occurred on August 8, 2019. IOS finalized the JAQ based on the recommended edits from the SMEs.

A total of 117 task statements were included on the JAQ. Eight job duties were developed based on commonalities among task statements. Also included were 49 job knowledge areas, and 41 skill, ability, and other characteristic (SAO herein) dimensions. The 12 SAO dimensions were comprised of 41 SAOs that were individually rated.

*Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) Composition*

In order to identify and document the tasks and KSAOs that are critical and to obtain the numerical data to support the criticality of these particular tasks and KSAOs, a JAQ was developed and distributed to incumbents. The JAQ utilized various rating scales to allow respondents to indicate the task's or KSAO's respective applicability, importance, frequency, requirements upon promotion, differentiation between high and low job performers, and requirements of reference versus recall. These scales will be further described in this section. The JAQ was divided into three separate surveys to help alleviate the time burden of

completing it in its entirety. One focused on the tasks, the other on KSAOs, and the other included the linkage between the KSAOs and the job duty areas.

### *Task Statement Rating Scales*

Individuals completing the Task Analysis Questionnaire made ratings on each of the task statements. The ratings included: (1) applicability, (2) degree of importance, (3) frequency, and (4) required to perform upon promotion. A four-point Likert scale was used for the importance rating and the frequency rating. A two-point scale was used for the required to perform upon promotion rating and applicability rating. Table 5 below presents the rating scales utilized in this section of the questionnaire.

Table 5. Scales Used for Rating Job Tasks on the JAQ

<b>Applicability Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Yes, task is applicable.		No, task is NOT applicable.	
<b>Importance Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Not Important	Low Importance	Important	High Importance
<b>Frequency Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Seldom Perform	Occasionally Perform	Often Perform	Constantly Perform
<b>Required Upon Promotion Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Upon promotion, I performed this task <u>without</u> training.		Upon promotion, I performed this task <u>only after</u> specialized training and/or on the job training	

### *Job Duty Areas Comprising Task Statements*

Tasks were categorized into eight job duty areas. Tasks associated with each job duty area were listed under the respective job duty area label on the questionnaire. Table 6 presents the job duty areas along with the respective number of task statements included within each.

Table 6. Job Duty Areas and Associated Number of Task Statements

<b>Job Duty Areas</b>	<b>Number of Task Statements</b>
1. Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects	16
2. Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations	10
3. Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events	14
4. Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities	26
5. Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations	13
6. Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities	10
7. Participate in Professional Development Opportunities	6
8. Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>

*Knowledge Rating Scales*

Individuals completing the KSA questionnaire made ratings on each knowledge area. The ratings included: (1) applicability, (2) importance, (3) reference versus recall, (4) differentiation, and (5) required upon promotion. A four-point Likert scales was used for the importance rating. A three-point Likert scale was used for the differentiation scale. A two-point scale was used for the required upon promotion rating, reference versus recall rating and applicability rating. Table 7 below presents the rating scales used in this section of the questionnaire.

Table 7. Scales Used for Rating Knowledge Areas

<b>Applicability Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Yes, knowledge area is applicable to the job.		No, knowledge area is not applicable to the job.	
<b>Importance Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Not Important	Low Importance	Important	High Importance
<b>Differentiation Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
No Differentiation	Moderate Differentiation	High Differentiation	
<b>Required Upon Promotion Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Individuals <u>are</u> required to possess this knowledge area immediately upon promotion.		Individuals <u>are not</u> required to possess this knowledge area immediately upon promotion.	
<b>Reference Versus Recall Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	

Knowledge area <u>is referenced</u> or “looked up” as needed; no need to “know” this information.	Knowledge area <u>cannot be referenced</u> or “looked up”; a strong need to “know” this information.
---	--

*Knowledge Areas Comprising Knowledge Statements*

In all, there were 49 knowledge statements included in the questionnaire. The knowledge statements were department-specific areas determined through general knowledge of the lieutenant rank, knowledge of the department and discussions with SMEs. The knowledge area statements were organized into two distinct areas. The breakdown of the number of knowledge statements included within each area is included in Table 8.

Table 8. Organization of Knowledge Area Statements

<b>Knowledge Areas</b>	<b>Number of Knowledge Statements</b>
Knowledge of Personnel/Administrative Principles, Polices, and Systems	17
Knowledge of Law Enforcement Standards and Practices	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>

*Skill and Ability Rating Scales*

Individuals completing the questionnaire made ratings on each skill and ability area. The ratings included: (1) applicability, (2) importance, (3) differentiation, and (4) required upon promotion. A four-point Likert scale was used for the importance rating. A three-point Likert scale was used for the differentiation scale. A two-point scale was used for the required upon promotion rating and applicability rating. Table 9 below presents the rating scales utilized in this section of the questionnaire.

Table 9. Scales Used for Rating Skill and Ability Areas

<b>Applicability Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Yes, skill/ability is applicable to the job.		No, skill/ability is not applicable to the job.	
<b>Importance Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Not Important	Low Importance	Important	High Importance
<b>Differentiation Scale</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
No Differentiation	Moderate Differentiation	High Differentiation	
<b>Required Upon Promotion Scale</b>			
<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
Individuals <u>are</u> required to possess this skill/ability area immediately upon promotion.		Individuals <u>are not</u> required to possess this skill/ability area immediately upon promotion.	

*Skill/Ability Areas Comprising Skill and Ability Statements*

Typically, a group of SMEs will be asked to provide labels for the abilities necessary to complete certain tasks. However, IOS has determined that a finite taxonomy of human abilities is generally preferable to developing a unique set of ability labels for each analysis. Often, ability labels developed in the context of a job analysis project are not clearly defined and are confusing to SMEs who must evaluate their importance. This is because often SMEs are unfamiliar with which abilities are consistent across the public safety field, and thus they tend to choose labels that are long-winded or that vary widely in specificity, redundancy and definition. As a result, IOS has developed a comprehensive set of specific abilities based on extensive experience in the public safety field. This comprehensive set of abilities has been categorized into a finite taxonomy of human abilities using a Q-sort methodology, which groups similar abilities together to prevent redundancy and keep the list concise. IOS uses a subset of the ascertained abilities for test-development purposes, eliminating abilities that are either inappropriate or unmeasurable. In all, there were 41 skill/ability statements included in the JAQ. The skill/ability statements were organized into 12 distinct areas. The breakdown of the number of skill/ability statements included within each area is included in Table 10.

Table 10. Organization of Skill/Ability Statements

Skill/Ability Areas	Number of Skill/Ability Statements
Personnel Supervision	3
Leadership	3
Organizational Skills	6
Technological Skills	2
Interpersonal Skills	6
Critical Thinking	4
Decision-Making	3
Incident Operations	2
Written Communication	2
Oral Communication	2
Quantitative Analysis	2
Other Characteristics	6

*Percent of Job Covered Rating*

A job analysis gauges the degree to which the job tasks fully describe the focal job. It is conceivable that whole domains of the job could be missed in the job analysis process (i.e., fail to be included on the questionnaire). Without a measure of the degree to which the rated job tasks cover the focal job, erroneous conclusions may occur. For example, if the job tasks that are included on a questionnaire and rated by SMEs only cover 50% of the job, then half the job has not yet been assessed. Any conclusions based upon these results would be misguided to a significant degree. To ensure this does not occur, a “comprehensiveness” rating was collected from all SMEs. Specifically, the percent of job covered rating measures the extent to which the task statements and KSAOs included in the questionnaire adequately represent the SFPD lieutenant rank. Respondents were asked to rate the percentage of the SFPD lieutenant job covered by the task statements and KSAOs included in the questionnaire. The percent of job covered rating scale is presented in Table 11. The instructions explained that a rating of 2, 3, 4, or 5 was indicative of the tasks and knowledge/skill/ability areas in the questionnaire being an “acceptable representation” of the job. A rating of 1 indicated that “important aspects of the job are missing” from the questionnaire.

Table 11. Percent of Job Covered Rating Scale

Percent of Job Covered				
1	2	3	4	5
Less than 69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-95%	96-100%

### *Relative Importance of Job Duty Areas*

Respondents rated the relative importance of each of the job duty areas of their job. These ratings were made by dividing 100 points among the eight job duty areas. The eight job duty areas included were presented in Table 6.

The average importance rating for each duty area is calculated across all respondents. This allows IOS to determine the relative degree of importance, or criticality, of each duty area. The corrected ratio score is used, which corrects for total point allocation errors made by respondents. For instance, individuals filling out the questionnaire sometimes make mistakes calculating the 100-point total, and their duty area points do not add up to 100. The corrected ratio score takes these miscalculations into account in determining the overall relative importance of each duty area.

### *Development of the Linkage Analysis Questionnaire (LAQ)*

The purpose of the linkage analysis was to determine a relationship between the job tasks (that comprise the job duty areas) of a lieutenant and the knowledge and skills/abilities (KSAs) identified during the job analysis and contained within the questionnaire. Demonstration of a linkage between the job tasks and the KSAs is a necessary component in gathering content validity evidence supporting the use of measuring the specified KSAs, for the purpose of evaluating potential candidates for the job of lieutenant. In other words, if measures of a candidate's knowledge and/or skills/abilities are used in evaluating whether or not to promote the candidate, it must first be demonstrated that the knowledge and/or skills/abilities in question are used on the job for which the candidate is being considered. Once this linkage has been demonstrated it serves as one form of validity evidence supporting the use of measures of these KSAs within the promotional process. The job duty areas included in the LAQ were presented in Table 6. The Linkage Analysis Questionnaire (LAQ herein; refer to Appendix C) contained two sections, including:

- Section I. Skill/ability areas were rated to assess their importance in performing tasks associated with each of the job duty areas.
- Section II. Knowledge areas were rated to assess their importance in performing tasks associated with each of the job duty areas.

### *Skill/Ability Linkage*

The SAOs were categorized into 12 skill/ability areas. These 12 skill/ability areas are based on the work by IOS in conducting job analyses with hundreds of public safety agencies around the U.S. The Q-sort methodology was used to group like SAOs together to prevent overlap and to develop a concise list of skill/ability areas. IOS uses a subset of the ascertained skill/ability areas for test-development purposes as certain skill/ability areas are simply not appropriate or

measurable. Table 12 presents the SAOs that composed each of the 8 skill/ability areas included in the LAQ.

Table 12. Composition of Skill/Ability Areas included in the LAQ

<b>Skill/Ability Area</b>	<b>SAOs Contained within Area</b>
Personnel Supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Management</li> <li>• Supervision Skill</li> <li>• Delegation</li> </ul>
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influencing Others</li> <li>• Vision</li> <li>• Command Presence</li> </ul>
Organizational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> <li>• Organizing</li> <li>• Prioritization</li> <li>• Coordination</li> <li>• Time Management</li> <li>• Budgeting</li> </ul>
Technological Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computer Skill</li> <li>• Mechanical Skill</li> </ul>
Interpersonal Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship Building</li> <li>• Conflict Resolution</li> <li>• Teamwork</li> <li>• Sensitivity</li> <li>• Cultural Sensitivity/Awareness</li> <li>• Community Relation Skill</li> </ul>
Critical Thinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem Sensitivity/Analysis</li> <li>• Problem Solving</li> <li>• Information Ordering</li> <li>• Observing/Listening and Memorization/Recall</li> </ul>
Decision-Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoning</li> <li>• Judgment</li> <li>• Decisiveness</li> </ul>
Incident Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incident Management</li> <li>• Tactical Skill</li> </ul>
Written Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Comprehension</li> <li>• Written Expression</li> </ul>
Oral Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oral Expression</li> <li>• Presentation</li> </ul>
Quantitative Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Analysis</li> <li>• Basic Mathematical Operations</li> </ul>
Other Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honesty and Integrity</li> <li>• Adaptability</li> </ul>

Skill/Ability Area	SAOs Contained within Area
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependability</li> <li>• Conscientiousness</li> <li>• Initiative</li> <li>• Stress Tolerance/Composure</li> </ul>

*Skill/Ability Linkage Rating Scale*

Individuals completing the second section of the LAQ used a four-point Likert scale to link each skill/ability area to each of the job duty areas. Table 13 below presents the rating scale utilized in this section of the LAQ.

Table 13. Scale Used for Linking Skill and Ability Areas on the LAQ

4-Point Rating Scale for SAO Linkage			
1	2	3	4
SAO is <u>not important</u> to performing job duty area	SAO has <u>low importance</u> to performing job duty area	SAO is <u>important</u> to performing job duty area	SAO is <u>highly important</u> to performing job duty area

*Knowledge Linkage*

The 49 knowledge areas from the JAQ were grouped into 2 knowledge areas: Knowledge of Personnel/Administrative Principles, Policies, and Systems; and Knowledge of Law Enforcement Standards and Practices. These two knowledge areas were further investigated in the LAQ to understand their relationship with the eight job duty areas of interest.

*Knowledge Linkage Rating Scale*

Individuals completing this section of the LAQ used a four-point Likert rating scale to link each knowledge area to each of the job duty areas. Table 14 presents the rating scale used in this section of the LAQ.

Table 14. Scale Used for Linking Knowledge Areas on the LAQ

4-Point Rating Scale for Knowledge Area Linkage			
1	2	3	4
Knowledge area is <u>NOT important</u> to performing job duty area	Knowledge area has <u>LOW importance</u> to performing job duty area	Knowledge area is <u>important</u> to performing job duty area	Knowledge area is <u>highly important</u> to performing job duty area

### Administration of the Job Analysis Questionnaire and Linkage Analysis Questionnaire

The three JAQ surveys (task, KSAO, linkage) were distributed to lieutenants in the SFPD. The data were collected using SurveyMonkey, which is an online survey development software. Respondents were sent an email that provided them a link to complete one of the three JAQ surveys. Incumbents had over two weeks to complete their survey. Information entered by respondents was saved in the SurveyMonkey.com database.

### Sample Information

A sample of 97 SFPD lieutenants were asked to complete one of the three JAQ surveys. Specifically, 53 were invited to complete the task survey, 26 were invited to complete the KSA survey, and 18 were invited to complete the linkage survey. In total, 77 (79%) of the 97 invited SFPD lieutenants completed a survey: 43 (81%) completed the task, 21 (81%) completed the KSA and 13 (72%) completed the linkage.

### Demographic Breakdown

The JAQ surveys included demographic variables, which include the following: Overall Tenure, Education, Race, and Gender. A breakdown for each of these demographic variables across all three questionnaires (task, KSA, linkage) is presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Participant Demographics for JAQ Survey Type

		Task		KSA		Linkage	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Participants</b>		<b>43</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>13</b>	
<b>Overall Tenure</b>	11 to 15 years	6	14.0	3	14.3	1	7.7
	16 to 20 years	11	25.6	3	14.3	3	23.1
	More than 20 years	26	60.5	15	71.4	9	69.2
<b>Education</b>	High School Diploma/GED	0	0	1	4.8	2	15.4
	Some College	13	30.2	8	38.1		
	Associate's Degree	7	16.3	1	4.8	3	23.1
	Bachelor's Degree	17	39.5	8	38.1	6	46.2
	Master's Degree or above	6	14.0	3	14.3	2	15.4
<b>Race</b>	African American/Black--Non-Hispanic	4	9.3	3	14.3	2	15.4
	Asian	5	11.6	2	9.5	1	7.7
	Hispanic--Non-White	6	14.0	2	9.5	1	7.7
	Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	1	2.3	0	0	0	0
	White--Non-Hispanic	24	55.8	11	52.4	8	61.5
	Two or More Races	3	7.0	3	14.3	0	0
	Other	0	0	0	0	1	7.7

<b>Gender</b>	Male	37	86.0	17	81.0	10	76.9
	Female	6	14.0	3	14.3	3	23.1
	Missing	0	0	1	4.8	0	0

### *Data Compilation and Analysis*

The data from the questionnaires was exported from SurveyMonkey.com into a SPSS file for analysis. Next the data was analyzed by a consultant from IOS. Data analysis and survey results are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

### Step 5: Job Analysis Results

#### *Analysis of Task Statements*

As previously mentioned, individuals asked to complete the JAQ made four ratings on each of the task statements (i.e., applicability, importance, frequency, and required upon promotion). Several key outputs were derived from the analysis of the JAQ task statements. The key outputs include: a) applicability; b) average importance; c) standard deviation of importance; d) average frequency; e) average composite; f) percent essential; and g) required upon promotion. The following sections describe each of these key outputs used for the interpretation of the JAQ task data.

- a) **Applicability.** To better understand how various tasks relate to the job in question, the applicability of each task was calculated. A percent applicable rating was calculated by (1) counting the number of participants who indicated that the statement was applicable to the job (those who did not mark “No”), (2) dividing this number by the total sample of participants, and (3) multiplying this number by 100 to form a percentage. Therefore, the applicability of a task is the percentage of participants who rated it as being applicable to their job. The applicability for each task statement can be reviewed in Appendix A.
- b) **Average Importance.** To compute the respective importance of each task, ratings on importance were averaged across participants. The higher the average importance rating, the more critical the task to the rank being evaluated. The average importance for each statement can be reviewed in Appendix A.
- c) **Standard Deviation of Importance.** The standard deviation of each task statement was computed to understand the spread of the respective importance ratings. A smaller standard deviation for a task’s importance indicated that the importance ratings closely clustered near the average importance rating calculated for that respective task. The standard deviation of importance for each statement can be reviewed in Appendix A.

- d) **Average Frequency.** To compute the respective frequency by which each task is performed, ratings on frequency were averaged across participants. The higher the average frequency rating for a particular task statement, the more frequently the task is performed in the rank. The average frequency for each statement can be reviewed in **Appendix A.**
- e) **Average Composite.** A composite score was calculated for only those participants who provided ratings of task importance and frequency. A participant's composite score was derived for each statement by weighting the participant's importance rating for a task statement two times that of their frequency rating and then summing these weighted results (importance rating  $\times .667$  + frequency rating  $\times .333$ ). The rationale for weighting importance and frequency in this manner is that many times the most important tasks that are critical to a job are not frequently performed. A task could be performed rarely, but the consequence of an error during the task could be severe. For example, it seems reasonable that the importance of firing a weapon should be more heavily weighted than the frequency with which it is performed. The average composite for each statement can be reviewed in **Appendix A.**
- f) **Percent Essential.** The percent essential (PE herein) calculation involves a decision-rule. In this decision rule, a task statement is considered "Essential to the Job" for a particular individual if that individual's composite rating is 3.0 or greater. The essentiality of a particular task statement was determined by (1) counting the number of participants with a composite score that was equal to or greater than 3.0, (2) dividing this number by the total sample of participants, and (3) multiplying this number by 100 to form a percentage. This percentage represents the extent to which a task is considered to be an essential job function. Therefore, the essentiality of a task statement is the percentage of participants who rated the task to have a composite score of three or higher. The PE for each task statement can be reviewed in **Appendix A.**

In order for a task to be considered essential, a 2/3 majority of participants need to rate the task statement as essential, which is indicated by the PE score. Thus, a PE score of 66.67% or greater indicates that the task is essential to the job. A rating between a simple majority and a 2/3 majority indicates that the task is marginally relevant and may be included based upon factors such as importance and frequency ratings of those participants who rated it as relevant. Below a simple majority, the task either is a secondary job function, or is trivial to the job. Table 16 shows the essentiality allocation categories, the labels associated with the rules, and a short description of the label.

