

Request for Proposal

***RFP NO. 531-8880
Development of Police Sergeant Written Examination - 2003***

Opens: June 9, 2003, 2:00 PM



Venice of America

***City of Fort Lauderdale
Administrative Services Department/Purchasing Division***

***Linda R. Wilson
(954) 828-5146***

E-mail: lindaw@ci.fort-lauderdale.fl.us

***Visit us on the web at ci.fort-lauderdale.fl.us/purchasing
(954) 828-5140***

PART I - INFORMATION/SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION: The City of Fort Lauderdale is requesting proposals from qualified Proposers hereinafter referred to as the test developer or Contractor to provide a Police Sergeant written examination.

2. BACKGROUND: The City of Fort Lauderdale is a moderately sized City on the southeast coast of Florida which provides municipal services to a permanent population of approximately 167,000. The City currently employs approximately 2,600 permanent employees in various capacities. The Police Department is the largest City department, with an annual operating budget of \$68,000,000 and 784 employees, including 500 sworn officers and 285 civilian personnel.

The Fort Lauderdale Personnel Division administers a Police Sergeant Examination every two years per the Labor Contract Agreement between the City and Fraternal Order of Police Local 31. The examination consists of and is graded as follows: Written Test - 60%, Oral Interview - 40%. Only candidates who achieve a passing score on the written portion of the examination are eligible to take the oral interview.

Appropriate scientific techniques and procedures are used in scoring and evaluating the results of examinations and in determining the relative ratings of the competitors. The written examination is given and graded using a flexible passing point. This is determined prior to the examination by establishing the total number of candidates who will receive a passing score on the written examination. If the lowest passing point has more than one candidate with tie scores resulting in a higher number of successful candidates than initially announced, then the total number of passing candidates will be modified to include all those with tie scores at the base passing point.

After administering the written examination and prior to notifying candidates of the results of this test, a group test review session is scheduled and conducted. Candidates are permitted to inspect their written test paper, and the answer key, and have three days to substantiate in writing any claims of error or appeals in the test. The appeals by the group of candidates are submitted to the test author who will render a decision on the twenty (20) most challenged questions.

3. INFORMATION OR CLARIFICATION: For information concerning procedures for responding to this RFP contact Procurement Specialist II, Linda R. Wilson, at (954) 828-5146. For information concerning the technical specifications contained in this RFP contact Personnel Analyst, Lisa Slagle at (954) 828-5316. Such contact is to be for clarification purposes only. Material changes, if any, to the technical specifications or bidding procedures will only be transmitted by written addendum.

3.1. Last Date for Questions of a Material Nature:

Requests for clarifications or questions related to this RFP will be accepted in writing, by e-mail or by fax transmission. All questions be submitted in writing to the Purchasing Division, 100 North Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL, 33301, Attn: Linda Wilson. To facilitate prompt receipt of questions, they can be sent via FAX to (954) 828-5576 Attn: Linda Wilson, or by e-mail to lindsw@ci.fort-lauderdale.fl.us

Questions of a material nature must be received prior to the cut-off date specified in the RFP Schedule. Any addendum, if required, will be issued within three (3) days of this date to all bidders who have been mailed a copy of the RFP.

04. ELIGIBILITY: To be eligible to respond to this RFP, the proposer should demonstrate that he/she or they, or the principals assigned to the project, have successfully completed services, similar to those specified in the Scope of Services section of this RFP, to at least one organization similar in size and complexity to the City of Fort Lauderdale.

05. SELLING, TRANSFERRING OR ASSIGNING CONTRACT: No contract awarded under these terms, conditions and specifications shall be sold, transferred or assigned without the written approval of the City Manager or designee.

06. INVOICES: The City will accept invoices no more frequently than the following schedule: The first invoice shall be submitted with the final camera ready copy of the written test. Payment shall be made by the City within thirty (30) days of acceptance of the test by the City. The first invoice shall not exceed 65% of the total cost for the services as bid.

The second invoice shall be submitted after the written responses to the challenged appeals are received and accepted by the City and shall cover all expenses of the project not contained in the first invoice. Payment shall be made by the City within thirty (30) days of acceptance of the written responses by the City.

07. MINORITY-WOMEN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION: It is the desire of the City of Fort Lauderdale to increase the participation of minority (MBE) and women-owned (WBE) businesses in its contracting and procurement programs. While the City does not have any preference or set aside programs in place, it is committed to a policy of equitable participation for these firms. Proposers are requested to include in their proposals a narrative describing their past accomplishments and intended actions in this area. If proposers are considering minority or women owned enterprise participation in their proposal, those firms, and their specific duties have to be identified in the proposal. If a proposer is considered for award, he will be asked to meet with City staff so that the intended MBE/WBE participation can be formalized and included in the subsequent contract.

See General Conditions Section 1.08 for MBE and WBE definitions.

08. VARIANCES: The City allows Contractors to take variances to the RFP terms, conditions, and specifications, the number and extent of variances taken will be considered in determining proposal responsiveness and in allocating proposal evaluation points. See Section 1.06 of GC.

09. GENERAL CONDITIONS: RFP General Conditions (GC) Form G-107A, Rev. 7/01, are included and made a part of this RFP.

10. NEWS RELEASES/PUBLICITY: News releases, publicity releases, or advertisements relating to this contract or the tasks or projects associated with the project shall not be made without prior City approval.

11. RFP DOCUMENTS: The Contractor shall examine this RFP carefully. Ignorance of the requirements will not relieve the Contractor from liability and obligations under the Contract.

