

ILLINOIS STATE POLICE DIRECTIVE PER-030, COMPLAINT AND DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATIONS

| | |
|--|---|
| RESCINDS: PER-030, 2004-013 issued 03-22-2004. | REVISED: 09-30-2007 2007-077 |
| RELATED DOCUMENTS: PER-103, ROC-002 | DISTRIBUTION: All employees maintaining an ISP Directives Manual All holders of the ISP Field Manual Office/desk copy |
| RELATED CALEA STANDARDS: 26.1.4, 26.1.5, 26.1.8, 52.1.1, 52.1.2, 52.1.3, 52.1.4, 52.1.5, 52.1.7, 52.1.9, 52.1.10 | |

I. POLICY

- I.A. The Illinois State Police (ISP) will conduct internal investigations under the authority of the Director.
- I.B. All employees will comply with department rules, regulations, directives, and orders.
- I.C. Sworn employees will be held strictly accountable for properly exercising the authority they have been given to protect the rights, lives, and property of all individuals.
- I.D. At the same time, department employees must be protected against false allegations of misconduct.
 - I.D.1. This can only be accomplished through a consistently thorough investigative process.
 - I.D.2. Thorough investigations will be conducted into allegations of misconduct to establish facts that can absolve the innocent and identify the guilty.
 - I.D.3. An amendment to the State Police Act effective 01/01/06, requires the public filing a complaint against a state police officer to have the complaint supported by a sworn affidavit.
 - I.D.4. Anonymous complaints received will be investigated and pursued without a sworn affidavit if independent corroborating evidence is obtained through the investigative process.
 - I.D.5. No affidavit will be required in support of anonymous complaints of criminal conduct.

NOTE: In the event the Department is relying on independent corroborative evidence in lieu of a sworn affidavit, the **type** of corroborative evidence **must** be identified on the Complaint Against Department Member form, ISP3-23, available from the ISP Document Library at <http://maphome/documentlibrary/>). Furthermore, the ISP3-23 must be signed by a sworn officer who is accountable to the Rules of Conduct.

II. DEFINITIONS

- II.A. Acceptable performance - the satisfactory completion of tasks or duties required of an individual in the respective position or job.
- II.B. Complaint - an allegation of a criminal or policy violation provided either in writing or orally to an employee of the ISP.
- II.C. Exonerated - incident occurred, but the employee's conduct was lawful and in accordance with policy. No further action necessary and the case is closed.
- II.D. Less serious transgression - improper act or omission that lends itself to prompt, corrective action and the discipline for which, if the allegation were true as reported, would not exceed a two-day suspension.
- II.E. Not sustained - there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation. The allegation may have occurred but could not be supported through the investigation process.

- II.F. Policy Procedure Failure – noted that the alleged act did occur, however, the officer was acting in accordance with the established Department policy and procedure that had a weakness regarding the specifics of the case, or there was a lack of policy regarding the specifics of the case.
- II.G. Summary punishment - discipline issued consisting of an oral or written reprimand or a suspension of one or two days. Summary punishment applies to officers only. See the personnel code and collective bargaining contracts for discipline that applies to code personnel.

A list of conduct that typically will result in summary punishment is in Addendum 2.

- II.G.1. The list is not exhaustive.
- II.G.2. The inclusion of conduct on the list does not preclude the imposition of more severe punishment in any case.
- II.H. Sustained - evidence was sufficient to prove the allegation. Criminal and/or administrative charges are identified and the disciplinary process is initiated.
- II.I. Unfounded complaint - an allegation that was demonstrably false. The investigation revealed an incident did not occur.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

III.A. Department Responsibility

- III.A.1. The Director is charged with the responsibility and has the authority to maintain discipline within the ISP.
- III.A.2. The Director delegates authority as specified in this directive.