Table 16. Percent Essential Categories

Percent Essential	Label	Description
<b>66.67% or Higher</b>	<i>Essential</i>	Most SMEs rated the task as essential, meaning it is necessary for the successful completion of the job. This task is required as part of the job.
<b>50.00% to 66.67%</b>	<i>Marginal</i>	A majority of SMEs rated the task as essential; it is marginally related to the job. The task may be required as part of the job based upon other factors such as the relevance ratings.
<b>33.33% to 50.00%</b>	<i>Secondary</i>	Only a few SMEs rated this task as essential. Likely, this task is secondary to other tasks. Inclusion of the task is likely not critical, but is still possible depending on other considerations.
<b>0% to 33.33%</b>	<i>Trivial</i>	Very few SMEs rated this task as essential. Those that did may have different jobs or hold specialized positions. The vast majority of individuals did not deem this task as necessary for their job. It is likely of trivial importance to the job and thus not job-related.

Note that the PE calculation is independent of the percent applicable calculation as the PE calculations are made on only those participants indicating that the task is applicable to their job. Thus, a task can have a low percent applicable rating and still have a PE rating of 100 percent. In such a circumstance, the task is essential to those performing the task and not applicable to the job of others. Such a task might represent a “specialized job function,” whereby only a select group of participants performs a particular task and others do not.

- g) **Required Upon Promotion.** This measure reflects the percentage of participants who rated that a particular task statement would be required to be performed immediately upon promotion, without training. Higher percentages on this measure for a particular task statement indicate greater agreement among participants that performance of task would be required upon promotion. This metric is seen as important only for consideration in assessment development, not as a means to define the job in question. The required upon promotion results for each statement can be reviewed in **Appendix A**.

*Using the Job-Relatedness Matrix to Review Tasks*

To lend further guidance in the interpretation of the JAQ task results, a job-relatedness matrix was developed by IOS. A system was developed based upon the applicability and PE task statement results; in that, these two values provide a thorough analysis of raters' views of a given task. These interactions are defined by the job-relatedness decision matrix, which can be found in Table 17.

Table 17. Job-Relatedness Decision Matrix: Essentiality by Relevance

		Essentiality				
		<i>Essential</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Secondary</i>	<i>Trivial</i>	
		66.67% or Higher	66.67% to 50.00%	50.00% to 33.33%	33.33% to 0%	
Applicability	<i>Relevant</i>	66.67% or Higher	1	2	1	2
	<i>Important</i>	50% to 66.67%	3	4	3	4
	<i>Specialization</i>	33.33% to 50.00%	1	2	1	2
	<i>Tangential</i>	0% to 33.33%	3	4	3	4

The job-relatedness matrix defines all possible interactions between the four essentiality categories and the applicability categories. In total, there are 16 possible interactions. These interactions have been sub-divided into four zones. Each zone has a specific “job-relatedness” characteristic. In determining an interaction’s impact on the job-relatedness, the essentiality is more heavily considered than the applicability. There are many cases when a smaller group of individuals may be required to conduct certain tasks that are essential to their job that others do not perform. The employer may be bound to hire individuals who can fill all possible roles, thus this “specialization” could be part of the job requirements; therefore, the “specialized” tasks are job-related and the measure of KSAOs that are necessary to perform those specialized tasks is a business need. Alternatively, there are few cases when a task should be seen as job-related when the majority agrees that the task is performed, but also agree that it is trivial. Each zone is composed of four interactions which are labeled as I.1, I.2, I.3., I.4 for

Zone I. The zones and their associated interactions are described below in relation to the decisions made about a task's job-relatedness.

- **ZONE 1 – Job-related**: This zone consists of multiple interactions between applicability and essentiality where the percentage magnitude of one or both is 66.67% or above. The interaction between the two marginal categories in this zone is also categorized as job-related as a majority will have seen the task as applicable and essential. Thus, all interactions in this zone are considered as job-related.
- **ZONE 2 – Trivial Job Tasks**: This zone consists of interactions between applicability scores where the majority of participants agree they perform the task, and essentiality results indicating that the majority of participants agree that the task is not essential to the rank (or a trivial task). Thus, the interactions in these zones are unlikely to be considered job-related. In these cases, the magnitude of percent essential scores and applicability percentages will be considered.
- **ZONE 3 – Essential for Specialized Roles**: This zone consists of interactions between percent essential scores where the majority of participants identify the task as essential. However, the majority of participants did not indicate that they saw these tasks as applicable to the job. This disconnect indicates that certain individuals may hold specialist positions within the job category. It is possible that the interactions could be deemed job-related if there was a departmental need to fill these roles, or if everyone was required to perform these duties at some point in their career.
- **ZONE 4 – Not Job-Related**: The majority of participants view these tasks as tangential and trivial to the job. These interactions show that the given task is not job-related and should not be considered as part of the job for the position.

This matrix could be used to support the development of tests and assessments for the position of interest. Tasks falling into zones 1 and 3 should be further considered for test development purposes. Nonetheless, the tasks falling into zone 3.3 and 3.4 should be further scrutinized in regard to test development. The respective zone of each task statement is included for review in Appendix A.

#### *Task Statement Results Summary*

As described previously, the PE was computed from the ratings on importance and frequency. To provide a snapshot of the categorization of the job tasks into the various job-relatedness zones for the SFPD lieutenant rank, a summary table of the percentage breakdown is presented below in Table 18 and Table 19. The list of all tasks and their respective rating scale scores for the SFPD lieutenant rank are presented in Appendix A. Task statements are listed by duty area and sorted based on essentiality, then applicability ratings.

The task analysis results indicate that out of 117 task statements, 111 tasks belong to “Zone 1– Job Related;” 2 tasks belong to “Zone 2 – Trivial Job Tasks;” 2 tasks belong to “Zone 3 – Essential for Specialized Roles;” and 2 tasks belong to “Zone 4 – Not Job-Related.”

Table 18. Job Task Percentages and Number of Tasks by Zone Categorization

	<b>% of Tasks</b>	<b>Number of Tasks</b>
<b>Zone 1</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>111</b>
1.1	83.8%	93
1.2	4.5%	5
1.3	11.7%	13
1.4	0.0%	0
<b>Zone 2</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	50.0%	1
2.2	0.0%	0
2.3	50.0%	1
2.4	0.0%	0
<b>Zone 3</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	100.0%	2
3.2	0.0%	0
3.3	0.0%	0
3.4	0.0%	0
<b>Zone 4</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2</b>
4.1	50.0%	1
4.2	0.0%	0
4.3	0.0%	0
4.4	50.0%	1

Table 19. Job Relatedness Decision Matrix

		<b>Essentiality</b>				
		<i>Essential</i>	<i>Marginal</i>	<i>Secondary</i>	<i>Trivial</i>	
		<b>66.67% or Higher</b>	<b>66.67% to 50.00%</b>	<b>50.00% to 33.33%</b>	<b>33.33% to 0%</b>	
<b>Applicability</b>	<i>Relevant</i>	<b>66.67% or Higher</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	<i>Marginal</i>	<b>50% to 66.67%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	<i>Specialization</i>	<b>33.33% to 50.00%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	<i>Tangential</i>	<b>0% to 33.33%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>

In order to provide an assessment of the tasks required upon promotion to this rank, the required upon promotion (RUP) scale was used. This scale presented participants with two possible options to categorize the task statements: required to perform immediately upon promotion without training or performed only after specialized training and/or on the job training. A task statement was categorized into one of the two options when a majority of participants identified it as such. The overall summary of the RUP categorization analysis can be seen in Table 20 below.

Table 20. Summary of Task RUP Categorization

<b>Position</b>		<b>Task Statements</b>	
		<b>RUP</b>	<b>Not RUP; learned OTJ</b>
<i>Lieutenant</i>	<i># items</i>	117	0
	<i>% of Task Statements</i>	100.0%	0.0%

The next step in the analysis was to provide a list of the tasks that are required upon promotion into the lieutenant rank ranked in order of their essentiality. The analysis provides a concise perspective of what are the most important tasks a lieutenant should be able to perform or possess upon promotion. For this analysis, items that were rated as RUP by the majority of SME participants were selected and then rank-ordered in terms of their essentiality.

For tasks, essentiality was defined as the percentage of SMEs that rated an item as having a composite of three or greater. An abbreviated list of the top 20 task statements is provided in Table 21 for the lieutenant rank. The complete rank-ordered lists can be seen in Appendix B.

Table 21. Abbreviated Rank-Ordered RUP Tasks

Rank	Item #	Task	%Essential	%RUP
1	TASK_41	Review incident reports for completeness and consistency (e.g., whether all elements are contained within the report, whether action taken by officer was within policy, grammar and spelling are correct).	100	100
2	TASK_96	Demonstrate appropriate behavior by performing duties in accordance with unit and departmental policies and procedures.	100	100
3	TASK_97	Explain new department policies and procedures to subordinates to answer questions, discuss changes in laws or rules, or provide other updates.	100	100
4	TASK_100	Determine causes of and solutions for work-related problems by asking questions and listening to subordinates.	100	100
5	TASK_101	Identify officer safety issues by monitoring subordinates' activities and receiving information from supervisors in order to implement appropriate corrective measures and provide training.	100	100
6	TASK_29	Respond to incident(s) that require presence of a lieutenant to provide direction in handling of the incident(s) and perform tasks as needed.	100	97.22
7	TASK_43	Enter daily and anticipated officer work schedule information into the computer (HRMS) and onto a Daily Assignment Sheet to maintain record of personnel activity.	100	97.22
8	TASK_99	Meet with sergeants to disseminate information, increase morale, and/or discuss issues such as subordinates' concerns, performance issues, training needs, etc.	100	97.22
9	TASK_28	Evaluate complexity of incidents by collecting information over the radio or by phone from dispatch and units at the scene regarding the situation to determine required procedures (e.g., set-up command post).	100	97.14

Rank	Item #	Task	%Essential	%RUP
10	TASK_31	Verify the adequacy of actions taken by subordinates by monitoring radio and/or calling for situation reports on various activities such as ensuring the perimeter is established, the scene is controlled, the crime scene is preserved, notifications are made, etc.	100	97.14
11	TASK_56	Brief superior(s) about critical or sensitive incidents or investigations.	100	94.59
12	TASK_33	Assume charge of field incident and/or crime scene by taking command, directing activities of subordinates, requesting additional resources.	100	94.44
13	TASK_34	Evaluate the location of the command post based on factors such as proximity to the scene, degree of danger, personnel and equipment needs, etc.	100	94.29
14	TASK_27	Monitor activities happening in the district through the radio, computer queries, notifications, and/or observation to determine if calls are backing up or supervisory intervention is needed.	100	94.12
15	TASK_30	Determine minimum staffing levels needed throughout the district (including at the station) based on an evaluation of staffing needs at an incident scene and of on-going activities in the district.	100	94.12
16	TASK_44	Coordinate vacation schedules, training mandates, time-off, overtime, and other issues that impact staffing by taking into account factors such as Department policies, MOU, needs of unit or shift, etc.	100	92.11
17	TASK_35	Determine the need for specialized units or outside agencies, such as GTF, SOB, MTA, etc., to assist at an incident by evaluating developments at the scene.	100	91.43
18	TASK_46	Make beat and car assignments based on a review of factors such as personnel and equipment availability, Operations Bureau mandates, special events scheduled, etc.	100	90.62
19	TASK_75	Assign cases within unit based on established criteria, available personnel, volume of cases, solvability factors, specialties of personnel, call-out criteria, etc.	100	76.19

Rank	Item #	Task	%Essential	%RUP
20	TASK_17	Review results of an investigation involving subordinates for completeness and accuracy of conclusions, including documentation and investigations done by subordinate sergeants, to make recommendations to superiors regarding remedies.	100	85

### *Analysis of Knowledge Statements*

As previously mentioned, individuals asked to complete the JAQ made five ratings on each of the knowledge areas (i.e., applicability, importance, reference versus recall, differentiation, and required upon promotion). Several key outputs were derived from the analysis of the JAQ knowledge statements. The key outputs include: a) applicability; b) average importance; c) standard deviation of importance; d) reference versus recall; e) differentiation; f) required upon promotion; and g) essentiality/criticality of knowledge areas. The following sections describe each of these key outputs used for the interpretation of the JAQ knowledge statements.

- a) **Applicability**. To better understand how various knowledge statements relate to the job in question, the applicability of each was calculated. A percent applicable rating was calculated by (1) counting the number of participants who indicated that the statement was applicable to the job (those who did not mark “No”), (2) dividing this number by the total sample of participants, and (3) multiplying this number by 100 to form a percentage. Therefore, the applicability of a knowledge statement is the percentage of participants who rated it as being applicable to their job. The applicability for each knowledge statement can be reviewed in Appendix C.
- b) **Average Importance**. To compute the respective importance of each knowledge statement, ratings on importance were averaged across participants. The higher the average importance rating, the more critical the knowledge statement to the rank being evaluated. The average importance for each knowledge statement can be reviewed in Appendix C.
- c) **Standard Deviation of Importance**. The standard deviation of each knowledge statement was computed to understand the spread of the respective importance ratings. A smaller standard deviation for a knowledge statement’s importance indicated that the importance ratings closely clustered near the average importance rating calculated for that respective knowledge. The standard deviation of importance for each knowledge statement can be reviewed in Appendix C.
- d) **Reference Versus Recall**. This measure reflects the percentage of participants who indicated that a particular knowledge statement must be recalled while engaging in job

tasks and there is a strong need to know this information. Higher percentages on this measure for a particular knowledge statement indicate greater agreement among participants that the knowledge statement can be referenced while on the job. The reference versus recall rating for each knowledge statement can be reviewed in Appendix C.

- e) **Differentiation.** To compute the degree that each knowledge statement differentiates high on-the-job performers from low on-the-job performers, ratings on differentiation were averaged across participants. The higher the average differentiation rating, the more the knowledge statement differentiates between high and low job performers. In other words, higher averages on this measure for a particular knowledge area indicate greater agreement among participants that having more of this knowledge would make a lieutenant a stronger performer. The differentiation rating for each knowledge area can be reviewed in Appendix C.
- f) **Required Upon Promotion.** This measure reflects the percentage of participants who indicated that a particular knowledge statement would be required immediately upon promotion, without training. Higher percentages on this measure for a particular knowledge statement indicate greater agreement among participants that the knowledge area would be required upon promotion. This metric is seen as important only for consideration in assessment development, not as a means to define the job in question. The required upon promotion results for each knowledge statement can be reviewed in Appendix C.
- g) **Essentiality/Criticality of the Knowledge Statements.** In order to answer the question of whether a knowledge statement can be considered essential as a whole, a criteria threshold must be put in place to determine its essentiality. Seeing as knowledge statements lacked the use of the percent essential scale or the ability to create a composite scale, the importance scale was used as an indication of how important or essential a knowledge area was to the job. Knowledge areas were deemed 'essential' if they received an average rating on the importance scale of 3 or higher and an applicability rating of 66.67 percent or higher. This threshold was chosen as it corresponds to a considerable degree of importance being placed on the knowledge area in relation to the job. Out of the 49 knowledge areas, 34 were deemed essential to the job of lieutenant. The essentiality results for each knowledge area can be viewed in Appendix C.

#### *Knowledge Statement Results Summary*

Among the 49 knowledge areas, all areas were seen as highly applicable to the lieutenant rank. Applicability percentages were all at or above 77.8% with the average applicability being 95.3%.

All importance ratings were at or above 2.00 with the average importance rating being 3.11. The most important knowledge area was “Knowledge of procedures and legal constraints regarding searches and seizures, laws of arrest.” with a rating of 3.78. The least important knowledge area was “Knowledge of the SF Transportation Code.” with a rating of 2.00. The full results of the knowledge analysis can be seen in Appendix C. The knowledge areas were sorted based on importance, then applicability ratings.

In order to provide an assessment of the extent to which knowledge areas differentiate high on-the-job performers from low on-the-job performers, the differentiation scale was used. This scale presented participants with three possible options to categorize the knowledge areas: no differentiation, moderate differentiation, and high differentiation. A knowledge statement was categorized as being able to differentiate between high and low job performers when the participants identified it as either being a moderate or high differentiator. The overall summary of the differentiation categorization analysis can be seen in Table 22 below.

Table 22. Summary of Knowledge Differentiation Categorization

<b>Position</b>		<b>Knowledge Areas</b>	
		<b>Moderate/High Differentiation</b>	<b>No Differentiation</b>
<i>Lieutenant</i>	<i># items</i>	44	5
	<i>% of Knowledge Areas</i>	89.8%	10.2%

In order to provide an assessment of the knowledge required upon promotion to this rank, the required upon promotion (RUP) scale was used. This scale presented participants with two possible options to categorize the knowledge areas: required to possess immediately upon promotion or not required to possess immediately upon promotion. A knowledge area was categorized into one of the two options when a majority of participants identified it as such. The overall summary of the RUP categorization analysis can be seen in Table 23 below.

Table 23. Summary of Knowledge RUP Categorization

<b>Position</b>		<b>Knowledge Areas</b>	
		<b>RUP</b>	<b>Not RUP; learned OTJ</b>
<i>Lieutenant</i>	<i># items</i>	40	9
	<i>% of Knowledge Areas</i>	81.6%	18.4%

As can be seen in the above table, 81.6% of the knowledge areas were rated as RUP by the majority of SME participants, while 18.4% were rated as learned on-the-job and not required upon entry.

The next step in the analysis was to provide a list of the knowledge areas that are required upon promotion into the lieutenant rank, ranked in order of their essentiality. The analysis provides a concise perspective of what are the most important knowledge areas a lieutenant should be able to possess upon promotion. For this analysis, items that were rated as RUP by the majority of SME participants were selected and then rank-ordered in terms of their essentiality. For knowledge areas, an item was deemed essential if it received an average importance rating of 3 or higher and an applicability rating of 66.67 percent or higher. Then for all knowledge areas that were rated to be essential by a majority of SMEs, the items were then rank ordered in terms of their importance values. An abbreviated list of the top 10 knowledge areas is provided in Table 24 for the lieutenant rank. The complete rank-ordered lists can be seen in Appendix D.