PART II - RFP SCHEDULE

The City anticipates making an award to the successful Contractor within ten (10) days of the proposal opening date.

| | | |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| Release of the RFP | | May 1, 2003 |
| Last date for Receipt of Questions | | May 12, 2003, 5:00 PM |
| Addendum, if required | | May 16, 2003 |
| RFP OPENS, 2:00 P.M. | | June 9,2003 |
| Evaluation Committee review & ranking | Week of | 06/30/03 |
| Anticipated award date | Week of | 06/30/03 |
| REQUIRED DELIVERY DATE - DRAFT TEST COPY | | 10/27/03 |
| COMPLETED CAMERA READY WRITTEN TEST COPY | | 11/24/03 |
| COMPLETED REVIEW AND DETERMINATION OF CHALLENGED TEST QUESTIONS | | 1/12/03 |

PART III - SCOPE OF SERVICES

1. SCOPE OF SERVICES: The successful Contractor shall develop a Police Sergeant Examination in accordance with the RFP specifications contained herein.

1.1. Test developer to utilize the job analysis and list of references provided by the City to develop a test content outline. These materials are to guide the test developer in test construction. Only references specified by the City will be permitted for use as reference materials. Applicants will have knowledge of reference materials prior to the administration of the test.

This reference listing is provided as **EXHIBIT "A"**, attached to proposal summary pages

A job analysis was conducted in 1995 and a list of "KSA's" (Knowledge, Skills and Abilities) measured in the 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001 examination are attached to the RFP marked **EXHIBIT "B"**.

1.2. The test developer must provide a draft copy with a minimum of 150 test items by October 27, 2003. The test items are to be developed from the list of reference materials provided by the City. Test developer will not be provided copies of previous examinations for inspection. The test will be reviewed by Police Department management personnel and will be reviewed in the following manner:

The items will be reviewed by City of Fort Lauderdale Police Department personnel familiar with the class. They will evaluate each test question using the following three criteria:

- a. Job Relatedness:
Consider the degree of relatedness this question has to the job of Police Sergeant in the City of Fort Lauderdale.
- b. Difficulty:
Consider the degree of difficulty this question would represent for the average Police Sergeant candidate.
- c. Clarity:
Consider the degree of clarity and the intent of the test question.

Questions which are not considered Job Related for a Police Sergeant in the City of Fort Lauderdale will be eliminated from the draft. Additional test questions may be requested, and questions which do not meet the Difficulty and Clarity criteria will be rewritten, if:

- 1) the final draft consists of less than 100 items; and/or
- 2) if, upon elimination of these items, the test is no longer content valid.

If test items must be rewritten, delivery date will be November 17, 2003, and will be again evaluated according to the criteria and standards above.

The test item review session will be conducted by the Fort Lauderdale Personnel Division.

The test developer is to review the top twenty (20) challenged test questions and render a judgment as to the validity of the challenges. **The test developer is to submit the results of this judgment to the City no later than January 12, 2004.** The test developer will be provided the challenges by December 15, 2003.

PART IV - EVALUATION AND AWARD

EVALUATION & AWARD: The City will evaluate all responsive and responsible proposals to determine which proposal best meets the needs of the City, based on the evaluation criteria. Evaluation will be made by a committee established for this purpose, composed of City staff and any other qualified persons deemed necessary.

Award will be based on a review of all the information submitted, plus a review of the references submitted, and certain objective and subjective considerations, including:

| <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> | <u>Assigned Points</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. Experience, qualifications, and past performance of proposer, in preparing similar exams for the City or other governmental entities. | 35 |
| 2. Cost to the City for the examination development. | 20 |
| 3. Qualifications and technical expertise of project coordinator and persons participating in the test development. | 35 |
| 4. Proposer's ability to meet the deadlines specified in this proposal. | <u>10</u> |
| TOTAL POINTS: | 100 |

Finalists may be asked to appear before an Evaluation Committee, if desired by the City. Such oral presentation, if required, shall be for clarification purposes only.

The City reserves the right to award the contract to that proposer who will best serve the interest of the City. The City reserves the right, based upon its deliberations and in its opinion, to accept or reject any or all proposals, or parts of proposals. The City also reserves the right to waive minor variations to the specifications and in the bidding process.

PART VI - REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL

INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS/REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL:

1) **Proposers are required to submit ONE (1) ORIGINAL AND FOUR (4) COPIES OF RFP response and all attachments.** Any attachments shall be clearly identified. To be considered, the proposal shall respond to all parts of the RFP. Any other information thought to be relevant, but not applicable to the enumerated categories, should be provided as an appendix to your RFP response.

2) All proposals shall be submitted in a sealed envelope with the proposer name and address, RFP number, due date and time, and RFP title clearly marked on the outside. If more than one package is submitted, please mark 1 of 2, 2 of 2, etc.

3) **All proposals must be received in the Purchasing Division, 6th Floor, 100 North Andrews Avenue, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, prior to 2:00 pm the due date specified in the RFP schedule.**

4) Proposal shall be signed by a representative who is authorized to contractually bind the Contractor.

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL: Proposers shall include all the following as a part of the RFP response:

- a) RFP Proposal Summary Page 1, signed and dated;
- b) All PROPOSAL SUMMARY PAGES, completed;
- c) ANY ADDENDUM OR ATTACHMENTS;
- d) A list of client references for whom you have performed these services;
- e) The requested Original and four copies of your RFP response.**

PROPOSAL SUMMARY PAGES

PROPOSER PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

The proposer hereby offers to enter into an agreement with the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida to provide POLICE SERGEANT WRITTEN EXAMINATION test services in accordance with these RFP specifications and provisions. I have read all attachments, including the specifications and fully understand what is required. By submitting this signed proposal I will accept a contract, if approved by the City and such acceptance covers all terms, conditions, and specifications of this proposal. I certify that I have not divulged to, discussed with, or compared this RFP with any other proposer(s) and have not colluded with any other proposer(s) or parties to this RFP. I further certify that I am authorized to contractually bind the proposing firm.

1. Name of company: _____
(legal registered)

Address: _____

Principal Contact: _____
(name & title)

Telephone No.: (____) _____ Fax No.: (____) _____

Email address: _____ Website: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Does your firm qualify for MBE, WBE or SBE status in accordance with Section 1.08 of the General Conditions? (MBE) _____ (WBE) _____ (SBE) _____

ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Proposer acknowledges that the following addenda have been received, IF APPLICABLE, and are included in the proposal response:

ADDENDUM NO.