III.B. Individual Responsibility

- III.B.1. Each employee of the Department will perform his/her duties and assume the obligations of his/her rank and/or position in the investigation of complaints or allegations of misconduct against any employee of the Department.
- III.B.2. Each employee will cooperate fully with personnel of the Division of Internal Investigation (DII) or any other personnel conducting such an investigation.
- III.B.3. When misconduct is observed or complaints/information about misconduct are received by any employee, such employee will immediately notify his/her supervisor and prepare a written report to be forwarded through the chain of command containing the information received, observations, and/or action taken.
- III.B.4. Any employee who has, or is purported to have, knowledge of circumstances surrounding a complaint investigation will submit to his/her immediate supervisor a written report before reporting off duty.
 - III.B.4.a. The report will be accurate and will include all facts relating to the incident known or reported to the employee.
 - III.B.4.b. The immediate supervisor will forward the report via the chain of command to the investigator conducting the investigation.
- III.B.5. When reports of alleged or suspected violations are received, the supervisor or command officer who first receives information about the alleged violation will record all information available at the time the complaint was received, prepare a written report, and forward it to the respective Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander.

- III.B.5.a. All complaints against sworn employees must be supported by a sworn affidavit.
- III.B.5.b. When a supervisor receives an allegation of misconduct from a citizen, the supervisor shall notify the citizen that the allegations must be in writing and notarized for the report to proceed.
- III.B.5.c. A complaint against an officer that is supported by an affidavit will not require additional affidavits in support of additional allegations within the same complaint. Complaints against additional officers not named in the original complaint/affidavit that arise during the course of the initial investigation, **will require** additional complaint forms and must conform to the guidelines.
- III.B.5.d. When a department employee makes an allegation against another department employee neither will be required to sign an affidavit because sworn officers are subject to discipline for making a false report per directive ROC-002, "Rules of Conduct", and code employees are subject to discipline for making a false report per directive PER-103, "Code Employees Disciplinary Rules."

NOTE: Command officers and supervisors have an obligation to report all allegations of possible criminal and/or policy violations against a sworn officer up their chain of command.

- III.B.6. The original form and report are to be forwarded immediately to:

Illinois State Police
Division of Internal Investigation
Attention: Colonel (DII)
801 South 7th Street
Springfield, Illinois 62703-2487

- III.B.6.a. A copy should be forwarded to the Division's Colonel through the chain of command. If the accused is from another Division, it will be forwarded to the Colonel of the accused's Division.
- III.B.6.b. During office hours, the respective commander will report the information to the appropriate DII Area Commander or designee as soon as possible after the information is received. Complaints received after hours requiring immediate attention (shooting incidents, criminal activity, etc.), will be reported by calling 217-786-6677 to contact the DII duty agent.
- III.B.6.c. The DII Colonel or his/her designee will determine who will be responsible for conducting an investigation and will assign a case number to the complaint.
- III.B.6.d. The DII Colonel or his/her designee will convey significant information about personnel investigations to the Director of the ISP.

- III.B.7. Allegations deemed "less serious transgressions" will be handled as follows:

- III.B.7.a. The Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander will contact the DII and provide the information needed to complete the File Initiation Report, form ISP4-1. The 4-1 will be completed by DII.
- III.B.7.b. The DII will refer allegations deemed to be "less serious transgressions" back to the referring unit after assignment of a case tracking number.
- III.B.7.c. When the case is referred back to the Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander, the Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander will:
 - III.B.7.c.1) Prepare an acknowledgment to the complainant, if appropriate.
 - III.B.7.c.2) Ensure that a thorough investigation of the complaint is conducted, properly documented, and filed in a secure area that will ensure the confidentiality of its content.
 - III.B.7.c.3) Review the investigative reports for accuracy and completeness.
 - III.B.7.c.4) Review the officer's file for summary punishment in the last two years or other disciplinary action within the last five years, or review the code employee's files.
 - III.B.7.c.5) Impose the appropriate summary punishment or discipline for officers and route a copy of all related documents through the chain of command to the Colonel for transmittal to the DII.

III.B.7.c.6) Recommend, through the chain of command, the appropriate discipline for code employees and route a copy of all related documents along with the recommended discipline to the DII.

III.B.7.d. At the conclusion of a case involving a "less serious transgression," and after appropriate summary punishment or discipline has been issued, the Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander will forward a copy of the investigative reports through his/her respective chain of command to the DII.