Table 24. Abbreviated Rank-ordered RUP Knowledge Areas

Rank	Item #	Knowledge Areas	Import.	%RUP
1	KSAO_140	Knowledge of procedures and legal constraints regarding searches and seizures, laws of arrest.	3.78	100
2	KSAO_122	Knowledge of Human Resource Management System (HRMS)/eMerge to be able to update, maintain, retrieve and interpret records.	3.74	73.68
3	KSAO_139	Knowledge of response procedures for a field incident including how to respond and who should respond.	3.65	100
4	KSAO_137	Knowledge of Department General Orders.	3.61	94.44
5	KSAO_136	Knowledge of elements to a crime needed to be presented in the incident report.	3.61	94.44
6	KSAO_118	Knowledge of the actions that constitute rules violations.	3.58	100
7	KSAO_119	Knowledge of Departmental policies and procedures for the correction of unacceptable behavior.	3.58	89.47
8	KSAO_142	Knowledge of procedures to secure and protect a crime scene.	3.56	94.44
9	KSAO_125	Knowledge of officer safety principles and procedures to assess compliance, determine training needs, and to provide feedback regarding these procedures.	3.53	89.47
10	KSAO_141	Knowledge of Department Bulletins.	3.5	100

#### *Analysis of Skill and Ability Areas*

As previously mentioned, individuals asked to complete the KSA survey made four ratings on each of the skill/ability areas (i.e., applicability, importance, differentiation, and required upon

promotion). Several key outputs were derived from the analysis of the JAQ skill and ability areas. The key outputs include: a) applicability; b) average importance; c) standard deviation of importance; d) differentiation; e) required upon promotion; and f) essentiality/criticality of the skill/ability areas. The following sections describe each of these key outputs used for the interpretation of the JAQ skill and ability areas.

- a) **Applicability**. To better understand how various skill and ability areas relate to the job in question, the applicability of each was calculated. A percent applicable rating was calculated by (1) counting the number of participants who indicated that the statement was applicable to the job (those who did not mark “No”), (2) dividing this number by the total sample of participants, and (3) multiplying this number by 100 to form a percentage. Therefore, the applicability of a skill/ability is the percentage of participants who rated it as being applicable to their job. The applicability for each skill/ability can be reviewed in Appendix D.
- b) **Average Importance**. To compute the respective importance of each skill/ability, ratings on importance were averaged across participants. The higher the average importance rating, the more critical the skill/ability to the position being evaluated. The average importance for each skill/ability can be reviewed in Appendix D.
- c) **Standard Deviation of Importance**. The standard deviation of each skill/ability was computed to understand the spread of the respective importance ratings. A smaller standard deviation for the importance of a skill/ability indicated that the importance ratings closely clustered near the average importance rating calculated for that respective skill/ability. The standard deviation of importance for each skill/ability can be reviewed in Appendix D.
- d) **Differentiation**. To compute the degree that each skill/ability differentiates high on-the-job performers from low on-the-job performers, ratings on differentiation were averaged across participants. The higher the average differentiation rating, the more the skill/ability differentiates between high and low job performers. In other words, higher averages on this measure for a particular skill/ability indicate greater agreement among participants that having more of this skill/ability would make a lieutenant a stronger performer. The differentiation rating for each skill/ability statement can be reviewed in Appendix D.
- e) **Required Upon Promotion**. This measure reflects the percentage of participants who rated that a particular skill/ability would be required to be possessed immediately upon promotion, without training. Higher percentages on this measure for a particular skill/ability indicate greater agreement among participants that the skill/ability would be required to be possessed upon promotion. This metric is seen as important only for

consideration in assessment development, not as a means to define the job in question. The required upon promotion results for each skill/ability statement can be reviewed in Appendix D.

- f) **Essentiality/Criticality of the Skill/Ability Areas.** In order to answer the question of whether a skill/ability area can be considered essential as a whole, a criteria threshold must be put in place to determine its essentiality. Seeing as skill/ability areas lacked the use of the Percent Essential scale or the ability to create a composite scale, the importance scale was used as an indication of how important or essential a skill/ability area was to the job. Skill/ability areas were deemed ‘essential’ if they received an average rating on the importance scale of 3 or higher and an applicability rating of 66.67 percent or higher. This threshold was chosen as it represents the middle of the scale and corresponds to a considerable degree of importance being placed on the skill/ability in relation to the job. Out of the 41 skill/ability areas, 35 were deemed essential to the job of lieutenant. The essentiality results for each skill/ability can be reviewed in Appendix D.

#### *Skill and Ability Results Summary*

The list of 41 skill/ability areas were rated as highly applicable by participants. Applicability percentages were all at or above 73.7% (with the exception of the skill/ability area “Mechanical Skill”, which had an applicability percentage of 42.1%). The average applicability percentage was 95.7%. All importance ratings were at or above 2.53 with an average importance rating of 3.37. The most important skill/ability area was found to be “Influencing Others” with an importance score 3.95. The least important skill/ability area was “Data Analysis” with an average importance rating of 2.53. The full results of the skill/ability analysis for the lieutenant position can be seen in Appendix D. Skill/Ability areas were sorted based on importance, then applicability ratings.

In order to provide an assessment of the extent the skill/ability areas differentiate high on-the-job performers from low on-the-job performers the differentiation scale was used. The scale presented participants with three possible options to categorize the skill/ability areas: no differentiation, moderate differentiation, and high differentiation. A skill/ability area was categorized as being able to differentiate between high and low job performers when the participants identified it as either being a moderate or high differentiator. The overall summary of the differentiation categorization analysis can be seen in Table 25.

Table 25. Summary of Skill/Ability Differentiation Categorization

<b>Position</b>		<b>Skill/Ability Areas</b>	
		<b>Moderate/High Differentiation</b>	<b>No Differentiation</b>
Lieutenant	<i># items</i>	25	16
	<i>% of Skill / Ability Areas</i>	61.0%	39.0%

In order to provide an assessment of the skill/ability areas required upon promotion to this rank, the RUP scale was used. This scale presented participants with two possible options to categorize the skill/ability areas: required to possess immediately upon promotion or not required to possess immediately upon promotion. A skill/ability area was categorized into one of the two options when a majority of participants identified it as such. The overall summary of the RUP categorization analysis can be seen in Table 26 below.

Table 26. Summary of Skill/Ability RUP Categorization

<b>Position</b>		<b>Skill/Ability Areas</b>	
		<b>RUP</b>	<b>Not RUP; learned OTJ</b>
Lieutenant	<i># items</i>	39	2
	<i>% Skill / Ability Areas</i>	95.1%	4.9%

As can be seen in the above table, 95% of the skill/ability areas were rated as RUP by the majority of SME participants, while approximately 5% were rated as learned on-the-job and not required upon entry.

The next step in the analysis was to provide a list of the skill/ability areas that are required upon promotion into the lieutenant rank ranked in order of their essentiality. The analysis provides a concise perspective of what are the most important skill/ability areas a lieutenant should be able to possess upon promotion. For this analysis, items that were rated as RUP by the majority of SME participants were selected and then rank-ordered in terms of their essentiality. For skill/ability areas, an item was deemed essential if it received an average importance rating of 3 or higher and an applicability rating of 66.67% or higher. Then for all skill/ability areas that were rated to be essential by a majority of SMEs, the items were then rank ordered in terms of their importance values. An abbreviated list of the top 10 skill/ability areas are provided in Table 27 for the lieutenant rank. The complete rank-ordered list can be seen in Appendix E.

Table 27. Abbreviated Rank-ordered RUP Skill/Ability Areas

Rank	Item #	Skill/Ability Areas	Import.	%RUP
1	KSAO_170	Influencing Others: Willingness to lead, take charge, and offer opinions and direction to others in the organization. Providing inspirational motivation and serving as a role model.	3.95	89.47
2	KSAO_202	Honesty and Integrity: Ability to act in an honest and fair manner. Willingness to accept responsibility for actions when things go wrong. Ability to display a high degree of integrity and professionalism in action and word.	3.89	100
3	KSAO_168	Supervision Skill: Ability to apply department rules and procedures uniformly and in the appropriate circumstances.	3.79	100
4	KSAO_204	Dependability (Work and Personal): Ability to follow through on work without prompt. Requires little oversight. Consistent and dependable in regard to personal actions and behavior.	3.79	100
5	KSAO_207	Stress Tolerance/Composure: Maintaining a calm and rational thought process and demeanor amid chaos or heightened levels of stress.	3.79	94.74
6	KSAO_193	Decisiveness: Making decisions based on all relevant information and then committing to those decisions with confidence.	3.74	100
7	KSAO_188	Problem Solving: The ability to identify a solution or corrective action and use available information and resources to solve problems. Often, information is gathered through critical analysis and investigation.	3.74	94.74
8	KSAO_187	Problem Sensitivity/Analysis: The ability to tell when something is wrong or is likely to go wrong. It does not involve solving the problem, only recognizing there is a problem and identifying the extent of the problem.	3.74	94.74
9	KSAO_194	Incident Management: Establishing the incident objectives, strategies, and goals. Determining the tactics and resources needed for achieving objectives. Maintaining accountability and responsibility over personnel and the incident. Coordinating with other resources to achieve incident objectives.	3.68	94.74

Rank	Item #	Skill/Ability Areas	Import.	%RUP
10	KSAO_192	Judgment: Processing contextual information and known objectives while weighing various options and their respective outcomes, in order to arrive at a solution that yields the greatest benefit with the least risk.	3.63	100

#### *Percent of Job Covered Results*

The percent of job covered rating addresses the comprehensiveness of the JAQ. Specifically, it measures the extent to which the task statements, knowledge areas, and skill and ability areas included in the JAQ adequately represent the rank being studied. Participants were asked to rate the percent of job covered by the JAQ. The average rating across all participants was 3.14 (SD = .98). When translated to the rating scale, the rating suggests that participants felt that the questionnaire covered approximately 80-89% percent of the position. These results suggest appropriate domain coverage of the JAQ.

#### *Relative Importance of Duty Area Results*

Participants rated the relative importance of each of the duty areas of their job. These ratings were made by dividing 100 points among the eight job duty areas. Average importance ratings for each duty area were calculated across all questionnaire participants. Table 28 presents the average relative importance of all duty areas. It is important to note that the relative importance of duty area ratings was translated into ratios instead of percentages, e.g., .5 as opposed to 50 percent. Duty areas are sorted based on their relative importance score. Participants rated “Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel” as having the most relative importance, whereas “Participate in Professional Development Opportunities” was rated as having the least relative importance for this rank.

Table 28. Results from Relative Importance of Duty Area Ratings

Duty Area	Relative Importance
Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel	0.34
Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events	0.14
Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations	0.11
Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects	0.11
Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities	0.11
Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities	0.07
Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations	0.07

Participate in Professional Development Opportunities	0.06
---	------

### *Analysis of Linkage Ratings*

The LAQ required participants to make a series of ratings regarding the importance of the 2 knowledge areas and 8 skill/ability areas in performing each of the eight job duty areas identified as relevant to the rank of lieutenant in the SFPD. These ratings provide validation evidence and support for test criteria decisions. These ratings reflect the importance of the ability and knowledge areas to the job as a whole, across all duty areas. The linkage ratings seek to further analyze the importance of the ability and knowledge areas by considering each duty area separately.

### *Linkage Matrix Results*

The linkage matrices were calculated using the standard methodology practices of IOS. The skill/ability linkage ratings produced a 12 x 8 skill/ability to job duty area matrix, which represents the 12 skill/abilities that were each rated on their importance in performing tasks associated with the eight job duty areas included in the study. Table 29 presents the average importance ratings across participants for each of the skill/ability areas in performing tasks associated with the respective job duty areas. The knowledge area linkage ratings produced a 2 x 8 knowledge area to job duty area matrix, which represents the 2 knowledge areas that were each rated on their importance in performing tasks associated with the eight job duty areas included in the study. Table 30 presents the average importance ratings across participants for each of the knowledge areas in performing tasks associated with the respective job duty areas. The higher the rating, the more so that a skill/ability area or knowledge area is essential to performing tasks associated with the respective job duty area.

Table 29. Skill/Ability Linkage Matrix

Skill/Ability Areas	Job Duty Areas							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Personnel Supervision	3.42	3.33	3.42	3.58	3.33	2.75	2.42	3.83
Leadership	3.67	3.58	4.00	3.92	3.58	3.58	3.50	4.00
Organizational Skills	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.83	3.83	3.17	3.42	3.50
Technological Skills	2.83	2.58	2.73	2.83	3.17	2.33	2.58	2.73
Interpersonal Skills	3.50	3.67	3.50	3.58	3.58	3.50	3.50	3.75
Critical Thinking	3.83	3.75	3.92	3.92	3.83	3.00	3.00	3.50
Decision-Making	3.83	3.75	3.92	3.83	3.67	2.92	3.17	3.83
Incident Operations	3.67	2.83	3.83	3.17	2.83	2.42	2.17	3.00
Written Communication	3.33	3.67	3.08	3.42	3.58	3.00	3.17	3.25
Oral Communication	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.58	3.58	3.82	3.50	3.75
Quantitative Analysis	2.33	2.33	2.42	2.75	2.92	2.33	2.33	2.58
Other Characteristics	2.75	3.08	3.17	3.25	3.17	2.92	2.92	3.08

Note: Job Duty Areas: 1 = Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects; 2 = Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations; 3 = Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events; 4 = Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities; 5 = Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations; 6 = Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities; 7 = Participate in Professional Development Opportunities; 8 = Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel.

Table 30. Knowledge Linkage Matrix

Knowledge Areas	Job Duty Areas							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Knowledge of Personnel/Administrative Principles, Policies, and Systems	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.83	3.00
Knowledge of Law Enforcement Standards and Practices	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.83	3.00

Note: Job Duty Areas: 1 = Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects; 2 = Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations; 3 = Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events; 4 = Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities; 5 = Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations; 6 = Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities; 7 = Participate in Professional Development Opportunities; 8 = Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel.

To compute the final linkages, the skill/ability and knowledge area linkage matrices were multiplied by the average relative importance of duty areas as indicated in Table 28. Therefore, the 12 skill/ability areas for each job duty area, as well as the 2 knowledge areas for each job duty area, were weighted according to how important that particular job duty area was rated. The final result is a mean linkage matrix representing the average weighted skill/ability areas and

knowledge areas by duty areas across all participants, herein the initial weighted linkage matrices (Appendices I and J).

Each skill/ability area and knowledge area was then summed across the eight job duty areas to get the final “weighted” skill/ability and knowledge area linkage vertex, which represents the relative importance of a skill/ability or knowledge area weighted across all job duty areas. Essentially then, these values represent the weighted importance of each skill/ability or knowledge area to the job globally. These values are reported in the “total” column in Appendices I and J. These total values were then standardized with a mean of 3 and a standard deviation of 1. The standardization process helps define “weighted importance total” differences. When a score is extremely high, the particular skill/ability or knowledge area has been described by participants as more important to the job globally as compared to the other skill/ability or knowledge areas. Extremely small values represent the opposite situation – less important to the job globally as other skill/ability or knowledge areas.

#### *Linkage Results and Summary*

The initial weighted skill/ability linkage matrix can be found in Appendix F, which is the mean linkage matrix representing the average weighted skill/ability areas by duty areas across all participants. The final skill/ability analysis/linkage results, which provide the standardized score representing the weighted importance of the skill/ability areas across all duty areas, can be found in Table 31.

Table 31. Final Skill/Ability Area Analysis/Linkage Study Results

<b>Skill/Ability Area</b>	<b>Standardized Score</b>
Leadership	4.12
Decision-Making	3.87
Oral Communication	3.83
Critical Thinking	3.65
Organizational Skills	3.64
Interpersonal Skills	3.61
Personnel Supervision	3.24
Written Communication	2.84
Incident Operations	2.35
Other Characteristics	2.29
Technological Skills	1.54
Quantitative Analysis	1.02

The initial weighted knowledge linkage matrix can be found in Appendix G, which is the mean linkage matrix representing the average weighted knowledge areas by duty areas across all participants. Standardized scores could not be completed for the knowledge linkage matrix as there was no variance in the total scores for the two knowledge areas.

As shown in Table 31, job analysis SMEs rated a majority of the KSA clusters as helpful or essential in performing the tasks in the above job duty areas. This linkage confirmed the relationship between the job tasks that would be simulated in the test exercises and the essential KSAs identified through the job analysis.

This evidence supported a selection process consisting of the following components: role plays simulating a meeting with sergeants, a subordinate, and the community; oral exercise managing field operations; and an oral exercise evaluating and responding to documents that lieutenants are commonly required to review and evaluate. As discussed in the next section, the design of these components draws heavily on the tasks in the above job duty areas.

## **Section IV: Selection Procedure and Its Content: Assessment Center**

The following section describes the SFPD lieutenant promotional assessment center developed by IOS. The primary purpose of the assessment center (AC herein) was to measure the KSAs required for performing the job of a lieutenant within the SFPD. Based on the results of the job analysis, a set of measurable KSAs was identified for the position; AC components were designed to measure these KSAs; and criteria determining successful performance on each of the components were developed. The culmination of the AC yielded candidate performance results that were delivered to the Department of Human Resources for use in creating an eligibility list. Each phase of the development process will be described in detail below.

### **Introduction to the Assessment Center**

Assessment centers are “best conceptualized as a method by which information concerning multiple behavioral dimensions is collected” (Arthur & Day, 2010). In an assessment center process, candidates complete multiple exercises and are evaluated by multiple assessors on multiple dimensions deemed necessary for a job (Guion, 1998). Some behavioral dimensions that are commonly measured using assessment centers include communication; organization and planning; and problem solving (Arthur & Day, 2010). Possible exercises include in-basket exercises (Frederikson, Saunders, & Wand, 1957), leaderless group discussions (Bass, 1954; Thornton & Byham, 1982), job simulations, scenario-based interviews (e.g. stress interviews, role playing simulations, and panel interviews), presentations, and written exercises. Multiple exercises are used because “the process of seeking confirmation from several exercises leads to more validity of measurement of complex dimensions” (Thornton & Byham, 1982).

The Guidelines and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations (2014), specify ten essential elements of an assessment center. These elements are listed below, along with a brief description of how each element was addressed in the assessment center developed for the SFPD:

- 1) **Systematic Analysis to Determine Job-Relevant Behavioral Constructs:** Addressed in the IOS job analysis.
- 2) **Behavioral Classification:** Addressed in the dimensions IOS and SMEs identified and measured in the assessment center.
- 3) **Multiple Assessment Center Components:** Achieved by including six distinct assessment center exercises: a community meeting role-play, a field operations exercise, a tactical exercise, an administrative in-basket, a sergeant meeting role-play, and a subordinate meeting role-play.
- 4) **Linkages between Behavioral Constructs and Assessment Center Components:** Achieved in the content validation process described in the “AC Exercise Validation Process” section in this chapter.

- 5) **Simulation Exercises:** All exercises are considered simulation exercises in that they “require the same or similar elicit behaviors representative of the targeted behavioral constructs and within a context consistent with the focal job”. According to the Assessment Center Guidelines (2014, page 8), simulation exercises include, “in-box exercises, leaderless group discussions, case study analyses/presentations, role plays, and fact-finding exercises”.
- 6) **Assessors:** A panel of law enforcement SMEs served as assessors in the assessment center (described in the “Administration of AC and the Rating Process” section in this chapter.
- 7) **Assessor Training:** A 8+ hour training session was held with assessors prior to beginning the rating process. See the section, “Administration of AC and the Rating Process”.
- 8) **Recording and Scoring of Behaviors:** Recording of candidate behaviors; IOS staff checked the accuracy and completeness of assessor ratings and scored each candidates’ ratings
- 9) **Data Integration:** Data integration (combining data across assessors and exercises) was performed by IOS staff.
- 10) **Standardization:** Standardization was addressed in the design of the assessment center (all candidates participated in the same exercises, were evaluated on the same dimensions using the same behavioral criteria, were given the same instructions), assessor frame of reference training, and score standardization described in Section V.