DATE ISSUED

2. VARIANCES: State any variances to the specifications, terms, and conditions in the space provided below or reference in this space all variances contained on other pages of the RFP, attachments or proposal pages.

No variations or exceptions by the proposer will be deemed to be part of the proposal submitted unless such variation or exception is listed and contained within the proposal documents and referenced in the space provided for this purpose. If no statement is contained in this space, it is hereby implied that your proposal complies fully with the RFP.

Variations: _____

3. Can you meet the deadlines as specified? ___ Yes ___ No

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

If NO, give the dates for the following:

Providing the draft copy: _____

Providing additional test questions, if required: _____

Providing final camera ready test copy: _____

4. Provide a summary of your firms qualifications for developing a POLICE SERGEANT Examination. (If additional space is needed, provide as an Appendix to your proposal)

5. Has your firm previously completed any assignments for the City of Fort Lauderdale?
___YES ___NO

If YES, provide specifics:

6. List below the person(s) who will be assigned to and responsible for coordinating the project and all personnel who will be involved with this project, *including the identification of the item writers for this project*. If additional space is required, please attach as an appendix to your RFP proposal response. Please also provide resumes of these person(s) with your response package.

7. Client References: Please provide information regarding agencies for whom you have prepared Police Sergeant examinations: A MINIMUM OF THREE IS REQUESTED .(Include contact name, telephone No. & address)

8. Indicate in the space provided your **TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED** for the services in accordance with the RFP specifications:

\$ _____

Proposer Comments/Suggestions: _____

**City of Fort Lauderdale
GENERAL CONDITIONS**

These instructions are standard for all contracts for commodities or services issued through the City of Fort Lauderdale Division of Procurement & Materials Management. The City may delete, supersede, or modify any of these standard instructions for a particular contract by indicating such change in the Invitation to Bid (ITB) Special Conditions, Technical Specifications, Instructions, Proposal Pages, Addenda, and Legal Advertisement.

PART I BIDDER PROPOSAL PAGE(S) CONDITIONS:

- 1.01 BIDDER ADDRESS:** The City maintains automated vendor mailing lists for each specific Commodity Class Item. Invitation to Bid (ITB'S) will be mailed first to a selection of Bidders who have fully registered on our system. Requests will be mailed to unregistered Bidders within a reasonable time frame for that bid only. Neither the mailing of one ITB to the vendor, nor a bid in return, will register a vendor on our system. If you wish purchase orders sent to a different address, please so indicate. If you wish payments sent to a different address, please so indicate on your invoice.
- 1.02 DELIVERY:** Time will be of the essence for any orders placed as a result of this ITB. The City reserves the right to cancel any orders, or part thereof, without obligation if delivery is not made in accordance with the schedule specified by the Bidder and accepted by the City.
- 1.03 PAYMENT TERMS AND CASH DISCOUNTS:** Payment terms, unless otherwise stated in this ITB, will be considered to be net 30 days after the date of satisfactory delivery at the place of acceptance and receipt of correct invoice at the office specified, whichever occurs last. Bidder may offer cash discounts for prompt payment but they will not be considered in determination of award. If a Bidder offers a discount, it is understood that the discount time will be computed from the date of satisfactory delivery, at the place of acceptance, and receipt of correct invoice, at the office specified, whichever occurs last.
- 1.04 TOTAL BID DISCOUNT:** If Bidder offers a discount for award of all items listed in the bid, such discount shall be deducted from the total of the firm net unit prices bid and shall be considered in tabulation and award of bid.
- 1.05 BIDS FIRM FOR ACCEPTANCE:** Bidder warrants, by virtue of bidding, that his bid and the prices quoted in his bid will be firm for acceptance by the City for a period of ninety (90) days from the date of bid opening unless otherwise stated in the ITB.
- 1.06 VARIANCES:** For purposes of bid evaluation, Bidder's must indicate any variances, no matter how slight, from ITB General Conditions, Special Conditions, Specifications or Addenda in the space provided in the ITB. No variations or exceptions by a Bidder will be considered or deemed a part of the bid submitted unless such variances or exceptions are listed in the bid and referenced in the space provided on the bidder proposal pages. If variances are not stated, or referenced as required, it will be assumed that the product or service fully complies with the City's terms, conditions, and specifications.
- 1.07 NO BIDS:** If you do not intend to bid please indicate the reason, such as insufficient time to respond, do not offer product or service, unable to meet specifications, schedule would not permit, or any other reason, in the space provided in this ITB. Failure to bid or return no bid comments prior to the bid due and opening date and time, indicated in this ITB, may result in your firm being deleted from our Bidder's registration list for the Commodity Class Item requested in this ITB.
- 1.08 MINORITY AND WOMEN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION AND BUSINESS DEFINITIONS:** The City of Fort Lauderdale wants to increase the participation of Minority Business Enterprises (MBE), Women Business Enterprises (WBE), and Small Business Enterprises (SBE) in its purchasing activities. If your firm qualifies in accordance with the below definitions please indicate in the space provided in this ITB.

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) "A Minority Business" is a business enterprise that is owned or controlled by one or more socially or economically disadvantaged persons. Such disadvantage may arise from cultural, racial, chronic economic circumstances or background or other similar cause. Such persons include, but are not limited to: Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Americans.

The term 'Minority Business Enterprise' means a business at least 51 percent of which is owned by minority group members or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock of which is owned by minority group members. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, minority group members are citizens of the United States who include, but are not limited to: Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Americans.

Women Business Enterprise (WBE) a "Women Owned or Controlled Business is a business enterprise at least 51 percent of which is owned by females or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock of which is owned by females.

Small Business Enterprise (SBE) "Small Business" means a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other legal entity formed for the purpose of making a profit, which is independently owned and operated, has either fewer than 100 employees or less than \$1,000,000 in annual gross receipts.

BLACK, which includes persons having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

WHITE, which includes persons whose origins are Anglo-Saxon and Europeans and persons of Indo-European decent including Pakistani and East Indian.