III.C. Overall Responsibilities

III.C.1. In general, the DII will investigate allegations that, if true, would result in discipline greater than summary punishment (two-day suspension). The Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander will contact the DII and provide the information needed to complete the ISP 4-1 and will forward any other relevant information or documentation to the DII.

III.C.2. Employees are reminded that failure to cooperate with an internal investigation can result in discipline up to and including termination from the Department.

III.C.3. In general, allegations of discrimination, harassment (including but not limited to sexual harassment), and retaliation will be investigated by the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office, either independently or in cooperation with the DII.

III.C.3.a. Upon receipt of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation allegations that may result in discipline, the EEO Office will confer with DII to make a decision regarding which entity (or both) will be responsible for the investigation.

III.C.3.b. In any case, the investigation will be conducted in accordance with applicable DII procedures.

IV. PROCEDURES

NOTE: See Addendum 1 for complaints involving allegations of impairment due to alcohol abuse.

NOTE: Refer to directive ROC-002, "Rules of Conduct," Addendum 1, for discipline schedule/matrix.

NOTE: All investigations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth by the DII.

IV.A. Investigating complaints against officers under the ISP Merit Board

IV.A.1. Cases investigated in which summary punishment has not been imposed by the Bureau Chief/Lab Director/Commander and he/she believes discipline in excess of summary punishment is warranted, are to be handled as follows:

IV.A.1.a. The completed investigation will be routed to the appropriate Colonel through the chain of command.

IV.A.1.b. The Colonel or his/her designee, acting as designee of the Director, will review the investigative file and may:

IV.A.1.b.1) Impose punishment not to exceed a three-day suspension.

IV.A.1.b.2) Require further investigation.

IV.A.1.b.3) Recommend the DII close the case file with no further action merited.

IV.A.1.b.4) Confer with the Colonel of DII, or designee, and/or other Colonels in determining appropriate discipline for the Director's consideration.

- IV.A.1.c. The Colonel of the Division that conducted the investigation will:
 - IV.A.1.c.1) Ensure the complainant is informed of the final status of the complaint.
 - IV.A.1.c.2) Forward a copy of the correspondence and any other documentation not previously submitted to the DII.
- IV.A.2. Summary punishment/suspension options and limitations
 - IV.A.2.a. All officers who do not appeal summary punishment to the Internal Review Panel (IRP) will be permitted to use accumulated time off, except sick time, to satisfy the period of any suspension of two days or less in lieu of days off without pay.
 - IV.A.2.b. Loss of wages as a result of being absent without permission will not be considered summary punishment served.
 - IV.A.2.c. A summary punishment recommendation by an immediate supervisor will not bar imposition of a more severe penalty by a higher authority.
 - IV.A.2.d. All officers may also use up to 30 days of accumulated time off, except sick time, to satisfy the period of any suspension of three or more days, in lieu of days off without pay provided the suspension is not appealed to the ISP Merit Board or through grievance or arbitration procedures.
 - IV.A.2.e. Officers appealing a second or subsequent IRP within a two-year period resulting in a "sustained" finding will result in a loss of seniority for all suspensions after the first sustained IRP.
 - IV.A.2.f. The appealing officer shall utilize accumulated time off to attend the IRP. If the summary punishment is rescinded, the accumulated time used by the officer to attend the IRP will be restored. Officers with the permanent rank of Master Sergeant or above will not be suspended for periods of less than a full week (five working days or 40 hours equivalence).
- IV.A.3. Appeal of summary punishment
 - IV.A.3.a. Oral and written reprimands may not be appealed. One and two day suspensions may be appealed to the IRP.
 - IV.A.3.b. For discipline greater than summary punishment, appeal rights are outlined in the State Police Act and/or the applicable collective bargaining agreement.
 - IV.A.3.c. Only the officer being punished may appeal the punishment.
 - IV.A.3.d. An officer who desires review of summary punishment (one or two day suspensions) must make the request within 10 calendar days of the receipt of the written discipline in question. Such request for review will be submitted in writing to the Director's office, to the attention of the Office of Labor Relations and Special Projects (OLR), and will clearly state that an internal review pursuant to this policy is being requested.
 - IV.A.3.e. Upon notification of the review request, the OLR will oversee the selection of, and convene an IRP in accordance with IV.A.7.a. and IV.A.7.b., arrange for clerical support, and notify the officer of the date, time, and place for the hearing. The hearing will be held within 60 days of the date filed.
 - IV.A.3.f. The officer will have a period of 14 calendar days from the date on which he/she requests review, to submit a written statement to the panel through the OLR.
 - IV.A.3.f.1) This written statement must set forth why the officer believes the summary punishment was unjust.
 - IV.A.3.f.2) The officer should set forth in this memorandum all relevant facts and circumstances that the officer wishes the panel to take into consideration.
 - IV.A.3.f.3) The officer should include a memorandum from each witness (if applicable) stating the relevant facts that the officer wishes the panel to consider.