Development of the Assessment Center

The SME panel, presented in Table 32 below, was utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development of the AC components. During the initial kick-off meeting held with the SME panel on September 5, 2019, various topics were discussed, including: the responsibilities of being a SME, tasks involved, the commitment and security requirements, and initial brainstorming of scenarios. Subsequent meetings with the SMEs were held to continue discussion on scenarios relevant to the lieutenant position within the SFPD.

Table 32. SME Panel - AC Development

<b>Name</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Current Assignment</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>SME Group</b>
	Lieutenant	Academy	White	Male	1
	Lieutenant	SVU	Black	Male	1
	Captain	Park Station	White	Female	1
	Lieutenant	Southern Station	White	Male	2
	Lieutenant	Taraval Station	Hispanic	Female	2
	Captain	Tenderloin Station	White	Male	2
	Lieutenant	Tactical	Asian	Male	3
	Lieutenant	CIT	Hispanic	Male	3
	Captain	Bayview Station	Black	Male	3

Components of the AC

In total, there were six exercise components included within the AC. The specific job duty areas that are sampled by each component are indicated in Table 33. Again, each component consisted of job duty areas (or work samples) replicating essential job duties that were linked to critical KSAs during the job analysis study.

Table 33. Job Duty Areas Sampled by Each Exercise Component

Exercise Component	Job Duty Areas
Community Meeting Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities</li> <li>• Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities</li> <li>• Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations</li> <li>• Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</li> </ul>
Field Operations Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events</li> <li>• Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</li> <li>• Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities</li> </ul>
Hot Call Tactical Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events</li> <li>• Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</li> <li>• Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations</li> </ul>
Sergeant Meeting Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel</li> <li>• Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities</li> <li>• Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</li> </ul>
Subordinate Meeting Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel</li> <li>• Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities</li> <li>• Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations</li> </ul>

Exercise Component	Job Duty Areas
In-Basket Presentation Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events</li> <li>• Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities</li> <li>• Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations</li> <li>• Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</li> <li>• Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities</li> <li>• Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations</li> <li>• Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel</li> </ul>

The following is a description of each component included as part of the Q060 Lieutenant AC, and the KSA clusters each component measured. Table 34 presents the assessment dimensions measured within each of the six AC components.

Table 34. AC Component X Assessment Dimension

	Dimension Included Within AC Exercise (✓)						
	KSA1	KSA2	KSA3	KSA4	KSA5	KSA6	KSA7
<b>Community Meeting</b>			✓	✓			✓
<b>Field Operations</b>			✓			✓	✓
<b>Hot Call Tactical</b>			✓			✓	✓
<b>In-Basket Presentation</b>		✓	✓		✓		✓
<b>Sergeant Meeting</b>	✓	✓	✓				✓
<b>Subordinate Meeting</b>	✓	✓		✓			✓

Note: KSA1 = Leadership; KSA2 = Supervision & Management; KSA3 = Critical Thinking; KSA4 = Interpersonal Skills / Community Relations; KSA5 = Administrative Management; KSA6 = Tactical Skills; KSA7 = Oral Communication.

### *Community Meeting*

This exercise served as a highly structured role-play exercise. Within this exercise, candidates played the role of a newly promoted lieutenant and met with citizens of a neighborhood within San Francisco. The Captain had requested that the lieutenant meet with these citizens to address issues and complaints with the homeless population. After the initial presentation to

the community members was completed, candidates were asked three structured follow-up questions. These three questions were asked for all candidates.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate's performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Oral Communication, (2) Community Relations, and (3) Critical Thinking.

#### *Field Operations Exercise*

Candidates were asked to prepare a plan to address a scenario concerning a planned demonstration at a local high school. In the plan, candidates had to discuss how he/she would handle the demonstration as a newly promoted lieutenant within the SFPD. Candidates were given up to 11 minutes to present their plan.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate's performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Tactical Skills, (2) Critical Thinking, and (3) Oral Communication.

#### *Hot Call Tactical*

Candidates were presented with a written scenario describing a "hot call" that required them to take immediate action and manage a scene. Upon entering the test room, candidates were given one minute to review the written details of the scenario, and then were instructed to begin the verbal response. This was done to simulate hot call incidents where there is little time to think before having to take action. After completing the response to the first part of the scenario, they received updated information regarding the situation. Candidates were provided with additional time to respond to the scenario. After this, further information to update the scene was provided and candidates had additional time to respond.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate's performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Tactical Skills, (2) Critical Thinking, and (3) Oral Communication.

#### *In-Basket Presentation*

Within this exercise, candidates reviewed seven items that required their attention. The in-basket included items of various importance and urgency, ranging from a personnel issue to an incident report. Candidates had 11 minutes to present their approach on how the items in their inbox would be handled.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate's performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Oral Communication, (2) Administrative Management, (3) Critical Thinking, and (4) Supervision and Management.

#### *Sergeant Meeting*

Candidates were given up to 11 minutes to conduct their sergeant meeting with their sergeants. Within the sergeant meeting exercise, candidates were instructed to provide (1) a

leadership style introduction to their staff and (2) a discussion of current issues. Candidates were guided with specifics on what they should include when discussing each of these parts. After the meeting, candidates were instructed to answer two questions provided by the sergeants.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate’s performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Oral Communication, (2) Supervision and Management, (3) Leadership, and (4) Critical Thinking.

*Highly Structured Subordinate Meeting*

This exercise served as a highly structured role-play exercise. Within this exercise, candidates played the role of a newly promoted lieutenant and met with a sergeant under their supervision. The candidates were given a detailed scenario to set-up the meeting. Candidates were given 11 minutes to conduct the meeting with the sergeant.

A panel of assessors evaluated each candidate’s performance based on the following dimensions: (1) Leadership, (2) Supervision and Management, (3) Interpersonal Skills, and (4) Oral Communication.

Weighting of Each AC Component Dimension

The weights of the AC component dimensions were established in a three-step process. First, three IOS consultants rated the degree to which each of the 7 KSA clusters (i.e., dimensions) were relevant to the six components in the assessment process. The rating scale used to rate the relevance of each KSA cluster is presented in Table 35. The average relevance ratings of each KSA cluster are presented in Table 36.

Table 35. Relevance Rating Scale

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Scale Descriptor</b>
<b>0</b>	This dimension is <b>NOT RELEVANT TO</b> this exercise.
<b>1</b>	This dimension is <b>MODERATELY RELEVANT TO</b> this exercise.
<b>2</b>	This dimension is <b>HIGHLY RELEVANT TO</b> this exercise.

Table 36. Average Exercise Dimension Relevance Ratings

Dimension	Average Relevance Ratings					
	Tactical	Field Operations	In-Basket	Sub. Meeting	SGT. Meeting	Community Meeting
Leadership	2.00	2.00	0	2.00	2.00	0
Oral Communication	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Admin Management	0	0	2.00	0	0	0
Critical Thinking	0	0	2.00	0	2.00	2.00
Supervision & Management	0	0	2.00	2.00	2.00	0
Interpersonal Skills / Community Relations	0	0	0	2.00	0	2.00
Tactical	2.00	2.00	0	0	0	0

Next, the three IOS consultants assigned weights to each dimension within each of the six components. This weighting was expressed as a percentage (0 to 100), and described the degree to which the dimension is represented in the component, as well as the amount of weight this dimension should be given when evaluating candidates. The average weightings for each dimension are presented in Table 37. The average weights for each dimension were the final weights used in calculating exercise scores.

Table 37. Average Dimension Weight x AC Component

Exercise	Dimension	Dim Wgt Rater 1	Dim Wgt Rater 2	Dim Wgt Rater 3	IOS Average / Final Dimension Weight
<b>Sergeant Meeting</b>	Leadership	43.00%	43.00%	40.00%	<b>42.00%</b>
	Supervision & Management	34.00%	34.00%	40.00%	<b>36.00%</b>
	Critical Thinking	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	<b>10.00%</b>
	Oral Communication	13.00%	13.00%	10.00%	<b>12.00%</b>
<b>Community Meeting</b>	Interpersonal Skills/Community Relations	60.00%	60.00%	70.00%	<b>63.33%</b>
	Critical Thinking	25.00%	25.00%	20.00%	<b>23.33%</b>
	Oral Communication	15.00%	15.00%	10.00%	<b>13.33%</b>
<b>Subordinate Meeting</b>	Leadership	37.00%	37.00%	35.00%	<b>36.33%</b>
	Supervision & Management	30.00%	30.00%	35.00%	<b>31.67%</b>
	Interpersonal Skills	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	<b>20.00%</b>
	Oral Communication	13.00%	13.00%	10.00%	<b>12.00%</b>
<b>In-Box</b>	Supervision & Management	19.00%	19.00%	20.00%	<b>19.33%</b>
	Critical Thinking	25.00%	25.00%	20.00%	<b>23.33%</b>
	Admin. Management	40.00%	40.00%	55.00%	<b>45.00%</b>
	Oral Communication	16.00%	16.00%	5.00%	<b>12.33%</b>
<b>Field-Operations</b>	Tactical Skills	72.00%	72.00%	70.00%	<b>71.33%</b>
	Critical Thinking	15.00%	15.00%	20.00%	<b>16.67%</b>
	Oral Communication	13.00%	13.00%	10.00%	<b>12.00%</b>
<b>Hot call</b>	Tactical Skills	72.00%	72.00%	70.00%	<b>71.33%</b>
	Critical Thinking	15.00%	15.00%	20.00%	<b>16.67%</b>
	Oral Communication	13.00%	13.00%	10.00%	<b>12.00%</b>

Weighting of Each AC Component

The weights of each AC component were established in a four-step process. First, the relative importance weights of the KSA clusters to each of the job duty areas from the Linkage Analysis was entered and can be viewed in Table 38. Next, three IOS consultants provided dimension weights for each of the six exercise components, which can be viewed in Table 39. For the next step, a weighted average for each dimension in a respective component was established by multiplying the SME relative KSA cluster weights by each components' final dimension weights. The weighted dimension averages for each component were then summed to get a total weight for each component. Finally, the total weighted average for each component was divided by the sum of the six weighted component averages to yield the relative weight of each component.

The final component weights, as well as the final dimension weights used by assessors during the AC are presented in Table 39.

Table 38. Relative Importance of KSA Cluster Results

KSA Cluster	Standardized Score	Weight as Ratio
Leadership	4.12	0.15
Administrative Management	3.75	0.13
Oral Communication	3.83	0.14
Critical Thinking	3.65	0.13
Interpersonal Skills/Community Relations	3.61	0.13
Supervision & Management	3.24	0.11
Tactical Skills	2.35	0.08
Total	28.32	1.00

Table 39. Final Exercise Weights

Exercise	Exercise Weight	Exercise Component Weights						
		KSA1	KSA2	KSA3	KSA4	KSA5	KSA6	KSA7
Community Meeting	18%			10%	12%	63.33%		
Field Operations	14%			16.67%	12%			71.33%
Hot Call Tactical	14%			16.67%	12%			71.33%
In-Basket Presentation	18%		19.33%	23.33%	12.33%		45%	
Sergeant Meeting	18%	42%	36%	10%	12%			
Subordinate Meeting	18%	36.33%	31.67%		12%	20%		

Note: Components marked with \* are combined to create the percentage. For example, for the Field Operations exercise, knowledge of law enforcement standards and practices combined with problem solving was weighted at 90%. KSA1 = Leadership; KSA2 = Supervision & Management; KSA3 = Critical Thinking; KSA4 = Oral Communication; KSA5 = Interpersonal Skills/Community Relations; KSA6 = Administrative Management; and KSA7 = Tactical Skills.

#### Development of Rating Criteria for Dimensions

Along with the development of each of the AC components, IOS, with assistance from SMEs, also developed a list of specific criteria used for rating performance for each dimension included within a respective component. These criteria include specific behavioral indicators that a candidate should be expected to engage in if the candidate is to perform effectively within a given dimension on an AC component. It is the policy of IOS that these criteria should not be

used as absolute ratings of a candidate’s score (i.e., completing a certain number of the criteria should not automatically correspond to a given score on that component). Rather, these criteria are meant to serve as useful guidelines for assessors when making their final performance ratings for a dimension. These criteria were kept secure and only viewed by assessors when making their final performance ratings for each candidate.

AC Exercise Validation Process

The relationship between the assessment center components and the Q060 Lieutenant position was established through a content validation strategy. First, a set of measurable KSA clusters was identified based on the job analysis. The content areas identified in the job analysis were used as the basis for developing the content of the components. The assessment center components were developed to assess the KSA clusters deemed to be important in the job analysis. Further, the SME panel provided the scenarios for the components based on their in-depth knowledge of the position. SMEs reviewed the component/exercise content and criteria to ensure they were valid and realistic representations of the job.

Furthermore, to support the relationship between the AC and the Q060 Lieutenant position, the SMEs who developed the exercises were asked to rate each exercise on the following areas: 1) the relevancy/importance of each exercise to the rank of lieutenant; 2) fidelity of each exercise, 3) ability for the exercise to differentiate high job performers from low job performers; 4) ability for the exercise *criteria* to differentiate high job performers from low job performers; 5) relevancy of the rating criteria for each exercise dimension and the exercise overall; 6) whether each rating criteria is related to successful performance in the exercise, and 7) whether each behavior presented in the rating criteria are required upon promotion. The scales used for each rating and the results are presented below.

A summary of which SME groups provided the validation ratings for each of the six AC exercises is shown in Table 40.

Table 40. Test Exercise-Job Analysis Linkage Meetings

<b>Exercise</b>	<b>Attendees</b>
Community Meeting	Group 2, Group 3
Field Operations	Group 1, Group 3
Hot Call Tactical	Group 1, Group 3
In-Basket Presentation	Group 1, Group 2
Sergeant Meeting	Group 3
Subordinate Meeting	Group 1, Group 2

*Exercise Modified Content Validity Ratio (CVR)*

SMEs were instructed to provide a rating based on their opinion as a manager in the SFPD regarding how relevant and important each exercise was to the rank of lieutenant. In other

words, SMEs rated how well each exercise measured KSAs that are important to performing the job of a Lieutenant in the SFPD. The CVR rating scale is presented in Table 41. The average CVR rating for each exercise provided by the SMEs is presented in Table 42.

Table 41. Modified Content Validity Ratio Scale

Rating	Scale Descriptor
0	The exercise <b><u>DOES NOT</u></b> measure KSAs that are relevant to performing the job of a lieutenant in the SFPD.
1	The exercise <b><u>SLIGHTLY MEASURES</u></b> KSAs relevant to performing the job of a lieutenant in the SFPD.
2	The exercise <b><u>MEASURES</u></b> KSAs relevant to performing the job of a lieutenant in the SFPD.
3	The exercise <b><u>STRONGLY MEASURES</u></b> KSAs relevant to performing the job of a lieutenant in the SFPD.

Table 42. Average Exercise Content Validity Ratio Results

Exercise	Average CVR Rating
Tactical	3.00
Field Operations	3.00
In-Basket	3.00
Subordinate Meeting	3.00
Sergeant Meeting	3.00
Community Meeting	3.00

#### *Exercise Fidelity Ratings*

SMEs were instructed to rate the extent to which each exercise was realistic and plausible (i.e., would a lieutenant be likely to encounter this scenario on the job?). The exercise fidelity rating scale is presented in Table 43. The average exercise fidelity ratings provided by the SMEs is presented in Table 44.

Table 43. Exercise Fidelity Rating Scale

Rating	Scale Descriptor
0	This exercise is <b><u>NOT REALISTIC, NOR PLAUSIBLE</u></b> for the rank. The exercise exhibits <b><u>NO FIDELITY</u></b> .
1	This exercise is <b><u>MODERATELY REALISTIC/PLAUSIBLE</u></b> for the rank. The exercise exhibits <b><u>MODERATE FIDELITY</u></b> .
2	This exercise is <b><u>HIGHLY REALISTIC/PLAUSIBLE</u></b> for the rank. The exercise exhibits <b><u>HIGH FIDELITY</u></b> .

Table 44. Average Exercise Fidelity Results

Exercise	Average Fidelity Rating
Tactical	2.00
Field Operations	2.00
In-Basket	2.00
Subordinate Meeting	1.67
Sergeant Meeting	2.00
Community Meeting	2.00

*Exercise Differentiation*

SMEs were instructed to rate the extent to which they expected a high performer to do well on each exercise and a lower performer to do worse on each exercise. This rating was made to determine the extent to which each exercise and the achievement of the rating criteria set forth for each exercise would differentiate high-on-the-job performers from lower on-the-job performers. The differentiation rating scale is presented in Table 45. The average differentiation rating for each exercise provided by the SMEs is presented in Table 46.

Table 45. Exercise Differentiation Rating Scale

Rating	Scale Descriptor
0	Higher performance on this exercise will NOT DIFFERENTIATE between high & low on-the job performance! NO DIFFERENTIATION!
1	Higher performance on this exercise will MODERATELY DIFFERENTIATE between high & low on-the job performance! MODERATE DIFFERENTIATION!
2	Higher performance on this exercise will provide HIGH DIFFERENTIATION between high & low on-the job performance! HIGH DIFFERENTIATION!

Table 46. Average Exercise Differentiation Results

Exercise	Average Differentiation Rating
Tactical	2.00
Field Operations	2.00
In-Basket	2.00
Subordinate Meeting	2.00
Sergeant Meeting	2.00
Community Meeting	2.00

*Exercise Criteria Differentiation*

SMEs were instructed to rate the extent that the exercise rating criteria would differentiate high on-the-job performers from lower on-the-job performers. The criteria differentiation rating

scale is presented in Table 47. The average differentiation rating for each exercise provided by the SMEs is presented in Table 48.

Table 47. Exercise Criteria Differentiation Rating Scale

Rating	Scale Descriptor
0	The exercise criteria set forth by this exercise will <b><u>NOT DIFFERENTIATE</u></b> between high & low on-the job performance! <b><u>NO DIFFERENTIATION!</u></b>
1	The exercise criteria set forth by this exercise will <b><u>MODERATELY DIFFERENTIATE</u></b> between high & low on-the job performance! <b><u>MODERATE DIFFERENTIATION!</u></b>
2	The exercise criteria set forth by this exercise will provide <b><u>HIGH DIFFERENTIATION</u></b> between high & low on-the job performance! <b><u>HIGH DIFFERENTIATION!</u></b>

Table 48. Average Exercise Criteria Differentiation Results

Exercise	Average Differentiation Rating
Tactical	2.00
Field Operations	1.80
In-Basket	1.60
Subordinate Meeting	1.83
Sergeant Meeting	1.67
Community Meeting	2.00

#### Rating Criteria

SMEs were instructed to make four ratings for each criterion. As stated previously, criteria were used for rating performance on each dimension included within a respective exercise. The four ratings were made to determine the extent to which the criteria listed under a chosen exercise dimension are associated with that specific dimension, are related to successful performance in the exercise, are reflective of excellent job performance, and are behaviors that are required upon promotion. The scales used for these four ratings are presented in Table 49 through Table 52. Criteria that did not meet the threshold for all four scales were removed from the exercise rating criteria.