HISPANIC, which includes persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

NATIVE AMERICAN, which includes persons whose origins are American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, or Native Hawaiians.

ASIAN AMERICAN, which includes persons having origin in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands.

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

1.09 MINORITY-WOMEN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION

It is the desire of the City of Fort Lauderdale to increase the participation of minority (MBE) and women-owned (WBE) businesses in its contracting and procurement programs. While the City does not have any preference or set aside programs in place, it is committed to a policy of equitable participation for these firms. Proposers are requested to include in their proposals a narrative describing their past accomplishments and intended actions in this area. If proposers are considering minority or women owned enterprise participation in their proposal, those firms, and their specific duties have to be identified in the proposal. If a proposer is considered for award, he will be asked to meet with City staff so that the intended MBE/WBE participation can be formalized and included in the subsequent contract.

1.09(a) CERTIFICATION BY BROWARD COUNTY, FL: If awarded a contract or purchase order as a result of this solicitation, and if the awarded contractor/vendor is claiming minority status in accordance with Section 1.08 of the General Conditions, then said awarded contractor/vendor shall apply for certification by Broward County, Florida, Division of Equal Employment and Small Business Opportunity. Contractor/vendor shall provide documentation of application status, and once approved or disapproved by Broward County, must also provide that documentation to the Procurement Division of the City of Fort Lauderdale.

A quotation received in response to this ITB will be considered to be a firm offer held for acceptance for ninety (90) days from quotation due date. Deduct trade discounts and quote firm prices. In the case of a discrepancy, the unit price will prevail. The City is exempt from Federal Excise and Florida Sales Taxes. All prices quoted shall be F.O.B. destination.

If approved Equal is listed in the specifications, the quotation must contain adequate information to ensure that the quoted item meets the required criteria. If estimated quantities are listed, they are for information purposes only, and no warranty or guarantee of quantities is given or implied.

Bids will only be considered from firms who are qualified to provide the required product or service. The City reserves the right to reject bids where evidence or evaluation by the City is determined to indicate inability to perform. The City reserves the right to award to the quotation(s) that will best serve the interest of the City, to reject any or all quotations, or to cancel the ITB and reissue. The City also reserves the right to waive minor variations or irregularities in the specifications or in the bidding process.

Items delivered will remain the property of the seller until accepted to the satisfaction of the City. Those that do not conform to bid specifications may be rejected and returned at sellers expense.

If seller is required to go on City property to perform work, he/she shall assume all responsibility and expense of obtaining insurance, as required by the City. The City reserves the right to cancel any contract for cause upon written notice, and for convenience upon thirty (30) days written notice. There shall be no discrimination as to race, sex, color, creed, age or national origin in the operations conducted under this contract. Seller shall not transfer or assign the performance required by this ITB without prior written consent of the City Manager, or designee.

The seller agrees to protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Fort Lauderdale and its officers, employees and agents from and against any and all losses, penalties, damages, settlements, claims, costs, charges for other expenses, or liabilities of every and any kind including attorney fees, in connection with or arising directly or indirectly out of the work agreed to or performed by the seller under the terms of any agreement that may arise due to the bidding process. Without limiting the foregoing, any and all such claims, suits, or other actions, relating to personal injury, death, damage to property, defects in materials or workmanship, actual or alleged violation of any applicable statute, ordinance, administrative order, rule or regulation, or decree of any court, shall be included in the indemnity hereunder. The parties waive the privilege of venue and agree that all litigation between them in the state courts shall take place in Broward County, Florida, and that all litigation between them in federal courts shall take place in the Southern District in and for the State of Florida.

EXHIBIT A – READING LIST

The following are the necessary resources to be used for the 2003 Police Sergeant's Written Examination to be administered in December, 2003.

REFERENCES

1. Fort Lauderdale Police Department Policy & Procedure Manual, (only the policies listed below will be on the written examination)

- **Policy 113** Authorized Less Lethal and Non-Lethal Weapons
- **Policy 117.3** Internal Affairs - Responsibility/Complaint Processing
- **Policy 117.6** Employee Performance Rating System
- **Policy 118** Rules of Conduct
- **Policy 119.1** Force - Use of - General
- **Policy 119.3** Use of Force - Reporting, Evaluation and Investigation
- **Policy 119.4** Accidental Discharge of Firearm
- **Policy 128** Selection Process - Employee Applications
- **Policy 128.1** Hiring Police Officers
- **Policy 204.4** Domestic and Repeat Violence and Service of Process
- **Policy 306.3** Vehicle Pursuit Policy
- **Policy 308.1** Barricaded Subjects/Hostages - General Policy
- **Policy 308.2** Barricaded Subjects/Hostages - Specific Responsibilities
- **Policy 308.3** SWAT Team
- **Policy 308.4** Crisis Negotiation Team
- **Policy 402** Employee Harassment
- **Policy 403.1** Infectious/Communicable Disease Exposure Control Plan
- **Policy 501.1** Arrests (General Procedures)
- **Policy 501.3** Searches of Persons Arrested
- **Policy 501.4** Warrantless Arrests
- **Policy 501.5** Warrant Arrest
- **Policy 501.6** Arrests Made in Other Jurisdictions (O.J. Arrests)
- **Policy 501.7** Countywide Arrest Powers
- **Policy 501.8** Escape of Prisoner During Transport
- **Policy 501.9** Arrest of School Employees
- **Policy 501.10** Mass Arrests
- **Policy 505** Holding Cell/Interview Rooms
- **Policy 508** Baker Act
- **Policy 509** Marchman Act

2. Fort Lauderdale Police Department Florida Criminal Law & Motor Vehicle Handbook , 2003 edition (only the sections listed below will be on the written examination)

- **Legal Guidelines** Pages LG-1 thru LG - 42
- **Ch 39** Proceeding Relating To Children
- **Ch 316.1935** Fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer; aggravated fleeing or eluding
- **Ch 715.10-111** Disposition of Personal Property Landlord and Tenant Act
- **Ch 741** Domestic Relations - Husband and Wife
- **Ch 775.21** The Florida Sexual Predator Act
- **Ch 776** Justifiable Use of Force
- **Ch 782** Homicide