In summary suspension cases only, the officer will be allowed to ask the IRP to hear one eye-witness or one witness with relevant information at the hearing.

The Department will, based on operational need, make an effort to adjust the witness' schedule to allow attendance on work time.

IV.A.3.g. The OLR will request the supervisor who imposed the summary punishment submit any additional written information to the panel explaining why the punishment that was decided upon was appropriate. A copy of this information and the investigative file, if any, will be provided to the officer as soon as practical before the hearing.

IV.A.3.h. The officer may ask a representative to prepare and submit written statements, and a representative may be present, upon the officer's request, at the hearing. The representative is there for the limited purpose of counseling the officer and may address the panel only when permitted.

IV.A.3.i. The panel will review the information provided and will convene a hearing at which the officer seeking review may appear and give testimony.

IV.A.3.j. The panel will appoint one of its members to record its action and prepare a written decision on the propriety of the summary punishment. The panel may sustain, reduce, or reverse the summary punishment but may not increase the severity of the punishment initially issued.

IV.A.3.j.1) Decisions of the panel will require a majority of the three-member panel, with each member of the panel having an equal vote. If the decision is not unanimous, the dissenting member may submit his/her opinion along with the majority decision.

IV.A.3.j.2) Such written majority decision will be issued within 30 calendar days of the hearing date. A copy will be provided to the officer and to the Director through the OLR.

IV.A.3.j.3) In the event the review panel upholds any period of suspension without pay, the officer will not be permitted to use accumulated time off to satisfy the summary punishment for a second or subsequent sustained finding within a two year period. In the event of a reduction or reversal of discipline, the officer will receive appropriate pay for any period of suspension actually served and not upheld by the panel.

IV.A.4. After summary punishment has been administered three times within a 12-month period, an officer who wishes to contest the application of summary punishment on a fourth occasion within the last 12 months, may contest the fourth and/or succeeding applications of summary punishment by timely challenge through either the IRP or Merit Board review.

IV.A.5. Retention of records

IV.A.5.a. Material relating to summary punishment will be retained in the affected officer's District or unit personnel file for a period of two years after the date the punishment was administered. At that time the material will be destroyed and will not be considered in any subsequent disciplinary or adverse personnel matter.

IV.A.5.b. Material relating to summary punishment will be retained by the DII for five (5) years after the close of the incident investigation.

IV.A.6. Seniority date

IV.A.6.a. The seniority date will not be adjusted for any period of suspension of 30 days or less.

IV.A.6.b. The seniority date will be adjusted for the number of days any disciplinary suspension exceeds 30 days.

IV.A.6.c. The seniority date will be adjusted for the second or subsequent sustained findings by the IRP within a two-year period.

IV.A.7. Internal Review Panel (IRP)

- IV.A.7.a. The members of the IRP assigned to an appeal will be randomly selected by the OLR from officers available on the hearing date as provided by the Regional Commander in the DOO, or an equivalent officer from other divisions.
- IV.A.7.b. All members of the panel must be assigned to the same division as the appealing officer. No member of the panel may be from the same lab/zone/district/bureau/unit of assignment as that of the appealing officer, nor may any two panelists be from the same lab/zone/district/bureau/unit of assignment.
- IV.A.7.c. The panel will consist of one officer of equal rank and one officer from each of the next two highest ranks. A pool of available officers will be identified by the appropriate Regional Commander and the OLR will randomly select the panel.