Table 49. Criteria-Dimension Relevance Rating Scale

Rating	Scale – Dimension Relevance
0	<b><u>MANY/ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NOT RELATED</u></b> to this dimension.
1	<b><u>MOST</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to this dimension.
2	<b><u>ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to this dimension.

Table 50. Criteria-Exercise High Performance Rating Scale

Rating	Scale – High Exercise Performance
0	<b><u>MANY/ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NOT RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>EXERCISE</u></b> performance.
1	<b><u>MOST</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>EXERCISE</u></b> performance.
2	<b><u>ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>EXERCISE</u></b> performance.

Table 51. Criteria-High Job Performance Rating Scale

Rating	Scale – High Job Performance
0	<b><u>MANY/ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NOT RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>JOB</u></b> performance.
1	<b><u>MOST</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>JOB</u></b> performance.
2	<b><u>ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors listed are <b><u>RELATED</u></b> to high <b><u>JOB</u></b> performance.

Table 52. Criteria-Required Upon Promotion Rating Scale

Rating	Scale – Required upon Promotion
0	<b><u>MANY/ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NOT NEEDED UPON PROMOTION.</u></b>
1	<b><u>MOST</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NEEDED UPON PROMOTION.</u></b>
2	<b><u>ALL</u></b> of the criteria/behavioral anchors are <b><u>NEEDED UPON PROMOTION.</u></b>

Table 53 presents the average ratings that SMEs provided to validate the criteria by dimension for each of the six exercises. All finalized rating criteria were rated to its respective dimension, related to high performance on the exercise and on the job, as well as expected to perform upon promotion.

Table 53. Summary of Criteria Validation Results

<b>Exercise</b>	<b>Dimension</b>	<b>1) Criteria related to Dimension</b>	<b>2) Criteria Related to High Exercise Performance</b>	<b>3) Criteria Related to High Job Performance</b>	<b>4) Required Upon Promotion</b>
<b>Community Meeting</b>	<i>Community Relations</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
<b>Field Operations</b>	<i>Tactical Skill</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
<b>Hot Call - Tactical</b>	<i>Tactical Skill</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	1.80	1.80	2.00	2.00
<b>Subordinate Meeting</b>	<i>Leadership</i>	1.80	1.80	2.00	2.00
	<i>Supervision and Management</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Interpersonal</i>	1.80	1.80	1.80	2.00
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
<b>In-Basket</b>	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Supervision and Management</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Administrative Management</i>	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.83
<b>Sergeant Meeting</b>	<i>Supervision and Management</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Leadership</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	<i>Oral Communication</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

Administration of the AC and the Rating Process

*Test Preparation Guide*

To help candidates prepare for the examination, and to put all candidates on an equal footing, a “Test Preparation Guide” was made available to candidates approximately 30 days prior to the administration of the first exercise. In general, the Preparation Guide presented:

- A general overview of the 2019 selection process
- How and where to direct questions about the Preparation Guide
- A description of the structure of each exercise
- A list of task clusters simulated, and KSA clusters measured in each exercise
- Sample candidate instructions for each exercise
- A list of suggested reading material

Candidates were invited to submit in writing to IOS any questions they had regarding the contents of the Preparation Guide. Three questions were submitted to IOS. A “Preparation Guide Update” addressing the questions raised was made available to candidates prior to the administration of the AC. A copy of the Preparation Guide and the Preparation Guide Update are contained in **Error! Reference source not found.K**.

*Assessor Training*

Assessor training occurred on January 6, 2020. In total, there were 37 assessors for the AC process. Assessors included law enforcement professionals who were at the rank of lieutenant or higher. The assessors were chosen based on tenure, rank, knowledge, skill and department experience, as well as previous assessment experience. Table 54 presents the demographics of the assessors who took part in the assessment center.

Table 54. Demographics of Assessors for 2016 Q060 Lieutenant Assessment Center

Rank	Name	Agency	Gender	Race
Lt. Colonel		Memphis	F	Black
Lieutenant		Indianapolis Metro	M	Black
Lieutenant		Dallas	M	White
Lieutenant		Chicago	F	Black
Major		Memphis	M	Black
Lieutenant		Austin	M	White
Lieutenant		Philadelphia	M	Black
Lieutenant		Milwaukee	M	White
Lieutenant		Colorado Springs	F	Black
Lieutenant		Philadelphia	F	Black

Rank	Name	Agency	Gender	Race
Lieutenant		Austin	M	Black
Captain		Honolulu	M	White
Lieutenant		Indianapolis Metro	F	Black
Lieutenant		Philadelphia	M	Black
Captain		Indianapolis Metro	M	White
Lt. Colonel		Memphis	M	Black
Captain		New Castle	M	Black
Lieutenant		Gwinnett County	M	White
Lieutenant		Austin	F	White
Lieutenant		Austin Police	M	White
Lieutenant		Virginia Beach	M	White
Commander		Pittsburgh Bureau	F	White
Lieutenant		Scottsdale	M	White
Commander		Pittsburgh Bureau	M	White
Inspector		Philadelphia	M	White
Captain		Honolulu	M	Asian/White
Lieutenant II		Los Angeles	F	White
Captain		Tucson Police	M	Hispanic
Lieutenant		Cincinnati	F	White
Lieutenant		Denver	M	White
Captain		Orlando Police	M	Black
Lieutenant		Oklahoma City	F	White
Commander		Pittsburgh	M	White
Inspector		Philadelphia	M	Black
Lieutenant		San Diego	M	Hispanic
Lieutenant		Cincinnati	M	White
Lieutenant		Oklahoma City	M	White

IOS staff conducted the mandatory full day assessor training seminar. At the training seminar, each assessor received an Assessor Manual which contained general training materials concerning the AC components, detailed descriptions and guides for evaluating the components, dimension rating scales, and rating documentation forms. Assessor training included general rater training, which reviewed in detail the rating scale and how to make ratings using the pre-determined criteria; rater errors and how to avoid them; and specifics about the components assessors would rate. Furthermore, assessors had several opportunities to practice rating AC components and have in-depth discussions on the rating process for these

mock-ups afterwards. Thus, all assessors received extensive training for the AC components prior to rating any candidates. SMEs from the SFPD also attended the assessor training and spoke to the assessors about the department and expectations for candidates for each component. Beyond the rater training, staff members from IOS were present during the administration of the AC to answer measurement-related questions and to check ratings to ensure that all panels were rating in accordance with the standards set in training.

*Administration of the AC*

The AC process was administered on December 17 through 18, 2019. Each day of the AC included three of the AC components. Thus, candidates had to arrive on each of the two administration days to complete the AC in its entirety. All candidates signed-in at their assigned arrival time and reviewed general information about the AC components and general logistical information. The AC took place at the City and County of San Francisco Employment Testing Center in San Francisco, California. A total of 131 candidates completed the AC.

*Ratings and Scoring Process*

The 37 assessors were divided into 12 panels, with 3 members serving on each panel. Two panels of assessors were assigned to each of the six exercises. The assessor panels were assigned with racial, gender, and professional diversity in mind. Assessors were trained on their assigned components. The assessors were instructed to make ratings for each performance dimension using the 7-point rating scale presented in Table 55.

Table 55. AC Rating Scale

<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
← Poor		Adequate		Strong →		

The assessors were instructed to make preliminary individual ratings on each AC component dimension. After assessors made a preliminary rating for each dimension for a given candidate, assessors were asked to discuss their ratings with the fellow members of their panel. The assessor panels then came to agreement on their scores, within a 1-point consensus, for each dimension for each candidate.

**Section V: Q060 Lieutenant Assessment Center Results**

The following section provides the basic descriptive statistics for the results of the Q060 Lieutenant AC.

The AC included six components: The Community Meeting Exercise, the Field Operations Exercise, the Hot Call Tactical Exercise, the In-Basket Presentation Exercise, the Sergeant Meeting Exercise, and the Subordinate Meeting Exercise. One hundred thirty-one Q060 Lieutenant candidates completed the full assessment center.

For each of the six exercises components, candidate raw scores on each exercise were totaled according to the respective dimension weights, and then standardized by rating panel. Following, the z score was converted to a T-score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A weighted T-score for each exercise was calculated based on the weight of the exercise component. All of the weighted T-scores were then summed to arrive at the candidate's final assessment center T-score. This final T-score was converted to a 700-1000 scale based on City of San Francisco's Civil Service Rules, which represented the candidate's final score in the assessment center.

By standardizing the component scores, their relative component weights could be applied appropriately. That is, to compute the final candidate scores, standardized candidate scores on the Community Meeting exercise were multiplied by .18, the Field Operations Exercise by .14, the Hot Call Tactical Exercise by .14, the In-Basket Presentation by .18, the Sergeant Meeting Exercise by .18, and the Subordinate Meeting Exercise by .18, and then summed.

A cut score was not recommended to DHR. Thus, all candidates were placed on the final eligible list. Selections from the eligible list are made within the Rule of Ten scores.

## **Section VI: Contact Information**

All records, data, and work products related to the project described in this report have been meticulously maintained and may be available for inspection upon request. Requests to review any and all records can be directed to the following address:

IOS, Inc.  
1520 Kensington Rd., Suite 110  
Oak Brook, IL 60523  
Phone: (888)784-1290  
Email: [info@iosolutions.org](mailto:info@iosolutions.org)

## **Section VII: Accuracy and Completeness**

IOS takes steps throughout the process to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the collection, analysis and report of data and results. Some of these steps are listed below.

- Quality control protocols were employed in the creation of the assessments.
- Quality control protocols are employed for data entry (e.g., assessment ratings). These controls include: data entry and data checking by separate staff members.
- Quality control protocols are employed for scoring the assessment components and calculating the overall scores. These controls include verification of all equations.
- All analyses are either completed by or reviewed by the project manager, a Master's or Ph.D. level industrial psychologist.
- All reports are either completed by or reviewed by the project manager, a Master's or Ph. D. level industrial psychologist.

## **Section VIII: References**

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Americans With Disabilities Act of 1991, Pub. L. No 101-336, 104, Stat. 328 (1990).
- Arthur, W. Jr., & Day, E. A. (2010). Assessment centers. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Volume II, Selecting Members* (pp. 205-235). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Arthur, W., Jr., Day, E. A., McNelly, T. L., & Edens, P. S. (2003). A meta-analysis of the criterion-related validity of assessment center dimensions. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 125–154.
- Bass, B.M. (1954). The leaderless group discussion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 465-492.
- Civil Rights Act of 1991 (1991). Retrieved from Equal Employment Opportunity Commission website: <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/cra-1991.cfm>.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, & Department of Justice. (1978). Adoption by four agencies of uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. *Federal Register*, 43, 38290-38315.
- Frederikson, N., Saunders, D.A., & Wand, B. (1957). The in-basket test. *Psychological Monographs*, 71. (Whole No. 438).
- Guion, R.M. (1998). *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel decisions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harvey, Robert J., Dunnette, Marvin D. (Ed), Hough, Leaetta M. (Ed). (1991). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 2, 2nd ed.*, (pp. 71-163). Palo Alto, CA, US: Consulting Psychologists Press, xxv, 957 pp.
- The International Taskforce on Assessment Center Guidelines. (2014). *Guidelines and ethical considerations for assessment center operations*.
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (2003). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.).
- Thornton, G.C., III, & Byham, W.C. (1982). *Assessment centers and managerial performance*. New York: Academic Press.

**Appendix A: Final Task Analysis Results**

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
13	Obtain assistance from another station or to adjust subordinates' work hours to ensure adequate staffing levels at planned events.	90.24	3.49	0.56	2.97	3.32	89.19	97.30	1.1
14	Plan tactical operations and serve as Event Commander for enforcement operations, such as STOP, buy/bust, DUI checkpoint, etc.	85.37	3.34	0.54	2.31	3.00	80.00	97.14	1.1
15	Develop and oversee crime prevention, deterrence, and apprehension programs and activities.	80.00	3.31	0.64	2.53	3.05	84.38	93.75	1.1
8	Exchange information with event organizer regarding parameters of function, such as number of people expected, scheduled hours, location, history and purpose of event, required permits, etc., in order to plan police involvement and to ensure safety for all those involved.	75.61	3.16	0.58	2.10	2.81	64.52	90.32	1.1
5	Develop a plan which addresses an identified community need and outlines a resolution to the problem.	95.12	3.03	0.49	2.38	2.81	87.18	89.74	1.1
12	Develop an operational order/plan for superior's approval.	92.68	3.29	0.65	2.42	3.00	89.47	89.47	1.1
16	Coordinate activities to ensure safety at an event (e.g., set-up communication system, establish who will be in charge, determine location of posts).	80.49	3.24	0.66	2.21	2.90	87.88	87.88	1.1
1	Identify crime patterns by reviewing information such as reports, crime maps, community input, suspect information, Crime Data Warehouse, etc., noting particulars of crimes, including locations, types of victims, and times of occurrence.	92.86	3.13	0.66	2.72	2.99	84.21	84.62	1.1

10	Explain procedures, practices, enforcement orders, and policies of special project prior to assigning unit member to the project.	92.68	3.16	0.68	2.58	2.96	78.95	84.21	1.1
6	Attend meetings with community officials, City personnel, and other SFPD personnel to gather information that deals with proposed changes in practices and policies or investigative operations.	90.24	3.16	0.69	2.22	2.85	78.38	83.78	1.1
3	Make an oral presentation to others (superior officers, DA, community officials, etc.) which includes information such as cost, staffing, any additional impacts, etc., to convince them to accept proposed changes or to adopt a new activity or plan.	78.05	3.06	0.67	2.16	2.76	75.00	81.25	1.1
4	Assess the impact of proposed changes or actions to determine if contingency plans are needed.	87.81	3.00	0.64	2.31	2.78	80.56	80.00	1.1
2	Interpret trends and patterns found in data and records in order to estimate and predict needs of a situation or assist in plan development, for daily use and Compstat.	90.24	2.86	0.75	2.32	2.68	67.57	75.68	1.1
7	Explain police policies and expectations to involved/concerned groups prior to planned events or special operations.	95.12	3.00	0.73	2.21	2.74	76.92	74.36	1.1
11	Evaluate the effectiveness of newly implemented (or modifications of existing) plans by observing, interviewing participants, analyzing computer printouts, and taking into account whether the plan is progressing as proposed.	65.85	2.78	0.70	1.89	2.48	62.96	70.37	1.3
9	Write a narrative report or memorandum that takes into account factors such as cost, personnel and equipment needs, impact of any recommended changes, ways to deal with new situations/events, etc.	95.12	2.51	0.79	1.64	2.22	64.10	48.72	2.1
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>

17	Review results of an investigation involving subordinates for completeness and accuracy of conclusions, including documentation and investigations done by subordinate sergeants, to make recommendations to superiors regarding remedies.	97.56	3.67	0.53	3.08	3.48	85.00	97.50	1.1
25	Ensure subordinates follow proper procedure in interviewing citizens regarding call for service and in completing the necessary documentation.	80.49	3.39	0.56	2.39	3.06	93.94	96.97	1.1
18	Make required notifications, as outlined in departmental policies and procedures, in the handling of administrative investigations, such as on-duty vehicle accidents and weapons discharges.	100.00	3.73	0.55	2.68	3.38	80.49	95.12	1.1
23	Complete administrative investigation and related forms for incidents involving sergeants/inspectors, such as member-involved collisions, industrial injuries, etc.	100.00	3.34	0.57	1.98	2.89	85.37	95.12	1.1
20	Conduct personnel investigations by interviewing employee, witnesses, supervisors, and other involved parties to gather information in areas such as alleged job-related misconduct, deficiencies, complaints, etc., and determine if SFPD policies and procedures were violated.	97.56	3.42	0.59	1.62	2.83	82.50	95.00	1.1
21	Summarize, in writing, information from various reports related to a personnel investigation in order to forward for appropriate recommendation from Captain.	92.68	3.32	0.62	1.84	2.82	83.78	92.11	1.1
26	Ensure that, when appropriate, the actions of the officer/sergeant are explained to a complainant in order to reduce/lessen the complainant's concerns or to attempt to resolve the complaint.	92.68	3.21	0.58	1.76	2.73	86.84	92.11	1.1
22	Request assistance from other Department units, such as Crime Scene Investigations, Traffic,	87.81	3.42	0.65	1.81	2.88	80.56	91.67	1.1

	Internal Affairs, etc., to gather information when completing an O.I.C. investigation report.								
24	Take complaint of alleged discrimination/harassment and forward to the Affirmative Action officer, as outlined in D.G.O. 11.07.	100.00	3.49	0.68	1.07	2.68	85.37	90.24	1.1
19	Discuss with citizen his/her concerns about the behavior of a member of SFPD and the complaint and/or investigative processes.	97.56	3.33	0.66	2.02	2.89	92.50	90.00	1.1
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
29	Respond to incident(s) that require presence of a lieutenant to provide direction in handling of the incident(s) and perform tasks as needed.	90.00	3.92	0.28	2.69	3.51	97.22	100.00	1.1
33	Assume charge of field incident and/or crime scene by taking command, directing activities of subordinates, requesting additional resources.	90.00	3.83	0.38	2.39	3.35	94.44	100.00	1.1
28	Evaluate complexity of incidents by collecting information over the radio or by phone from dispatch and units at the scene regarding the situation to determine required procedures (e.g., set-up command post).	87.50	3.80	0.41	3.11	3.57	97.14	100.00	1.1
31	Verify the adequacy of actions taken by subordinates by monitoring radio and/or calling for situation reports on various activities such as ensuring the perimeter is established, the scene is controlled, the crime scene is preserved, notifications are made, etc.	87.50	3.60	0.50	2.74	3.31	97.14	100.00	1.1
34	Evaluate the location of the command post based on factors such as proximity to the scene, degree of danger, personnel and equipment needs, etc.	87.50	3.71	0.46	2.06	3.16	94.29	100.00	1.1
35	Determine the need for specialized units or outside agencies, such as GTF, SOB, MTA, etc.,	87.50	3.57	0.50	2.03	3.06	91.43	100.00	1.1

	to assist at an incident by evaluating developments at the scene.								
27	Monitor activities happening in the district through the radio, computer queries, notifications, and/or observation to determine if calls are backing up or supervisory intervention is needed.	85.00	3.76	0.43	3.53	3.69	94.12	100.00	1.1
30	Determine minimum staffing levels needed throughout the district (including at the station) based on an evaluation of staffing needs at an incident scene and of on-going activities in the district.	85.00	3.76	0.43	3.26	3.60	94.12	100.00	1.1
40	Monitor vehicle pursuits for compliance and to determine when to cease pursuits.	85.00	3.65	0.65	1.88	3.06	91.18	97.06	1.1
32	Assess situation at an incident/crime scene through direct observation, questioning personnel at site, and/or review of CAD.	90.00	3.47	0.61	2.67	3.20	97.22	94.44	1.1
37	Designate officer(s) to carry out command post activities at an incident based on the complexity of the situation and the skills of available officers (e.g., monitoring radio transmissions from officers at scene and maintaining a log of communications).	84.62	3.45	0.62	1.67	2.86	90.91	93.94	1.1
39	Coordinate access of outside units to the scene of an incident to preserve the crime scene and to facilitate entrance of units to the area (e.g., coroner's office, medical personnel).	80.00	3.31	0.59	1.94	2.85	90.62	93.75	1.1
36	Coordinate activities with personnel of other command posts, other jurisdictions, and/or other agencies to optimize management of incident.	87.50	3.40	0.65	1.66	2.82	85.71	91.43	1.1
38	Ensure that officers set-up barricades and control traffic around an incident scene to ensure the perimeter and control activities in the area.	82.50	3.24	0.71	1.67	2.72	93.94	84.85	1.1
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>