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

- **Ch 784** Assault; Battery; Culpable Negligence
- **Ch 787** Kidnapping; False Imprisonment; Luring or Enticing Child; Custody Offences
- **Ch 794** Sexual Battery
- **Ch 810** Burglary and Trespass
- **Ch 812** Theft, Robbery, and Related Crimes
- **Ch 825** Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation of Elderly Persons and Disabled Adults
- **Ch 827** Abuse of Children
- **Ch 843** Obstructing Justice
- **Ch 856** Drunkenness; Open House Parties; Loitering; Prowling; Desertion

3. Problem-Oriented Policing, Herman Goldstein, Copyright 1990, McGraw-Hill, Inc., all chapters.
4. Effective Supervisory Practices, ICMA Third Edition, 1995, all chapters.
5. The Ethics Edge, ICMA
6. Magazine Articles
Broken Windows, James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling, The Atlantic Monthly, March 1982.
So You Want To Be A Leader, Richard M. Ayres, Beretta USA Leadership Bulletin, April 1994.

EXHIBIT B – JOB ANALYSIS

Police Sergeant
Job Analysis 1995

Prepared by: Lisa Slagle, Personnel Analyst

Purpose:

The previous job analysis was conducted in 1987 by a testing consultant who was hired to develop the written examination at that time. The 1987 job analysis was reviewed yearly to ensure that the KSAs being measured were still appropriate for the position. The major functions of the Police Sergeant classification have not significantly changed over the years. The contractual agreement between the City of Fort Lauderdale and the Fraternal Order of Police, Fort Lauderdale Police Lodge 31 (FOP), the contract negotiated for October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1997 states the testing process will be a written examination and an oral panel interview. The oral board interview contains a role play exercise which is assessed by the oral panel interview board. The purpose of this study was to ensure the proper knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) were being measured in the written examination and that the proper behavioral dimensions were being observed in the oral board interview.

The major responsibility of the Police Sergeant position is the command and supervision of subordinate patrol officers assigned to his/her zone or specialized unit. Assignments involve responsibility for coordinating and assigning the work activities of subordinate personnel engaged in a variety of law enforcement activities such as patrol, traffic control/enforcement, K-9 handling, investigations, Forensics, marine patrol, public safety education and community service programs.

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES

Job incumbents and supervisors edited an initial list of KSAs which were taken from the current Police Sergeant classification, other jurisdictions job analyses and input from supervisors and incumbents. Once the initial KSA list had been established, the surveys were sent out to every Police Sergeant assigned to Patrol and who had completed one year in the classification of Police Sergeant.

The incumbents completed a survey which measured the level of "Expected at Entry" and the "Criticality" of each KSA inventory. KSAs were eliminated from the inventory if they were rated as not needed at entry or not critical to overall satisfactory job performance.

Method:

1. Compute the mean "Expected at Entry" (EE) and "Criticality" (CK) ratings for each KSA.
2. Eliminate any KSAs from further consideration which have an EE or a CK rating of less than 1.5.

3. For each remaining KSA, add the EE and CK ratings to obtain the "Importance of KSA" (IK) index. ($IK = EE + CK$). The possible range of IK ratings is 3.0 to 6.0.

The incumbents then rated the necessity for performance of each important KSA.

Method:

1. Compute the mean "Necessity for Performance" (NP) rating for each KSA.
2. A KSA which has a NP value not greater than 1.5 may be difficult to defend if further considered in the selection process, since the KSA is only "desirable" (and not necessary) for the performance of important tasks.

Based on the above calculations and the ability of the KSA to be measured in a written examination format, the KSAs were rank ordered and sent to the test developer for the development of the written exam.

There are other factors which should be considered in selecting personnel for promotion. These cannot and will not be measured in a written format. These factors are better measured by the ICS (Identifying Criteria for Success) behavioral-based job analysis which is discussed below.

ICS - Identifying Criteria for Success

The Identifying Criteria for Success (ICS) is a software program that allows organizations to conduct behavioral-based job analyses using a personal computer. This approach defines positions in terms of the actual behaviors and activities that are important to success in the position being analyzed.

This job analysis allows the Subject Matter Experts to identify behaviors that lead to success in the job. When analyzing a job using the behavioral approach, it's almost impossible to describe every behavior associated with success or failure in that job. So to save time in the analysis and still define the job in terms of the behaviors needed to do it, it's necessary to group similar behaviors under a general label. This label or general description is called a "dimension". There are thousands of these behaviors and they change constantly.

Behavior -- defined in ICS as anything a person says or does to do a job -- is the basic building block of the ICS job analysis. To gather this behavior, ICS calls on "job content experts" (JCEs) who are incumbents in the targeted position, and their supervisors. In this case, the participants for the ICS job analysis were the incumbents and supervisors of the "core" group.

Once the behaviors for a job are determined, they are grouped into dimensions based on their commonality. For instance, all behaviors involved in coaching, motivating and disciplining subordinates might be grouped together. Another group might include the many behaviors involved in making decisions.

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

After behaviors are grouped, each group is given a name that describes it, thus creating a dimension. For example, the group behaviors that involve coaching, motivating, and disciplining subordinates is frequently called "Leadership". The group of behaviors that involves making decisions is often labeled "Judgment".

The dimensions used in the ICS system are the result of Development Dimensions International's extensive research and experience in the job analysis field, including the study of job analysis data involving more than 1000 positions.

The JCEs are asked to assign a criticality rating for each statement and also the frequency performed for each statement. After the dimensions have been selected based on the above criteria, the JCEs are asked to rank the importance of these dimensions and also to rate the importance of these dimensions.

Based on the results of the ICS job analysis and in keeping with the agreement between the City and the local FOP Lodge 31 contract, an oral board interview was chosen as the exercise to measure the dimensions.