IV.A.8. In cases where a Policy Procedure Failure is a factor, the Commander of the Unit making that determination will advise the Director of the failure through the chain of command.

IV.B. Investigating complaints against code employees

IV.B.1. Managers and investigators must remember that the rights of code employees are defined and protected by the jurisdiction of the Department of Central Management Services (CMS) and the distinctions of various collective bargaining agreements. The procedures set forth by the DII will be followed, unless a specific provision of an applicable collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise.

IV.B.2. Collective bargaining

IV.B.2.a. The seven collective bargaining units in effect are represented by four different employee unions:

- IV.B.2.a.1) The Teamsters
- IV.B.2.a.2) The Illinois Federation of Public Employees
- IV.B.2.a.3) The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
- IV.B.2.a.4) The International Union of Operating Engineers

IV.B.2.b. All potential code employee disciplinary matters must be handled in a manner that will protect the employee's contract rights yet preserve as many department options as possible.

IV.B.2.c. The OLR should be contacted to ascertain the proper interpretation of applicable union contract provisions.

IV.B.3. Investigatory interviews and representation

IV.B.3.a. Investigatory interviews of code employees are divided into two categories.

- IV.B.3.a.1) The first category covers situations where the employee is not the subject of the investigation, but instead may be a witness or possess pertinent information.
- IV.B.3.a.2) The second category covers cases where the employee is the subject of the investigation.

IV.B.3.b. Code employees who are not the subject of an investigation are not entitled to representation during interviews.

IV.B.3.b.1) In such circumstances, requests for representation can be denied; however, in cases where representation is requested and denied, statements made by the employee cannot be used for disciplinary purposes.

IV.B.3.b.2) Employees in such situations must cooperate fully and cannot refuse to answer questions or provide written statements.

IV.B.3.c. Employees who are the subject of an investigation might eventually:

- IV.B.3.c.1) Be arrested and charged with a crime in court.
- IV.B.3.c.2) Be charged with policy, procedure, rule, or regulation violations.
 - IV.B.3.c.2)a) Code bargaining unit employees who are the subject of an investigation should, upon request, be afforded union representation whether the interview involves alleged criminal or administrative violations.
 - IV.B.3.c.2)b) Any denial of such a request for union representation during the interview will violate the employee's union rights and will prevent the Department from successfully defending a union protest of any discipline that might be imposed.

IV.B.4. Delays for union representation

- IV.B.4.a. If an employee's request for union representation is granted, the interview may be postponed temporarily - normally not more than three days - to make arrangements for the presence of a union representative.
- IV.B.4.b. Employees covered by RC-29 (IFPE) desiring a representative must have a union employee present unless otherwise agreed between the union and management.
- IV.B.4.c. All other union employees desiring representation may have either a union steward, officer, or a union employee present.
- IV.B.4.d. The OLR can be contacted to help expedite arrangements for union representation at interviews.

IV.B.5. Request for representation by non-bargaining unit code employees

- IV.B.5.a. The State of Illinois Personnel Code and Rules, that are statutorily administered by CMS, cover code employees not in collective bargaining unit positions. These employees are not entitled to representation at investigatory interviews.
- IV.B.5.b. Occasionally, a non-bargaining unit employee will ask that an attorney or other representative be present during an interview. Requests should normally be granted if:
 - IV.B.5.b.1) The delay needed to obtain the attorney or representative is not detrimental to the case.
 - IV.B.5.b.2) The attorney or representative clearly understands that his/her role in the interview is only that of a silent observer.
 - IV.B.5.b.3) The employee is the subject of the investigation.