44	Coordinate vacation schedules, training mandates, time-off, overtime, and other issues that impact staffing by taking into account factors such as Department policies, MOU, needs of unit or shift, etc.	100.00	3.58	0.55	3.84	3.67	92.11	100.00	1.1
56	Brief superior(s) about critical or sensitive incidents or investigations.	97.37	3.76	0.43	2.89	3.47	94.59	100.00	1.1
43	Enter daily and anticipated officer work schedule information into the computer (HRMS) and onto a Daily Assignment Sheet to maintain record of personnel activity.	94.74	3.56	0.56	3.89	3.67	97.22	100.00	1.1
41	Review incident reports for completeness and consistency (e.g., whether all elements are contained within the report, whether action taken by officer was within policy, grammar and spelling are correct).	89.47	3.65	0.49	3.65	3.65	100.00	100.00	1.1
46	Make beat and car assignments based on a review of factors such as personnel and equipment availability, Operations Bureau mandates, special events scheduled, etc.	84.21	3.44	0.50	3.66	3.51	90.62	100.00	1.1
42	Conduct roll calls to give briefings, provide training, make assignments, alert officers to on-going enforcement and investigative actions and crime trends in district, read aloud teletypes and other important directives, and ensure officers are properly uniformed and equipped.	86.84	3.55	0.56	3.70	3.60	96.97	96.97	1.1
45	Summarize occurrences during the watch in the district for the next shift supervisor's information, such as major incidents, information on wanted individuals thought to be in the district, EPOs to be served, etc.	86.84	3.33	0.54	3.52	3.39	96.97	96.97	1.1
50	Note in writing major occurrences during the watch for the Captain's Morning Report.	84.21	3.34	0.60	3.50	3.40	93.75	96.88	1.1

47	Adjust priorities for self and subordinates based on factors such as resources, consequences, input from staff and superior officers, etc.	94.74	3.31	0.58	3.14	3.25	94.44	94.44	1.1
49	Reassign personnel or redistribute work to ensure maximum and effective use of existing personnel, taking into account the seriousness of the situation, to minimize use of overtime.	92.11	3.26	0.61	3.17	3.23	97.14	94.29	1.1
53	Review use of force, juvenile detention, and cell check logs to ensure that subordinates are completely and accurately documenting actions taken.	84.21	3.28	0.63	2.94	3.17	96.88	93.75	1.1
54	Log numbers of actions taken by subordinates during the shift (such as BIPs, movers, parking citations).	84.21	2.59	0.71	3.62	2.94	90.62	93.75	1.1
63	Ensure minimum staffing levels are maintained by reporting shortages in staff, requesting additional staff, and/or directing officers to work overtime.	84.21	3.34	0.60	2.91	3.20	87.50	93.75	1.1
57	Discuss personnel and enforcement issues with other lieutenants working the same shift, including patrol and SIT, to identify any problems and define possible solutions.	92.11	3.17	0.62	2.97	3.10	88.57	91.43	1.1
58	Discuss problems, priorities, or other issues at periodic meetings held with Captain and/or other supervisors.	92.11	3.17	0.57	2.60	2.98	82.86	91.43	1.1
62	Plan schedules for staff that take into account differences in reporting times, unit's needs for special events, and anticipated needs of unit and situation.	86.84	3.12	0.60	2.64	2.96	90.91	90.91	1.1
52	Ensure that EPOs and subpoenas are properly logged, served, and processed.	78.95	3.13	0.68	2.70	2.99	90.00	90.00	1.1
48	Evaluate training, experience, and capabilities of subordinates in order to assign work activities.	97.37	3.08	0.64	2.81	2.99	94.59	89.19	1.1
59	Respond to requests from other units for personnel by reviewing staffing to determine if	86.84	3.24	0.66	2.76	3.08	90.91	87.88	1.1

	coverage can be maintained if officers are detailed.								
55	Analyze information related to upcoming staffing changes, such as anticipated retirement of unit personnel, transfers, crime patterns in the district, etc., to advise Captain of recommended staffing levels for each watch.	78.95	3.17	0.70	2.57	2.97	86.67	83.33	1.1
64	Receive and review timesheets and conduct payroll approval.	52.63	3.10	0.97	2.05	2.75	70.00	80.00	1.3
51	Make periodic site visits to officers on patrol for the purpose of maintaining morale and ensuring compliance with departmental policy and procedure.	84.21	2.97	0.65	2.38	2.77	93.75	78.13	1.1
60	Review officer body-worn camera footage each shift to ensure compliance with policy and procedure as policy dictates.	60.53	3.17	0.89	1.70	2.68	73.91	69.57	1.3
65	Assist and/or approve the request for purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment.	42.11	2.31	0.87	1.56	2.06	62.50	43.75	4.1
61	Coordinate with the station keeper to retrieve information about police runs, reports, and other pertinent information.	55.26	2.48	0.87	1.62	2.19	85.71	42.86	2.3
66	Prepare written budget requests for presentation to superiors for unit needs, such as furniture, painting, and remodeling.	31.58	2.08	0.90	1.25	1.81	54.55	25.00	4.4
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
75	Assign cases within unit based on established criteria, available personnel, volume of cases, solvability factors, specialties of personnel, call-out criteria, etc.	55.26	3.48	0.51	2.90	3.29	76.19	100.00	1.3
67	Determine if initial and/or supplemental incident reports generated by subordinates should be approved based on a review of case factors such as documentation, charges, supporting evidence, etc.	81.58	3.55	0.57	3.29	3.46	96.77	96.77	1.1

72	Determine whether a case merits further investigation based upon an evaluation of information, such as investigator's findings, District Attorney's opinion, community concern, available technological or other resources to pursue the investigation, etc.	63.16	3.38	0.58	2.88	3.21	83.33	95.83	1.3
73	Review subordinate's conclusions and recommendations regarding disposition of a case(s) based on case elements, such as evidence gathered, available witnesses, District Attorney recommendations, etc.	57.90	3.48	0.60	2.95	3.30	85.71	95.24	1.3
70	Confer with personnel regarding how to proceed on a case, considering areas such as things that might have been overlooked, District Attorney recommendations, sensitivity of investigation, alternative avenues of investigation, etc.	70.27	3.27	0.60	2.42	2.99	92.31	92.31	1.1
71	Oversee and facilitate activities of subordinates working on enforcement and/or investigative projects by answering questions, advising on possible course(s) of action, requesting and coordinating resources, and/or monitoring for overlapping/conflicting actions.	68.42	3.31	0.62	2.73	3.12	96.15	92.31	1.1
77	Prioritize investigative resources to focus on identified crime trends.	63.16	3.17	0.56	2.33	2.89	87.50	91.67	1.3
79	Monitor course of serious or sensitive investigations by meeting periodically with subordinates for briefing on case status.	60.53	3.30	0.76	2.35	2.99	91.30	91.30	1.3
74	Explain status of case in response to a citizen's query by outlining probable upcoming steps in the investigative process or why case will not be pursued further.	60.53	2.91	0.42	1.87	2.57	78.26	86.96	1.3
78	Establish timelines for investigators on how often to provide a status update on a case or when to close a case based upon legal requirements, office	57.90	3.05	0.72	2.36	2.82	77.27	81.82	1.3

	policy, complexity of case, and sensitivity of issues involved in the case.								
68	Organize teams and identify resources, when needed, for investigative or enforcement efforts.	84.21	2.97	0.59	2.34	2.76	87.50	81.25	1.1
76	Confer with District Attorney concerning issues such as what should be done on a case to increase likelihood of successful prosecution of the case.	57.90	2.95	0.65	1.73	2.55	72.73	77.27	1.3
69	Determine availability of personnel, resources, and equipment from other units to assist in an investigative operation by contacting appropriate persons in chain of command.	78.95	2.93	0.64	2.17	2.68	90.00	76.67	1.1
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
80	Respond to community members' concerns when directed by superior via letter, e-mail, or phone.	91.89	3.24	0.61	2.24	2.90	94.12	91.18	1.1
81	Review bulletins, teletypes, e-mails, and crime alerts for release within SFPD and/or other agencies, regarding a case, investigation, incident, crime pattern, department activity, criminal activity, etc.	94.60	3.23	0.73	3.17	3.21	91.43	88.57	1.1
86	Draft public safety announcements or alerts regarding crime and/or crime prevention for dissemination to the public.	43.24	3.06	0.57	1.50	2.54	93.75	87.50	3.1
87	Interact, communicate, and organize meetings with community groups to obtain information on criminal activity and determine needs of the community.	78.38	3.00	0.65	1.76	2.59	93.10	86.21	1.1
82	Participate in meetings to exchange information, represent the Department, and develop plans.	91.89	3.06	0.69	2.44	2.85	91.18	82.35	1.1
88	Network with community members and leaders to make for efficient police-community communication channels.	72.97	3.04	0.76	2.22	2.77	96.30	81.48	1.1

89	Participate in task force meetings for the purpose of obtaining information for dissemination to others about SFPD.	54.05	2.68	0.89	1.74	2.37	84.21	73.68	1.3
84	Coordinate activities with other agencies (such as CHP, DPW, and MTA) so that events or other activities can be conducted as planned.	78.38	2.79	0.62	1.62	2.40	86.21	68.97	1.1
83	Present information verbally and in writing about the unit, station, SFPD, or technical areas to community, other agencies, professional groups, and/or other units within SFPD.	89.19	2.79	0.86	2.06	2.55	87.88	63.64	1.2
85	Speak with the media about the Department, particular activities, incidents, events.	72.97	2.78	0.93	1.30	2.28	74.07	59.26	1.2
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Participate in Professional Development Opportunities</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
92	Participate in training and recertification programs (e.g., firearms, interviewing and interrogation, state and federal laws, evidence collection) to receive information and develop and/or maintain skills.	94.44	3.17	0.79	2.20	2.85	80.00	82.86	1.1
90	Maintain knowledge and seek out training concerning relevant laws, court decisions, and Department rules and regulations to ensure appropriate enforcement and investigatory activities.	97.30	3.03	0.74	2.61	2.89	80.56	80.56	1.1
91	Participate in formal (e.g., attending classes or seminars) and informal training (e.g., meeting with other unit personnel) to remain up-to-date or to learn about new activities or assignments.	91.89	2.97	0.80	2.24	2.73	79.41	79.41	1.1
95	Study, read, and review journals, legal updates, articles, and other documents to remain aware of new developments in the fields of case law, new laws, and law enforcement and management.	97.30	3.03	0.84	2.53	2.86	72.22	77.78	1.1
94	Attend additional law enforcement and management academies, Institutes, etc. (e.g., FBI	83.78	2.84	0.82	1.58	2.42	67.74	64.52	1.2

	Academy), to enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities.								
93	Participate in seminars, conferences, college courses, etc., to enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities.	89.19	2.73	0.72	1.94	2.46	72.73	63.64	1.2
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel</b>	<b>APP</b>	<b>IMP</b>	<b>IMP_SD</b>	<b>FREQ</b>	<b>COMP</b>	<b>RUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>	<b>Zone.Class</b>
96	Demonstrate appropriate behavior by performing duties in accordance with unit and departmental policies and procedures.	100.00	3.70	0.46	3.84	3.75	100.00	100.00	1.1
97	Explain new department policies and procedures to subordinates to answer questions, discuss changes in laws or rules, or provide other updates.	100.00	3.51	0.51	3.27	3.43	100.00	100.00	1.1
100	Determine causes of and solutions for work-related problems by asking questions and listening to subordinates.	100.00	3.59	0.50	3.05	3.41	100.00	100.00	1.1
99	Meet with sergeants to disseminate information, increase morale, and/or discuss issues such as subordinates' concerns, performance issues, training needs, etc.	97.30	3.44	0.50	3.06	3.31	97.22	100.00	1.1
101	Identify officer safety issues by monitoring subordinates' activities and receiving information from supervisors in order to implement appropriate corrective measures and provide training.	91.89	3.53	0.51	2.62	3.23	100.00	100.00	1.1
109	Evaluate memoranda written by subordinates to determine if they are ready for forwarding.	100.00	3.32	0.63	3.46	3.37	97.30	97.30	1.1
98	Coordinate and participate in informal meetings with station personnel to debrief unit's performance after incidents or events to develop more effective ways of handling future situations.	97.30	3.39	0.60	2.61	3.13	97.22	97.22	1.1
112	Monitor activities in order to ensure that service to the community and district is maintained.	81.08	3.33	0.55	3.27	3.31	93.33	96.67	1.1

102	Conduct formal and informal counseling of employees to provide performance-related feedback, develop strategies to increase performance effectiveness, and outline performance improvement goals and timelines.	100.00	3.32	0.58	2.30	2.98	97.30	94.60	1.1
103	Prepare commendations (such as Meritorious Conduct Awards and Captain's Complimentary Reports) or review those prepared by sergeants to recognize exceptional actions of subordinates.	94.60	3.34	0.59	2.40	3.03	91.43	94.29	1.1
107	Complete the performance appraisal process and performance improvement plans for sworn and/or civilian subordinates by assessing performance, identifying strengths and developmental needs, completing required forms and reports, and discussing with subordinate.	86.49	3.00	0.57	1.97	2.66	93.75	87.50	1.1
104	Determine appropriate training for unit members, including informal or more formal training.	94.60	3.06	0.64	2.31	2.81	88.57	85.71	1.1
116	Establish and maintain appropriate lines of communication to and from personnel of all ranks to ensure an efficient flow of information within the chain-of-command, between shifts, and between districts within the department.	89.19	3.24	0.71	2.97	3.15	93.94	84.85	1.1
106	Monitor and review EIS, performance improvement plans, and performance appraisals completed by supervisors for accuracy, conformance to policy, and required information.	81.08	3.17	0.70	2.17	2.83	96.67	83.33	1.1
110	Assign subordinates to participate in investigations/investigative activities and projects based on the nature of the incident(s) and the resources available.	75.68	3.04	0.64	2.57	2.88	100.00	82.14	1.1
111	Recommend and/or administer disciplinary action, as needed.	75.68	3.18	0.72	1.61	2.65	85.71	82.14	1.1
113	Provide subordinates with information on the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), as needed.	94.60	3.06	0.68	1.43	2.51	97.14	80.00	1.1

115	Monitor and evaluate ongoing operations and programs within the shift and district to ensure operational efficiency and congruency with department goals, objectives, and policies.	94.60	3.00	0.69	2.26	2.75	85.71	77.14	1.1
117	Write/Revise, review, and distribute general orders, policies, and standard operating procedures.	45.95	3.24	0.83	1.65	2.71	82.35	76.47	3.1
108	Monitor progress of members enrolled in reentry to patrol and field training programs by ensuring all required steps are being followed.	64.87	3.08	0.78	2.00	2.72	95.83	75.00	1.3
105	Conduct employee orientation to familiarize new subordinates with unit policies and procedures.	67.57	2.88	0.73	1.88	2.55	80.00	72.00	1.1
114	Create operational plan for unit to achieve the goals and objectives of the department.	72.22	2.81	0.85	1.77	2.46	76.92	65.39	1.2

### **Appendix B: Complete Rank-ordered RUP Tasks**

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_41	Review incident reports for completeness and consistency (e.g., whether all elements are contained within the report, whether action taken by officer was within policy, grammar and spelling are correct).	100.00	100.00
TASK_100	Determine causes of and solutions for work-related problems by asking questions and listening to subordinates.	100.00	100.00
TASK_101	Identify officer safety issues by monitoring subordinates' activities and receiving information from supervisors in order to implement appropriate corrective measures and provide training.	100.00	100.00
TASK_96	Demonstrate appropriate behavior by performing duties in accordance with unit and departmental policies and procedures.	100.00	100.00
TASK_97	Explain new department policies and procedures to subordinates to answer questions, discuss changes in laws or rules, or provide other updates.	100.00	100.00
TASK_29	Respond to incident(s) that require presence of a lieutenant to provide direction in handling of the incident(s) and perform tasks as needed.	97.22	100.00
TASK_43	Enter daily and anticipated officer work schedule information into the computer (HRMS) and onto a Daily Assignment Sheet to maintain record of personnel activity.	97.22	100.00
TASK_99	Meet with sergeants to disseminate information, increase morale, and/or discuss issues such as subordinates' concerns, performance issues, training needs, etc.	97.22	100.00
TASK_28	Evaluate complexity of incidents by collecting information over the radio or by phone from dispatch and units at the scene regarding the situation to determine required procedures (e.g., set-up command post).	97.14	100.00
TASK_31	Verify the adequacy of actions taken by subordinates by monitoring radio and/or calling for situation reports on various activities such as ensuring the perimeter is established, the scene is controlled, the crime scene is preserved, notifications are made, etc.	97.14	100.00
TASK_56	Brief superior(s) about critical or sensitive incidents or investigations.	94.59	100.00
TASK_33	Assume charge of field incident and/or crime scene by taking command, directing activities of subordinates, requesting additional resources.	94.44	100.00
TASK_34	Evaluate the location of the command post based on factors such as proximity to the scene, degree of danger, personnel and equipment needs, etc.	94.29	100.00
TASK_27	Monitor activities happening in the district through the radio, computer queries, notifications, and/or observation to determine if calls are backing up or supervisory intervention is needed.	94.12	100.00
TASK_30	Determine minimum staffing levels needed throughout the district (including at the station) based on an evaluation of staffing needs at an incident scene and of on-going activities in the district.	94.12	100.00
TASK_44	Coordinate vacation schedules, training mandates, time-off, overtime, and other issues that impact staffing by taking into account factors such as Department policies, MOU, needs of unit or shift, etc.	92.11	100.00
TASK_35	Determine the need for specialized units or outside agencies, such as GTF, SOB, MTA, etc., to assist at an incident by evaluating developments at the scene.	91.43	100.00