Subject Matter Experts

There are currently sixty-four (64) budgeted, full-time positions. These positions are assigned to Patrol districts on shifts with several Police Sergeants being assigned to administrative positions.

The following incumbents and supervisors reviewed the initial list of KSAs:

| | Promoted <u>To Sgt.</u> | Promoted <u>To Capt.</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Sex</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|
| District Commander B.W. Smith | 03/01/81 | 10/20/85 | W | M |
| Captain James Hurley | 11/15/87 | 08/15/93 | W | M |
| Captain Robert Lamberti | 10/30/88 | 11/20/94 | W | M |
| Sergeant Timothy Falk | 09/13/92 | N/A | W | M |
| Sergeant Gregory Kridos | 07/14/85 | N/A | W | M |
| Sergeant Mitch Van Sant | 01/17/93 | N/A | W | M |

Once the list of KSAs had been edited, a survey form was sent to every Police Sergeant in Patrol who had completed a minimum of one (1) year as a Police Sergeant.

Survey Participants Incumbents

At the time the surveys were sent out (January 1995) there were sixty-three (63) permanent, budgeted Police Sergeant positions. The following is a breakdown of these positions:

- 3 Vacant
- 6 Incumbents on probationary status (Not sent questionnaire)
- 18 Sergeants assigned to special units (Not sent questionnaire)
- 27 Did not receive survey

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

Twenty-nine (29) incumbents were sent the survey, January 9, 1995. Incumbents had approximately two (2) weeks to complete the survey and return to Personnel by January 23, 1995.

Twenty-nine (29) incumbents did not complete

| | |
|--------|-------|
| 23 W/M | 2 W/F |
| 2 B/M | 1 B/F |
| 1 H/M | |

Seven (7) incumbents responded

| | |
|-------|-------|
| 5 W/M | 2 W/F |
| 0 B/M | 0 B/F |

Patrol Supervisors

Fourteen (14) Captains were sent the survey January 9, 1995. They had approximately two (2) weeks to complete the survey and return to Personnel by January 23, 1995.

Six (6) supervisors did not complete the survey
6 W/M

Eight (8) supervisors responded

8 W/M

The survey was completed by the following incumbents and Patrol supervisors:

Incumbents

| | <u>Date of Promotion</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Sex</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | <u>to Sergeant</u> | | |
| Sgt. Steve Lerman | 04/19/87 | W | M |
| Sgt. Ralph Nelson | 04/19/87 | W | M |
| Sgt. Lee Spector | 05/27/90 | W | M |
| Sgt. Mitch VanSant | 01/17/93 | W | M |
| Sgt. Judy Waldman | 12/20/92 | W | F |
| Sgt. David Wheeler | 04/16/89 | W | M |
| Sgt. Terry Wright | 03/14/82 | W | F |

| | <u>Date of Promotion</u> | <u>Date of Promotion</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Sex</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------|
| <u>Supervisors</u> | <u>to Captain</u> | <u>to Sergeant</u> | | |
| District Commander B.W. Smith | 10/20/85 | 03/01/81 | W | M |
| Captain David Doughty | 01/07/90 | 01/01/84 | W | M |
| Captain David Geyer | 01/17/93 | 11/01/81 | W | M |
| Captain James Hurley | 08/15/93 | 11/15/87 | W | M |
| Captain Robert Lamberti | 11/20/94 | 10/30/88 | W | M |
| Captain Robert Montagano | 05/23/93 | 10/29/89 | W | M |

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|----------|---|---|
| Captain Boris Sellers-Sampson | 01/17/93 | 10/12/80 | W | M |
| Captain Leonard Schneider | 12/20/92 | 04/19/87 | W | M |

The ICS job analysis was completed by the following Subject Matter Experts:

| <u>Incumbents</u> | <u>Date of Promotion to Sergeant</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Sex</u> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| Sergeant George Bentley | 10/01/78 | W | M |
| Sergeant Thomas Dickson | 06/21/92 | W | M |
| Sergeant Timothy Falk | 09/13/92 | W | M |
| Sergeant Kevin Finn | 02/26/95 | W | M |
| Sergeant Charmaine Gittens-Jacques | 09/25/94 | B | F |
| Sergeant Russell Hanstein | 11/22/92 | W | M |
| Sergeant Gregory Kridos | 07/14/85 | W | M |
| Sergeant William Lauginiger | 02/26/95 | W | M |
| Sergeant Richard Perez | 02/18/90 | H | M |
| Sergeant Ted Tyzo | 11/22/92 | W | M |

| <u>Supervisors</u> | <u>Date of Promotion to Captain</u> | <u>Date of Promotion to Sergeant</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Sex</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| District Commander Lew Hartman | 11/15/87 | 10/01/78 | W | M |
| District Commander B. W. Smith | 10/20/85 | 03/01/81 | W | M |
| District Commander Joseph Robinson | 10/09/83 | 10/07/71 | W | M |
| Captain Charles Drago | 09/24/95 | 04/19/87 | W | M |

These groups were chosen with ethnic and gender representation as a concern as well as looking at their current and previous job assignments, their exposure to different shifts and different geographic areas (districts) in the City.

Results

In accordance with the contractual agreement between the City of Fort Lauderdale and the FOP Lodge 31, the examination for the classification of Police Sergeant is as follows:

Written Exam 60%
Oral Board Interview 40%

A. Written Examination

By contract with the FOP Lodge 31, the written examination is 60% of the candidate's final score. The KSAs which ranked highest and could be measured in a written format were chosen. The following KSAs were measured in the written examination.

