

**PEACE OFFICER MERIT COMMISSION POLICY AND PROCEDURE****EXAMINATION ETHICS****DEFINITIONS**

**ADVISORY BOARD:** The subject matter experts approved by the Merit Commission to develop the examination plan.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** A conflict of interest is a reasonably perceived advantage or disadvantage one candidate has relative to the others including family relationships, business interests, romantic involvements, intense hostile feelings, or any similar association.

**EVALUATION BOARD:** The subject matter experts approved by the Merit Commission to examine and score selected components of the examination.

**PURPOSE**

Testing will be conducted in a fair and ethical manner. Special attention should be directed to areas involving conflicts of interest as well as candidates and others obtaining unauthorized examination materials, influencing evaluators, and engaging in any other activities that may compromise the integrity of the examination. The Merit Commission will set forth rules in the testing process to set standards that are fair and consistent for the candidate, the Advisory Board, and the Evaluation Board.

**PROCEDURES**1.0 **ADVISORY BOARD**

- 1.1 The responsibility of the Advisory Board is to develop the promotional test in conjunction with the Merit Administrator.
- 1.2 It is not a per se conflict of interest for an Advisory Board member to mentor, coach or advise potential examination participants before being selected for an advisory board. Board members shall disclose and cease such activity once selected as a board member.
- 1.3 When disclosing a conflict of interest, the Board member shall notify the Merit Administrator, who shall determine if the member will be replaced.
- 1.4 Each Advisory Board member shall sign a confidentiality statement regarding examination contents and procedures.

## 2.0 EVALUATION BOARDS

- 2.1 The purpose of Evaluation Boards is to evaluate the performance of candidates during the assessment process in accordance with the scoring criteria developed by the advisory board
- 2.2 It is not a per se conflict of interest for an Evaluation Board member to mentor, coach or advise potential examination participants before being selected for an evaluation board. Board member shall disclose and cease such activity once selected as a board member.
- 2.3 When disclosing a conflict of interest, the Board member shall notify the Merit Administrator, who shall determine if the member will be replaced.
- 2.4 Each Evaluation Board member shall sign a confidentiality statement regarding examination contents and procedures.
- 2.5 Evaluators are expected to follow the rules set forth by the Merit Commission. The Merit Administrator will train the evaluators regarding the rules as outlined by the Merit Administrator.

## 3.0 EVALUATION AND ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1 Board members shall not discuss the test content with anyone prior to or during the test other than members of the Board and Merit Commission staff.
- 3.2 Board members shall report to the Merit Administrator any improper attempt made by a candidate to influence the outcome of the evaluation.
- 3.3 Board members are expected to evaluate the candidates being tested objectively, impartially, and strictly on the basis of the test performance criteria.
- 3.4 Board members shall only discuss the test performance of candidates after the register is certified.

## 4.0 CANDIDATES OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 4.1 Candidates shall not engage in any activity or behavior that might have the effect of compromising the integrity of the test or testing process.
- 4.2 Candidates shall report to the Merit Administrator any unethical behavior or other misconduct by candidates or other persons that may compromise the integrity of the test or testing process.

## 5.0 ADVISORY BOARD APPOINTMENTS

- 5.1 Advisory Board members will be chosen by the Sheriff or designee.

6.0 EVALUATION BOARD APPOINTMENTS

- 6.1 Evaluation Board members will be approved by the Merit Commission and the Sheriff or designee.
- 6.2 Merit Commission staff will provide a written notice at least 15 days before the examination which will include the names of persons who will serve on the Evaluation Boards. If a candidate believes a conflict of interest exists, the candidate may challenge the appointment by requesting an administrative review at least 5 days before the examination date
- 6.3 Evaluation Boards shall consist of three scoring members.
- 6.4 Evaluation Board members who have a conflict of interest with a candidate will report the conflict to the Merit Administrator. The Merit Administrator will determine if the evaluator should be excused from scoring the candidate.

7.0 INFLUENCE OF EVALUATION BOARDS

- 7.1 Evaluation board members shall evaluate examination candidates based solely on the approved examination plan scoring criteria and the candidates' demonstrated competencies during the examination process. Consideration of any other factors not related to approved criteria constitutes unethical conduct.
- 7.2 No person shall attempt to influence the examination process by any unethical means. Examples of unethical conduct include, but are not limited to, the presence of unauthorized personnel during the testing process, influencing or attempting to influence evaluation board members, or trading undeserved ratings between Evaluation Board members. If any person working or participating in the testing process is aware of the described unethical behavior, he/she is to report the incident to the Merit Administrator in writing.
- 7.3 If a candidate believes there have been unethical examination irregularities, the candidate may request an administrative review in writing to the Merit Administrator.

APPROVED AND PASSED THIS 26 DAY OF May, 2015.

SALT LAKE COUNTY  
PEACE OFFICER MERIT COMMISSION

By   
Kenneth Wallentine, Chair