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_46	Make beat and car assignments based on a review of factors such as personnel and equipment availability, Operations Bureau mandates, special events scheduled, etc.	90.62	100.00
TASK_75	Assign cases within unit based on established criteria, available personnel, volume of cases, solvability factors, specialties of personnel, call-out criteria, etc.	76.19	100.00
TASK_17	Review results of an investigation involving subordinates for completeness and accuracy of conclusions, including documentation and investigations done by subordinate sergeants, to make recommendations to superiors regarding remedies.	85.00	97.50
TASK_109	Evaluate memoranda written by subordinates to determine if they are ready for forwarding.	97.30	97.30
TASK_13	Obtain assistance from another station or to adjust subordinates' work hours to ensure adequate staffing levels at planned events.	89.19	97.30
TASK_98	Coordinate and participate in informal meetings with station personnel to debrief unit's performance after incidents or events to develop more effective ways of handling future situations.	97.22	97.22
TASK_14	Plan tactical operations and serve as Event Commander for enforcement operations, such as STOP, buy/bust, DUI checkpoint, etc.	80.00	97.14
TASK_40	Monitor vehicle pursuits for compliance and to determine when to cease pursuits.	91.18	97.06
TASK_42	Conduct roll calls to give briefings, provide training, make assignments, alert officers to on-going enforcement and investigative actions and crime trends in district, read aloud teletypes and other important directives, and ensure officers are properly uniformed and equipped.	96.97	96.97
TASK_45	Summarize occurrences during the watch in the district for the next shift supervisor's information, such as major incidents, information on wanted individuals thought to be in the district, EPOs to be served, etc.	96.97	96.97
TASK_25	Ensure subordinates follow proper procedure in interviewing citizens regarding call for service and in completing the necessary documentation.	93.94	96.97
TASK_50	Note in writing major occurrences during the watch for the Captain's Morning Report.	93.75	96.88
TASK_67	Determine if initial and/or supplemental incident reports generated by subordinates should be approved based on a review of case factors such as documentation, charges, supporting evidence, etc.	96.77	96.77
TASK_112	Monitor activities in order to ensure that service to the community and district is maintained.	93.33	96.67
TASK_72	Determine whether a case merits further investigation based upon an evaluation of information, such as investigator's findings, District Attorney's opinion, community concern, available technological or other resources to pursue the investigation, etc.	83.33	95.83
TASK_73	Review subordinate's conclusions and recommendations regarding disposition of a case(s) based on case elements, such as evidence gathered, available witnesses, District Attorney recommendations, etc.	85.71	95.24
TASK_23	Complete administrative investigation and related forms for incidents involving sergeants/inspectors, such as member-involved collisions, industrial injuries, etc.	85.37	95.12

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_18	Make required notifications, as outlined in departmental policies and procedures, in the handling of administrative investigations, such as on-duty vehicle accidents and weapons discharges.	80.49	95.12
TASK_20	Conduct personnel investigations by interviewing employee, witnesses, supervisors, and other involved parties to gather information in areas such as alleged job-related misconduct, deficiencies, complaints, etc., and determine if SFPD policies and procedures were violated.	82.50	95.00
TASK_102	Conduct formal and informal counseling of employees to provide performance-related feedback, develop strategies to increase performance effectiveness, and outline performance improvement goals and timelines.	97.30	94.60
TASK_32	Assess situation at an incident/crime scene through direct observation, questioning personnel at site, and/or review of CAD.	97.22	94.44
TASK_47	Adjust priorities for self and subordinates based on factors such as resources, consequences, input from staff and superior officers, etc.	94.44	94.44
TASK_49	Reassign personnel or redistribute work to ensure maximum and effective use of existing personnel, taking into account the seriousness of the situation, to minimize use of overtime.	97.14	94.29
TASK_103	Prepare commendations (such as Meritorious Conduct Awards and Captain's Complimentary Reports) or review those prepared by sergeants to recognize exceptional actions of subordinates.	91.43	94.29
TASK_37	Designate officer(s) to carry out command post activities at an incident based on the complexity of the situation and the skills of available officers (e.g., monitoring radio transmissions from officers at scene and maintaining a log of communications).	90.91	93.94
TASK_53	Review use of force, juvenile detention, and cell check logs to ensure that subordinates are completely and accurately documenting actions taken.	96.88	93.75
TASK_39	Coordinate access of outside units to the scene of an incident to preserve the crime scene and to facilitate entrance of units to the area (e.g., coroner's office, medical personnel).	90.62	93.75
TASK_54	Log numbers of actions taken by subordinates during the shift (such as BIPs, movers, parking citations).	90.62	93.75
TASK_63	Ensure minimum staffing levels are maintained by reporting shortages in staff, requesting additional staff, and/or directing officers to work overtime.	87.50	93.75
TASK_15	Develop and oversee crime prevention, deterrence, and apprehension programs and activities.	84.38	93.75
TASK_71	Oversee and facilitate activities of subordinates working on enforcement and/or investigative projects by answering questions, advising on possible course(s) of action, requesting and coordinating resources, and/or monitoring for overlapping/conflicting actions.	96.15	92.31
TASK_70	Confer with personnel regarding how to proceed on a case, considering areas such as things that might have been overlooked, District Attorney recommendations, sensitivity of investigation, alternative avenues of investigation, etc.	92.31	92.31
TASK_26	Ensure that, when appropriate, the actions of the officer/sergeant are explained to a complainant in order to reduce/lessen the complainant's concerns or to attempt to resolve the complaint.	86.84	92.11

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_21	Summarize, in writing, information from various reports related to a personnel investigation in order to forward for appropriate recommendation from Captain.	83.78	92.11
TASK_77	Prioritize investigative resources to focus on identified crime trends.	87.50	91.67
TASK_22	Request assistance from other Department units, such as Crime Scene Investigations, Traffic, Internal Affairs, etc., to gather information when completing an O.I.C. investigation report.	80.56	91.67
TASK_57	Discuss personnel and enforcement issues with other lieutenants working the same shift, including patrol and SIT, to identify any problems and define possible solutions.	88.57	91.43
TASK_36	Coordinate activities with personnel of other command posts, other jurisdictions, and/or other agencies to optimize management of incident.	85.71	91.43
TASK_58	Discuss problems, priorities, or other issues at periodic meetings held with Captain and/or other supervisors.	82.86	91.43
TASK_79	Monitor course of serious or sensitive investigations by meeting periodically with subordinates for briefing on case status.	91.30	91.30
TASK_80	Respond to community members' concerns when directed by superior via letter, e-mail, or phone.	94.12	91.18
TASK_62	Plan schedules for staff that take into account differences in reporting times, unit's needs for special events, and anticipated needs of unit and situation.	90.91	90.91
TASK_8	Exchange information with event organizer regarding parameters of function, such as number of people expected, scheduled hours, location, history and purpose of event, required permits, etc., in order to plan police involvement and to ensure safety for all those involved.	64.52	90.32
TASK_24	Take complaint of alleged discrimination/harassment and forward to the Affirmative Action officer, as outlined in D.G.O. 11.07.	85.37	90.24
TASK_19	Discuss with citizen his/her concerns about the behavior of a member of SFPD and the complaint and/or investigative processes.	92.50	90.00
TASK_52	Ensure that EPOs and subpoenas are properly logged, served, and processed.	90.00	90.00
TASK_5	Develop a plan which addresses an identified community need and outlines a resolution to the problem.	87.18	89.74
TASK_12	Develop an operational order/plan for superior's approval.	89.47	89.47
TASK_48	Evaluate training, experience, and capabilities of subordinates in order to assign work activities.	94.59	89.19
TASK_81	Review bulletins, teletypes, e-mails, and crime alerts for release within SFPD and/or other agencies, regarding a case, investigation, incident, crime pattern, department activity, criminal activity, etc.	91.43	88.57
TASK_59	Respond to requests from other units for personnel by reviewing staffing to determine if coverage can be maintained if officers are detailed.	90.91	87.88
TASK_16	Coordinate activities to ensure safety at an event (e.g., set-up communication system, establish who will be in charge, determine location of posts).	87.88	87.88
TASK_86	Draft public safety announcements or alerts regarding crime and/or crime prevention for dissemination to the public.	93.75	87.50
TASK_107	Complete the performance appraisal process and performance improvement plans for sworn and/or civilian subordinates by assessing performance,	93.75	87.50

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
	identifying strengths and developmental needs, completing required forms and reports, and discussing with subordinate.		
TASK_74	Explain status of case in response to a citizen's query by outlining probable upcoming steps in the investigative process or why case will not be pursued further.	78.26	86.96
TASK_87	Interact, communicate, and organize meetings with community groups to obtain information on criminal activity and determine needs of the community.	93.10	86.21
TASK_104	Determine appropriate training for unit members, including informal or more formal training.	88.57	85.71
TASK_38	Ensure that officers set-up barricades and control traffic around an incident scene to ensure the perimeter and control activities in the area.	93.94	84.85
TASK_116	Establish and maintain appropriate lines of communication to and from personnel of all ranks to ensure an efficient flow of information within the chain-of-command, between shifts, and between districts within the department.	93.94	84.85
TASK_1	Identify crime patterns by reviewing information such as reports, crime maps, community input, suspect information, Crime Data Warehouse, etc., noting particulars of crimes, including locations, types of victims, and times of occurrence.	84.21	84.62
TASK_10	Explain procedures, practices, enforcement orders, and policies of special project prior to assigning unit member to the project.	78.95	84.21
TASK_6	Attend meetings with community officials, City personnel, and other SFPD personnel to gather information that deals with proposed changes in practices and policies or investigative operations.	78.38	83.78
TASK_106	Monitor and review EIS, performance improvement plans, and performance appraisals completed by supervisors for accuracy, conformance to policy, and required information.	96.67	83.33
TASK_55	Analyze information related to upcoming staffing changes, such as anticipated retirement of unit personnel, transfers, crime patterns in the district, etc., to advise Captain of recommended staffing levels for each watch.	86.67	83.33
TASK_92	Participate in training and recertification programs (e.g., firearms, interviewing and interrogation, state and federal laws, evidence collection) to receive information and develop and/or maintain skills.	80.00	82.86
TASK_82	Participate in meetings to exchange information, represent the Department, and develop plans.	91.18	82.35
TASK_110	Assign subordinates to participate in investigations/investigative activities and projects based on the nature of the incident(s) and the resources available.	100.00	82.14
TASK_111	Recommend and/or administer disciplinary action, as needed.	85.71	82.14
TASK_78	Establish timelines for investigators on how often to provide a status update on a case or when to close a case based upon legal requirements, office policy, complexity of case, and sensitivity of issues involved in the case.	77.27	81.82
TASK_88	Network with community members and leaders to make for efficient police-community communication channels.	96.30	81.48
TASK_68	Organize teams and identify resources, when needed, for investigative or enforcement efforts.	87.50	81.25

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_3	Make an oral presentation to others (superior officers, DA, community officials, etc.) which includes information such as cost, staffing, any additional impacts, etc., to convince them to accept proposed changes or to adopt a new activity or plan.	75.00	81.25
TASK_90	Maintain knowledge and seek out training concerning relevant laws, court decisions, and Department rules and regulations to ensure appropriate enforcement and investigatory activities.	80.56	80.56
TASK_113	Provide subordinates with information on the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), as needed.	97.14	80.00
TASK_4	Assess the impact of proposed changes or actions to determine if contingency plans are needed.	80.56	80.00
TASK_64	Receive and review timesheets and conduct payroll approval.	70.00	80.00
TASK_91	Participate in formal (e.g., attending classes or seminars) and informal training (e.g., meeting with other unit personnel) to remain up-to-date or to learn about new activities or assignments.	79.41	79.41
TASK_51	Make periodic site visits to officers on patrol for the purpose of maintaining morale and ensuring compliance with departmental policy and procedure.	93.75	78.13
TASK_95	Study, read, and review journals, legal updates, articles, and other documents to remain aware of new developments in the fields of case law, new laws, and law enforcement and management.	72.22	77.78
TASK_76	Confer with District Attorney concerning issues such as what should be done on a case to increase likelihood of successful prosecution of the case.	72.73	77.27
TASK_115	Monitor and evaluate ongoing operations and programs within the shift and district to ensure operational efficiency and congruency with department goals, objectives, and policies.	85.71	77.14
TASK_69	Determine availability of personnel, resources, and equipment from other units to assist in an investigative operation by contacting appropriate persons in chain of command.	90.00	76.67
TASK_117	Write/Revise, review, and distribute general orders, policies, and standard operating procedures.	82.35	76.47
TASK_2	Interpret trends and patterns found in data and records in order to estimate and predict needs of a situation or assist in plan development, for daily use and Compstat.	67.57	75.68
TASK_108	Monitor progress of members enrolled in reentry to patrol and field training programs by ensuring all required steps are being followed.	95.83	75.00
TASK_7	Explain police policies and expectations to involved/concerned groups prior to planned events or special operations.	76.92	74.36
TASK_89	Participate in task force meetings for the purpose of obtaining information for dissemination to others about SFPD.	84.21	73.68
TASK_105	Conduct employee orientation to familiarize new subordinates with unit policies and procedures.	80.00	72.00
TASK_11	Evaluate the effectiveness of newly implemented (or modifications of existing) plans by observing, interviewing participants, analyzing computer printouts, and taking into account whether the plan is progressing as proposed.	62.96	70.37
TASK_60	Review officer body-worn camera footage each shift to ensure compliance with policy and procedure as policy dictates.	73.91	69.57

<b>Task #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>PUP</b>	<b>ESS</b>
TASK_84	Coordinate activities with other agencies (such as CHP, DPW, and MTA) so that events or other activities can be conducted as planned.	86.21	68.97
TASK_114	Create operational plan for unit to achieve the goals and objectives of the department.	76.92	65.39
TASK_94	Attend additional law enforcement and management academies, Institutes, etc. (e.g., FBI Academy), to enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities.	67.74	64.52
TASK_83	Present information verbally and in writing about the unit, station, SFPD, or technical areas to community, other agencies, professional groups, and/or other units within SFPD.	87.88	63.64
TASK_93	Participate in seminars, conferences, college courses, etc., to enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities.	72.73	63.64
TASK_85	Speak with the media about the Department, particular activities, incidents, events.	74.07	59.26
TASK_9	Write a narrative report or memorandum that takes into account factors such as cost, personnel and equipment needs, impact of any recommended changes, ways to deal with new situations/events, etc.	64.10	48.72
TASK_65	Assist and/or approve the request for purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment.	62.50	43.75
TASK_61	Coordinate with the station keeper to retrieve information about police runs, reports, and other pertinent information.	85.71	42.86
TASK_66	Prepare written budget requests for presentation to superiors for unit needs, such as furniture, painting, and remodeling.	54.55	25.00

### **Appendix C: Knowledge Analysis Results**

#	Description	APP	IMP	REF	DIFF	REQU	ESS
KSAO_140	Knowledge of procedures and legal constraints regarding searches and seizures, laws of arrest.	100.00	3.78	44.44	2.11	100.00	1.00
KSAO_122	Knowledge of Human Resource Management System (HRMS)/eMerge to be able to update, maintain, retrieve and interpret records.	100.00	3.74	36.84	2.42	73.68	1.00
KSAO_139	Knowledge of response procedures for a field incident including how to respond and who should respond.	94.44	3.65	33.33	2.84	100.00	1.00
KSAO_137	Knowledge of Department General Orders.	100.00	3.61	72.22	2.53	94.44	1.00
KSAO_136	Knowledge of elements to a crime needed to be presented in the incident report.	100.00	3.61	72.22	2.26	94.44	1.00
KSAO_118	Knowledge of the actions that constitute rules violations.	100.00	3.58	47.37	2.47	100.00	1.00
KSAO_119	Knowledge of Departmental policies and procedures for the correction of unacceptable behavior.	100.00	3.58	73.68	2.79	89.47	1.00
KSAO_142	Knowledge of procedures to secure and protect a crime scene.	100.00	3.56	11.11	2.74	94.44	1.00
KSAO_125	Knowledge of officer safety principles and procedures to assess compliance, determine training needs, and to provide feedback regarding these procedures.	100.00	3.53	31.58	2.11	89.47	1.00
KSAO_141	Knowledge of Department Bulletins.	100.00	3.50	66.67	2.26	100.00	1.00
KSAO_147	Knowledge of crowd control procedures, techniques and special equipment used in crowd control.	94.44	3.41	47.06	2.37	94.12	1.00
KSAO_138	Knowledge of the procedures and legal constraints regarding arrest, booking, detention and JMS for adults and juveniles.	100.00	3.39	61.11	2.68	88.89	1.00
KSAO_126	Knowledge of resources available through the Behavioral Science Unit (e.g., CIRT, Employee Assistance Program and peer counselors) to assist individuals who are having problems.	100.00	3.37	84.21	2.26	84.21	1.00
KSAO_158	Knowledge of Department units and resources available (e.g., Tactical, Hondas, Forensic Services) and how they can be utilized for law enforcement.	94.44	3.35	41.18	2.68	94.12	1.00
KSAO_146	Knowledge of Bureau General Orders.	94.44	3.35	88.89	2.58	76.47	1.00
KSAO_121	Knowledge of the rights of officers and civilian personnel, such as in administrative investigations or when processing Internal Affairs or EEO complaints.	100.00	3.32	78.95	2.79	89.47	1.00
KSAO_124	Knowledge of staffing guidelines related to minimum staffing requirements, watch assignments, seniority, and overtime usage.	100.00	3.32	63.16	2.16	68.42	1.00
KSAO_145	Knowledge of procedures for conducting cold shows, photo spreads, and line-ups.	94.44	3.29	52.94	2.68	94.12	1.00
KSAO_148	Knowledge of what constitutes physical evidence to determine when and/or how evidence should be collected and preserved.	94.44	3.29	23.53	2.21	88.24	1.00
KSAO_120	Knowledge of the responsibilities and standards of conduct for sworn and civilian members.	94.74	3.28	55.56	2.16	77.78	1.00
KSAO_150	Knowledge of the Penal Code.	94.44	3.24	82.35	2.26	100.00	1.00
KSAO_135	Knowledge of chain of command and notification requirements, including specialized units.	100.00	3.22	38.89	2.26	72.22	1.00