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

1. Knowledge of policies and procedures (e.g., details, arrests, evidence, grooming/uniforms, etc.) as written in the FLPD manual.
2. Knowledge of the tasks and responsibilities of immediate subordinates.
3. Knowledge of FLPD forms and their time frames for submission (e.g., overtime cards, injury report, complaint form) as written in the FLPD manual.
4. Knowledge of the care and maintenance of service weapons as written in the FLPD manual.
5. Knowledge of the geographical territory covered by one's district or command area.
6. Knowledge of training techniques such as coaching, demonstration, advising and explaining procedures to subordinates.
7. Knowledge of crime scene techniques.
8. Knowledge of accident scene investigation techniques.
9. Knowledge of overall objectives and primary responsibilities of each unit and program. (Aviation, k9, FTO, Internal Affairs, etc.) within FLPD.
10. Knowledge of Personnel Division guidelines, rules, and regulations including performance appraisal procedures and forms.
11. Knowledge of services available for crime scene investigations such as fingerprint specialists and hair – and- fiber specialists.
12. Knowledge of court proceedings regarding case prosecution (e.g., suppression hearing, rules of evidence, how to process subpoenas).
13. Knowledge of the methodology and practices of community policing.

The written examination test questions were developed by a test consultant. These questions were reviewed on September 27, 1995, by the following: Captain Mary Grimm, Captain Robert Montagano, Captain Robert Pusins, and the above referenced preparer. The test developer submitted 168 questions for review. The committee reviewed each question individually before the meeting and made a determination on the job relatedness, difficulty and clarity of the test questions. Questions were rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 3 considered average. The committee removed 49 questions from the examination and requested that 6 questions be reformatted. The final selection of test questions was left to the discretion of the test developer. The final written exam was not reviewed by anyone from the Police Department.

B. Oral Board Interview

The dimensions were chosen based on their mean importance rating. (The highest rated dimension is first, the lowest rated dimension is last.) The following dimensions were measured in the oral board interview:

DIMENSIONS

MEAN

COMMUNICATION - Expressing ideas effectively in individual and group situations (e.g., verbal or nonverbal communication); adjusting language or terminology to the characteristics and needs of the audience. 3.93

JUDGMENT (Problem Solution) - Committing to an action after developing alternative courses of action that are based on logical assumptions and factual information and that take into consideration resources, constraints, and organizational values. 3.86

INITIATIVE -- Making active attempts to influence events to achieve goals; self-starting rather than accepting passively; taking action to achieve goals beyond what is required. 3.64

INDIVIDUAL LEADERSHIP (Influence) - Using appropriate interpersonal styles and methods to guide individuals or groups (subordinates, peers, and superiors) toward goal achievement; modifying behavior according to tasks and individuals involved. 3.64

ANALYSIS (Problem Identification) - Securing relative information and identifying key issues and relationships from a base of information. Relating and comparing data from different sources. Identifying cause-effect relationships. 3.46

ORAL BOARD INTERVIEW FORMAT

1. Roleplay Scenario

This roleplay was developed in-house by the above referenced preparer and Arlette Steinberger, Employment Manager. This roleplay was not reviewed by anyone at the Police Department.

The roleplay was a counseling session with a subordinate officer. This officer had no problems which required disciplinary actions, but needed to be made aware of deficiencies in his interpersonal/sensitivity skills when dealing with people. This interpersonal/sensitivity problem was documented throughout the role player's personnel file.

Candidates were allowed twenty (20) minutes to prepare their roleplay and fifteen (15) minutes maximum to conduct the roleplay.

2. Targeted Selection Interview

After the roleplay exercise had been completed, the candidate was given instructions for the Targeted Selection Interview. Targeted selection is a systematic approach to selection interviewing.

There are several components to the Targeted Selection approach, all of which are based on the assumption that past behavior predicts future behavior. In the interview component, candidates were asked questions designated to illicit past behavior, specifically, candidates were asked to give answers in the form of a STAR:

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

S = Situation

T = Task

A = Action

R = Result

Comments:

The final results of this job analysis show a consistency in the major duties and responsibilities with the job analysis completed in 1987.

The job analysis showed no differences in duties or responsibilities based on geographic areas (districts). The major differences are in the volume of calls not in the duties or responsibilities of the Police Sergeant.

The job analysis and reference materials should be reviewed and updated every two (2) years before the RFP for the examination process is bid out.

Addendum to the 1995 Job Analysis Report

The job analysis from 1995 was modified in 1997, 1999 and 2001, 2003 to reflect the following:

A. The following two (2) KSA's describe knowledge domains that are not addressed by any of the mandatory reading materials; therefore these two (2) KSAs were not assessed.

1. Knowledge of geographical territory covered by one's district or command area.
10. Knowledge of Personnel Division guidelines, rules, and regulations including performance appraisal procedures and forms.

B. There was no data available for the IK value for the following KSA (#13). This KSA was an addition to the list of KSA's at the request of the department in 1997. The philosophy of Community Policing has been practiced by the department for many years. The importance of the KSA is well documented by a variety of sources including the Mission Statement and goals and objectives of the department. The domain described by the KSA is prominently represented by the reading list. The average of the IKs for the other important KSA's that will be assessed will be computed and that value will be required for determining KSA weighting and representation in the written examination beginning with the 1997 written examination.

13. Knowledge of the methodology and practices of community policing.

C. The following KSA (#6) was interpreted to incorporate a full range of supervisory concepts and functions which are specifically cited by other components of the job analysis. This interpretation was/is clearly supported by the 1997, 1999 and 2001 reading list which features comprehensive supervisory coverage.

6. Knowledge of training techniques such as coaching, demonstration, advising and explaining procedures to subordinates.

Highly rated abilities cite activities that include delegation, directing subordinates, training, counseling, motivation, performance appraisal, etc. Furthermore, the behavioral-based job analysis ICS (Identifying Criteria for Success), documents the importance of dimensions which included the following activities: delegating, providing instructions,

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

leading and guiding subordinates, setting work performance standards, reviewing others' work, scheduling employees, adjusting work assignments, and following up on delegated assignments.

D. At the request of the department, *Ethics Edge* , was added to the 2001 reading list.

This book is a compilation of articles available covering contemporary insights and current ideas on management practices in ethics. We are interpreting the above KSA on supervisory concepts to include the ethical behavior and practices of first line supervisors.

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
POLICE SERGEANT

DEFINITION

This is supervisory work and/or specialized work in the protection of life and property.