#	Description	APP	IMP	REF	DIFF	REQU	ESS
KSAO_127	Knowledge of operations orders and other sources (e.g., reading clip and computer resources) regarding upcoming special events, assignments and/or details to determine staffing needs.	100.00	3.21	63.16	2.47	63.16	1.00
KSAO_143	Knowledge of Department Manuals.	94.44	3.18	88.89	2.79	88.24	1.00
KSAO_151	Knowledge of the legal and Departmental procedural guidelines for interviews and interrogations.	94.44	3.12	64.71	1.76	76.47	1.00
KSAO_154	Knowledge of investigative procedures, techniques, and technological resources which can be employed in an investigation.	100.00	3.11	66.67	2.53	61.11	1.00
KSAO_166	Knowledge of superior's administration duties.	77.78	3.07	60.00	2.53	64.29	1.00
KSAO_153	Knowledge of Departmental resources for disseminating information within the Department, such as DOC, APBnet, teletypes, and emails.	94.44	3.06	64.71	2.84	88.24	1.00
KSAO_144	Knowledge of legal requirements and Departmental policy concerning the release of information to the public, media, and outside agencies.	94.44	3.06	70.59	2.74	76.47	1.00
KSAO_130	Knowledge of Early Intervention System thresholds and protocols in order to monitor an employee's performance.	89.47	3.06	94.44	2.16	94.12	1.00
KSAO_128	Knowledge of labor laws, MOU and Department policies applicable to voluntary and involuntary overtime and to leaves of absence.	100.00	3.05	78.95	2.11	68.42	1.00
KSAO_129	Knowledge of Department policies and procedures related to the investigation and reporting of on-duty/Worker's Compensation injuries.	100.00	2.95	94.74	1.75	84.21	0.00
KSAO_133	Knowledge of computer formats, queries, and applications (such as WORD and Excel) to generate reports and gain access to information, such as Daily Assignments/HRMS data, types and numbers of crimes, other statistical data.	100.00	2.95	47.37	2.68	68.42	0.00
KSAO_161	Knowledge of the authority and enforcement sections of the California Vehicle Code.	94.44	2.82	82.35	2.22	64.71	0.00
KSAO_123	Knowledge of the complaint filing procedures and notification requirements related to Citizen's Complaints.	100.00	2.79	73.68	2.68	78.95	0.00
KSAO_163	Knowledge of local codes and ordinances (e.g., the Municipal Police Code and Park Code).	88.89	2.75	87.50	2.42	68.75	0.00
KSAO_131	Knowledge of commendation requirements to reward superior performance of unit personnel.	100.00	2.68	94.74	1.55	57.89	0.00
KSAO_132	Knowledge of Performance Improvement Program in order to review for accuracy and completeness performance appraisals prepared by Sergeants.	94.74	2.67	77.78	2.58	77.78	0.00
KSAO_159	Knowledge of procedures regarding service of subpoenas.	88.89	2.50	87.50	2.42	50.00	0.00
KSAO_165	Knowledge of the SF Transportation Code.	77.78	2.00	100.00	2.37	57.14	0.00

### **Appendix D: Skill/Ability Analysis Results**

#	Description	APP	IMP	DIFF	REQU	ESS
KSAO_170	Influencing Others: Willingness to lead, take charge, and offer opinions and direction to others in the organization. Providing inspirational motivation and serving as a role model.	100.00	3.95	1.95	89.47	1.00
KSAO_202	Honesty and Integrity: Ability to act in an honest and fair manner. Willingness to accept responsibility for actions when things go wrong. Ability to display a high degree of integrity and professionalism in action and word.	100.00	3.89	1.82	100.00	1.00
KSAO_168	Supervision Skill: Ability to apply department rules and procedures uniformly and in the appropriate circumstances.	100.00	3.79	2.05	100.00	1.00
KSAO_204	Dependability (Work and Personal): Ability to follow through on work without prompt. Requires little oversight. Consistent and dependable in regard to personal actions and behavior.	100.00	3.79	1.69	100.00	1.00
KSAO_207	Stress Tolerance/Composure: Maintaining a calm and rational thought process and demeanor amid chaos or heightened levels of stress.	100.00	3.79	2.13	94.74	1.00
KSAO_193	Decisiveness: Making decisions based on all relevant information and then committing to those decisions with confidence.	100.00	3.74	2.12	100.00	1.00
KSAO_188	Problem Solving: The ability to identify a solution or corrective action and use available information and resources to solve problems. Often, information is gathered through critical analysis and investigation.	100.00	3.74	2.53	94.74	1.00
KSAO_187	Problem Sensitivity/Analysis: The ability to tell when something is wrong or is likely to go wrong. It does not involve solving the problem, only recognizing there is a problem and identifying the extent of the problem.	100.00	3.74	2.17	94.74	1.00
KSAO_194	Incident Management: Establishing the incident objectives, strategies, and goals. Determining the tactics and resources needed for achieving objectives. Maintaining accountability and responsibility over personnel and the incident. Coordinating with other resources to achieve incident objectives.	100.00	3.68	2.06	94.74	1.00
KSAO_192	Judgment: Processing contextual information and known objectives while weighing various options and their respective outcomes, in order to arrive at a solution that yields the greatest benefit with the least risk.	100.00	3.63	2.24	100.00	1.00
KSAO_203	Adaptability: Ability to adapt and change to accommodate circumstances. Ability to demonstrate flexibility in behavior and action. Ability to quickly and efficiently determine an appropriate course of action to target a particular situation. Accepting and accommodating to change.	100.00	3.63	1.50	100.00	1.00
KSAO_198	Oral Expression: Ability to speak in a clear, concise, understandable and appropriate manner. Ability to deliver a message in such a way that others clearly understand the meaning of an intended message.	100.00	3.63	1.47	100.00	1.00
KSAO_205	Conscientiousness: Thoughtful, careful/cautious, diligent and vigilant in regard to work and task performance. Exhibits a strong attention to detail. Maintains a strong work ethic, perseverance, productivity and desire to perform well. In addition, systematic and efficient.	100.00	3.63	1.53	94.74	1.00

#	Description	APP	IMP	DIFF	REQU	ESS
KSAO_182	Conflict Resolution: Working with individuals to identify problems, identify solutions and negotiate mutually acceptable outcomes. Also, working with opposing sides to make good faith efforts to pursue solutions and honor agreements.	100.00	3.63	2.56	84.21	1.00
KSAO_172	Command Presence: Skill at managing one's presentation and conducting oneself in a manner that engenders confidence and trust from others by exercising self-assuredness and confidence during challenging times.	100.00	3.58	1.84	94.74	1.00
KSAO_186	Community Relation Skill: Identifying the needs and concerns of community members and making a concerted effort to deliver services that address those needs and concerns. Understanding the manner in which the organization needs to be presented to the community at large and making necessary efforts to work with the public while protecting the integrity of the organization.	100.00	3.58	2.29	89.47	1.00
KSAO_191	Reasoning: The ability to apply general rules to specific problems to produce answers that make sense (deductive) and the ability to combine pieces of information to form general rules or conclusions (inductive).	100.00	3.53	2.41	94.74	1.00
KSAO_176	Coordination: Identifying, assembling and adjusting resources and personnel to address the needs of the department and the management of events or programs.	100.00	3.53	2.06	89.47	1.00
KSAO_195	Tactical Skill: Executing the appropriate actions and operations to achieve tactical strategies and goals. Applying acquired knowledge departmental guidelines, standards, and procedures.	94.74	3.50	2.39	88.89	1.00
KSAO_171	Vision: Identifying a high-level goal or purpose that unifies others and motivates others to work together for a common purpose.	94.74	3.50	1.94	66.67	1.00
KSAO_167	Performance Management: The management of subordinate performance by identifying personal strengths and weaknesses, enacting plans to develop weaknesses, monitoring and documenting performance, and providing counseling and direction as necessary.	100.00	3.47	2.16	89.47	1.00
KSAO_181	Relationship Building: Interacting with others in a pleasant and comfortable manner so as to build trust and rapport. The ability to encourage collaboration and put the right people together to create the most productive teams.	100.00	3.47	2.78	84.21	1.00
KSAO_183	Teamwork: Effectively working with others to accomplish mutual goals. Ability to rely on others to assist with a task, working interdependently to accomplish the goal.	100.00	3.37	2.56	84.21	1.00
KSAO_185	Cultural Sensitivity/Awareness: The ability to recognize cultural differences and commonalities and modifying behavior to cultural context. Demonstrating an understanding and respect of cultures (national, demographic, etc.) other than one's own.	100.00	3.37	1.94	84.21	1.00
KSAO_206	Initiative: Propelling oneself to pursue objectives and accomplish goals based on an internal drive to succeed.	89.47	3.35	1.43	94.12	1.00
KSAO_175	Prioritization: Managing the completion of one's own or other individuals' tasks, objectives and goals in terms of their importance and/or time sensitivity.	100.00	3.32	1.58	78.95	1.00
KSAO_196	Written Comprehension: Understanding written sentences and paragraphs in work related documents. Understanding written material maps, and charts, tables and graphs.	100.00	3.26	2.00	94.74	1.00

#	Description	APP	IMP	DIFF	REQU	ESS
KSAO_177	Time Management: Managing one's own time and the time of others to accomplish predetermined goals or objectives in a set period of time; the ability to project or anticipate the time required to complete tasks or projects.	89.47	3.24	2.50	88.24	1.00
KSAO_199	Presentation: Using language and non-verbals effectively to engage a group and clearly communicate a message in a formal or semi-formal presentation setting.	100.00	3.21	2.18	84.21	1.00
KSAO_184	Sensitivity: Demonstrating sensitivity toward people and empathizing with his or her situations. This characteristic affects the extent to which an individual is likely to sympathize with others and understand the feelings of others.	100.00	3.16	2.33	84.21	1.00
KSAO_179	Computer Skill: Performing basic operations on a personal computer. Use of e-mail, the internet, Microsoft Office programs, and other software on a computer or mobile/portable data terminal or device to create documents, send e-mails, schedule on a calendar, or facilitate the sharing of information.	100.00	3.16	2.56	78.95	1.00
KSAO_174	Organizing: Maintaining order and clear systems and structures that facilitate the efficient completion of tasks for oneself and others.	100.00	3.11	1.89	73.68	1.00
KSAO_197	Written Expression: Using written language (word choice, punctuation, grammar and syntax) to communicate clear thoughts.	100.00	3.00	1.94	100.00	1.00
KSAO_190	Observing/Listening and Memorization/Recall: Observing and noting events/incidents, actions, behaviors and details through observation and/or listening. Storing such information in memory for later retrieval and recalling such information when necessary.	100.00	3.00	2.24	84.21	1.00
KSAO_189	Information Ordering: The ability to arrange events or actions in a certain order or pattern according to a specific rule or set of rules (e.g., patterns of events, facts, numbers, words).	89.47	3.00	2.35	70.59	1.00
KSAO_173	Planning: Outlining a step-by-step method for addressing challenges of various degrees of complexity for oneself and others.	100.00	2.95	1.89	68.42	0.00
KSAO_169	Delegation: Assigning tasks/projects to subordinates based on task/project complexity or subordinate expertise. Monitoring and following-up on the completion of the task/project.	100.00	2.89	2.11	57.89	0.00
KSAO_180	Mechanical Skill: Using specialized equipment, machinery, technology and other tools to perform job functions. Includes selecting the appropriate tools and equipment to perform a task. Controlling operations of equipment and tools.	42.11	2.62	2.44	50.00	0.00
KSAO_201	Basic Mathematical Operations: The ability to add, subtract, multiply, or divide quickly and correctly.	73.68	2.57	1.82	85.71	0.00
KSAO_178	Budgeting: Allocating financial resources to various line items, such as personnel overtime, based on organizational value. Making decisions regarding the allocation of limited resources and managing that allocation to ensure that budgets are not exceeded.	73.68	2.57	2.61	42.86	0.00
KSAO_200	Data Analysis: The ability to analyze, synthesize, and summarize qualitative or quantitative data to convey common themes or trends.	78.95	2.53	1.44	40.00	0.00

## **Appendix E: Complete Rank-Ordered RUP Skill/Ability Areas**

#	Description	IMP	REQU
KSAO_140	Knowledge of procedures and legal constraints regarding searches and seizures, laws of arrest.	3.78	100
KSAO_122	Knowledge of Human Resource Management System (HRMS)/eMerge to be able to update, maintain, retrieve and interpret records.	3.74	73.68
KSAO_139	Knowledge of response procedures for a field incident including how to respond and who should respond.	3.65	100
KSAO_137	Knowledge of Department General Orders.	3.61	94.44
KSAO_136	Knowledge of elements to a crime needed to be presented in the incident report.	3.61	94.44
KSAO_118	Knowledge of the actions that constitute rules violations.	3.58	100
KSAO_119	Knowledge of Departmental policies and procedures for the correction of unacceptable behavior.	3.58	89.47
KSAO_142	Knowledge of procedures to secure and protect a crime scene.	3.56	94.44
KSAO_125	Knowledge of officer safety principles and procedures to assess compliance, determine training needs, and to provide feedback regarding these procedures.	3.53	89.47
KSAO_141	Knowledge of Department Bulletins.	3.5	100
KSAO_147	Knowledge of crowd control procedures, techniques and special equipment used in crowd control.	3.41	94.12
KSAO_138	Knowledge of the procedures and legal constraints regarding arrest, booking, detention and JMS for adults and juveniles.	3.39	88.89
KSAO_126	Knowledge of resources available through the Behavioral Science Unit (e.g., CIRT, Employee Assistance Program and peer counselors) to assist individuals who are having problems.	3.37	84.21
KSAO_158	Knowledge of Department units and resources available (e.g., Tactical, Hondas, Forensic Services) and how they can be utilized for law enforcement.	3.35	94.12
KSAO_146	Knowledge of Bureau General Orders.	3.35	76.47
KSAO_121	Knowledge of the rights of officers and civilian personnel, such as in administrative investigations or when processing Internal Affairs or EEO complaints.	3.32	89.47
KSAO_124	Knowledge of staffing guidelines related to minimum staffing requirements, watch assignments, seniority, and overtime usage.	3.32	68.42
KSAO_145	Knowledge of procedures for conducting cold shows, photo spreads, and line-ups.	3.29	94.12
KSAO_148	Knowledge of what constitutes physical evidence to determine when and/or how evidence should be collected and preserved.	3.29	88.24
KSAO_120	Knowledge of the responsibilities and standards of conduct for sworn and civilian members.	3.28	77.78
KSAO_150	Knowledge of the Penal Code.	3.24	100
KSAO_135	Knowledge of chain of command and notification requirements, including specialized units.	3.22	72.22
KSAO_127	Knowledge of operations orders and other sources (e.g., reading clip and computer resources) regarding upcoming special events, assignments and/or details to determine staffing needs.	3.21	63.16
KSAO_143	Knowledge of Department Manuals.	3.18	88.24
KSAO_151	Knowledge of the legal and Departmental procedural guidelines for interviews and interrogations.	3.12	76.47
KSAO_154	Knowledge of investigative procedures, techniques, and technological resources which can be employed in an investigation.	3.11	61.11
KSAO_166	Knowledge of superior's administration duties.	3.07	64.29
KSAO_130	Knowledge of Early Intervention System thresholds and protocols in order to monitor an employee's performance.	3.06	94.12
KSAO_153	Knowledge of Departmental resources for disseminating information within the Department, such as DOC, APBnet, teletypes, and emails.	3.06	88.24
KSAO_144	Knowledge of legal requirements and Departmental policy concerning the release of information to the public, media, and outside agencies.	3.06	76.47

#	Description	IMP	REQU
KSAO_128	Knowledge of labor laws, MOU and Department policies applicable to voluntary and involuntary overtime and to leaves of absence.	3.05	68.42
KSAO_129	Knowledge of Department policies and procedures related to the investigation and reporting of on-duty/Worker's Compensation injuries.	2.95	84.21
KSAO_133	Knowledge of computer formats, queries, and applications (such as WORD and Excel) to generate reports and gain access to information, such as Daily Assignments/HRMS data, types and numbers of crimes, other statistical data.	2.95	68.42
KSAO_161	Knowledge of the authority and enforcement sections of the California Vehicle Code.	2.82	64.71
KSAO_123	Knowledge of the complaint filing procedures and notification requirements related to Citizen's Complaints.	2.79	78.95
KSAO_163	Knowledge of local codes and ordinances (e.g., the Municipal Police Code and Park Code).	2.75	68.75
KSAO_131	Knowledge of commendation requirements to reward superior performance of unit personnel.	2.68	57.89
KSAO_132	Knowledge of Performance Improvement Program in order to review for accuracy and completeness performance appraisals prepared by Sergeants.	2.67	77.78
KSAO_159	Knowledge of procedures regarding service of subpoenas.	2.5	50
KSAO_165	Knowledge of the SF Transportation Code.	2	57.14

### Appendix F: Weighted Skill/Ability Linkage Matrix

Skill/Ability Areas	Job Duty Areas								Total	Z-Score	Standardized Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Leadership	0.40	0.24	0.58	0.42	0.40	0.24	0.20	1.37	3.86	1.12	4.12
Decision-Making	0.41	0.25	0.57	0.41	0.41	0.20	0.18	1.32	3.75	0.87	3.87
Oral Communication	0.41	0.25	0.54	0.38	0.40	0.26	0.20	1.29	3.73	0.83	3.83
Critical Thinking	0.41	0.25	0.57	0.42	0.43	0.20	0.17	1.20	3.66	0.65	3.65
Organizational Skills	0.41	0.25	0.54	0.41	0.43	0.22	0.20	1.20	3.65	0.64	3.64
Interpersonal Skills	0.38	0.25	0.51	0.38	0.40	0.24	0.20	1.29	3.64	0.61	3.61
Personnel Supervision	0.37	0.22	0.49	0.38	0.37	0.19	0.14	1.32	3.49	0.24	3.24
Written Communication	0.36	0.25	0.45	0.37	0.40	0.20	0.18	1.12	3.32	-0.16	2.84
Incident Operations	0.40	0.19	0.55	0.34	0.32	0.16	0.13	1.03	3.12	-0.65	2.35
Other Characteristics	0.30	0.21	0.46	0.35	0.35	0.20	0.17	1.06	3.09	-0.71	2.29
Technological Skills	0.31	0.17	0.39	0.30	0.35	0.16	0.15	0.94	2.78	-1.46	1.54
Quantitative Analysis	0.25	0.16	0.35	0.30	0.33	0.16	0.14	0.89	2.56	-1.98	1.02

Job Duty Areas: 1 = Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects; 2 = Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations; 3 = Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events; 4 = Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities; 5 = Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations; 6 = Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities; 7 = Participate in Professional Development Opportunities; 8 = Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel.

### **Appendix G: Weighted Knowledge Linkage Matrix**

Knowledge Areas	Job Duty Areas								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Knowledge of Personnel/Administrative Principles, Policies, and Systems	0.32	0.20	0.43	0.32	0.33	0.20	0.16	1.03	3.02
Knowledge of Law Enforcement Standards and Practices	0.32	0.20	0.43	0.32	0.33	0.20	0.16	1.03	3.02

Job Duty Areas: 1= Analyze Information and Formulate Operational Plans, Priorities, and Special Projects; 2 = Conduct, Coordinate, and Document Internal Administrative Investigations; 3 = Direct and Coordinate Field Operations, Incidents, and Events; 4 =Manage, Administer, and Document Station Activities; 5 = Manage, Coordinate, and Evaluate Investigative Operations; 6 =Participate in Community Engagement and Public Relations Activities; 7 =Participate in Professional Development Opportunities; 8 = Supervise, Manage, and Lead Personnel.