An employee in this classification is responsible for coordinating and assigning the work activities of subordinate personnel engaged in a variety of administrative and law enforcement activities including but not limited to patrol, traffic control/enforcement, K-9 handling, investigations, forensics, marine patrol, mounted patrol, recruiting, training, public safety education and community service programs.

Employees in this classification receive general supervision from a superior officer but exercise independent judgment in completing work assignments. Work is reviewed through observations, reports and conferences.

EXAMPLES OF WORK PERFORMED

Supervises and participates in general duties, responds to major police, accident and fire calls. Determines proper course of action to be taken in daily work activities, emergencies or complex law enforcement situations; explains and interprets general and special orders; instructs and advises new officers in various phases of operations. Receives, reviews and approves all reports generated by subordinates including but not limited to accident reports, miscellaneous incident reviews (pursuits/K-9), etc. Conducts incident reviews regarding officer-involved accidents, pursuits and discourtesy complaints.

Conducts roll call, inspects personal appearance and equipment of personnel; conducts information training sessions.

Maintains discipline by inspecting, evaluating, counseling and enforcing departmental orders and directives. Has the authority to verbally counsel/coach a subordinate, relieve from duty, with pay or to reassign to limited duty, an employee of lower rank if such action is in the best interest of the City, the employee or the general public.

Receives complaints and requests for law enforcement assistance and directs officers to the scene of emergencies and disturbances; ensures that all records and reports of law enforcement activities on the shift are properly executed and routed.

Responds to verbal and written complaints and inquiries from the public and other governmental agencies; provides information on departmental regulations and procedures; explains courses of action and refers complaints to appropriate departmental authorities.

Investigates individuals, crimes and alleged criminal activities; gathers information and evidence; makes arrests; provides law enforcement protection.

Prepares various narrative and statistical reports to present findings, recommend solutions, provide information and document activities, equipment usage and operations.

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

EXAMPLES OF WORK PERFORMED (Continued)

Accounts for all equipment, materials, supplies and vehicles assigned to the specific operating unit to ensure proper inventory levels and operational readiness.

Schedules personnel on a daily basis, as well as scheduling for special events/activities.

Testifies in judicial proceedings.

Operates a law enforcement vehicle.

Reads and comprehends legal and non-legal documents including preparing and processing such documents as citations, affidavits and warrants.

Plans and supervises investigations by the detectives in the Investigative Services Division, checks on progress being made.

Assigns cases to subordinate officers and reviews their work. Assists in investigations as necessary.

Assists with preparing and planning budget for their assigned specialty unit. Assists with the researching and purchasing of budgeted items and equipment for specialty units.

Performs related work as required.

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES

Considerable knowledge of policies and procedures (e.g., off-duty police, arrests, evidence, grooming/uniforms, etc.) as written in the Fort Lauderdale Police Department (FLPD) manual.

Considerable knowledge of the tasks and responsibilities of immediate subordinates.

Considerable knowledge of law enforcement methods and procedures.

Considerable knowledge of Fort Lauderdale Police Department forms and their time frames for submission (e.g., overtime cards, injury reports, complaint forms) as outlined in the FLPD manual.

Considerable knowledge of the proper use of service weapons as written in the FLPD manual.

Considerable knowledge of the state statutes, local ordinances and departmental regulations governing search and seizure of property, arrests and admissibility of evidence.

Knowledge of court procedures regarding case prosecution (e.g., suppression, hearing, rules of evidence, how to process subpoenas).

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES (Continued)

Knowledge of the geography of the City of Fort Lauderdale and the geographical territory covered by one's district or command area.

Knowledge of first-aid principles and skill in their application.

Knowledge of current judicial proceedings governing criminal/civil processes.

Knowledge of training techniques such as coaching, demonstrating, advising and explaining procedures to subordinates.

Knowledge of crime scene investigation techniques and accident scene investigation, including the knowledge of services available such as forensic specialists.

Knowledge of the overall objectives and primary responsibilities of each unit and program (K-9, Field Training Officer, Internal Affairs, Detective Bureau, Communications Center, etc.) within FLPD.

Knowledge of Personnel Division guidelines, rules, and regulations including performance appraisal procedures and forms.

Knowledge of the methodology and practices of community policing. Ability to plan, assign and coordinate the work of subordinate personnel. Ability to enforce the law firmly and impartially with respect for individual rights.

Ability to assess an emergency or criminal situation, respond promptly and assign personnel to specific areas during the emergency situation, and to delegate specific responsibilities to personnel during emergency situations without direct supervision.

Ability to prepare accurate reports of work activities.

Ability to courteously and effectively communicate with the public, both orally and in writing.

Ability to effectively use a variety of law enforcement tools and equipment, including service weapons.

Ability to follow oral and written instructions.

Ability to maintain current certifications as a law enforcement officer in the State of Florida.

Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the general public, co-workers, elected and appointed officials, and members of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds regardless of race, religion, age, gender, disability or political affiliation.

RFP No. 531-8880 Police Sgt. Written Examination - 2003

REQUIREMENTS

1. Have four (4) or more years of continuous service as a Police Officer.

OR

Have three (3) or more years of continuous service as a Police Officer and possess one (1) year certificate in police science or any police science related course of study approved by the Personnel Director;

OR

Have two (2) or more years of continuous service as a Police Officer and possess an Associate's degree or its equivalent in hours in designated subject areas. Designated subject areas are defined as course work directly concentrated in police science, police administration, law enforcement, social sciences (e.g., psychology or sociology), public or business administration, etc., but excludes other subject matter such as English, History, Health, Mathematics, etc. The minimum number of designated subject course work hours shall not be less than thirty-three (33) semester hours;

OR

Have two (2) years of service as a Police Officer and possess a Bachelor's or Master's degree in the law enforcement field, social sciences (e.g., psychology and sociology), public or business administration.

REVISION

LS: 11/12/97:clsspec6l6

MEDICAL GROUP I

FLSA: Non-exempt

EEO: 41