IV.B.6. Pre-disciplinary meetings with code union employees

- IV.B.6.a. With the exception of oral reprimands, a pre-disciplinary meeting must be held with every code union employee prior to the implementation of discipline.
- IV.B.6.b. Code employee union contracts normally require that pertinent documentation, names of witnesses, and a statement of charges be furnished to the subject and the union representative prior to the pre-disciplinary meeting.
 - IV.B.6.b.1) In most cases, the investigative summary will be the primary document furnished.
 - IV.B.6.b.2) This summary must:
 - IV.B.6.b.2)a) Include a list of all pertinent witnesses.
 - IV.B.6.b.2)b) Identify all key information used in determining the outcome of the case.
 - IV.B.6.b.2)c) List all ISP directives violated.

IV.C. Closure of investigatory files

IV.C.1. Investigatory files are considered closed when:

IV.C.1.a. The employee is exonerated because the employee's conduct was proper.

IV.C.1.b. The complaint is determined to be unfounded.

IV.C.1.c. The complaint is not sustained.

IV.C.1.d. Discipline is effected.

IV.C.2. The DII will notify employees and the appropriate union, when applicable, upon closure of investigatory files. In cases where discipline is imposed, the official disciplinary action will serve as notification that an investigatory file is closed.

IV.D. Maintenance of records

IV.D.1. All records of investigations of ISP employees will be forwarded to, and filed by, the DII. These records will be maintained by the DII in a secure area that will ensure the confidentiality of their content.

IV.D.2. The DII will retain and destroy the original records of ISP employee investigations in compliance with the Illinois Records Commission's rules, regulations, and approvals.

IV.D.3. The DII will microfilm or image-disc copy at a minimum all original case opening/closing forms, investigation summaries and discipline action letters. The DII will maintain a continuing record of these copies in case number order.

| Indicates new or revised items.

-End of Directive-

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE DIRECTIVE
PER-030, COMPLAINT AND DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATIONS
ADDENDUM 1, ALCOHOL TESTING**

| | |
|--|---|
| RESCINDS: PER-030, Addendum 1, 2001-083, issued 09-01-2001. | REVISED: 10-15-2007 2007-077 |
| RELATED DOCUMENTS: PER-103, ROC-002 | DISTRIBUTION: All employees maintaining an ISP Directives Manual All holders of the ISP Field Manual Office/desk copy |
| RELATED CALEA STANDARDS: 26.1.4, 26.1.5, 26.1.8, 52.1.1, 52.1.2, 52.1.3, 52.1.4, 52.1.5, 52.1.7, 52.1.9, 52.1.10 | |

1. Complaints involving allegations of impairment due to alcohol abuse

No employee will be required to submit to a blood test, a breath analyzer test, or any other test to determine the presence of alcohol in the blood, or any other test to determine the presence of drugs, or other chemical substances, unless the Department has reasonable cause to believe that the employee is under the influence of alcohol, or is a current user of non-prescribed controlled substances, or upon proposed changes in personnel status or permanent changes in assignment.

2. Testing procedures

- a. When a supervisor observes an employee exhibit conduct while on duty that indicates the individual is noticeably under the influence of alcohol or is in receipt of information that creates reasonable cause to believe an employee is abusing alcohol, the supervisor will request the employee to submit to the appropriate test to determine the presence of alcohol in the blood.
- b. Alcohol testing by breath
 - i. Breath testing will be conducted only on breath analyzers controlled and maintained by the Department.
 - ii. The breath test will be administered by a Department employee who is currently certified and licensed by the ISP.
 - iii. The breath test will be administered according to the standards and procedures established in the operation of breath analysis instruments by the Illinois State Police.
 - iv. The results of a breath test will be made available to the subject of the test and the appropriate supervisor in the Department.
- c. Testing for drugs will be conducted in accordance with directive PER-057, "Drug Testing and Awareness".

-End of Addendum-

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE DIRECTIVE
PER-030, COMPLAINT AND DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATIONS
ADDENDUM 2, SUMMARY PUNISHMENT**

| | |
|--|---|
| RESCINDS: PER-030, Addendum 2, 2001-083, issued 09-01-2001. | REVISED: 10-15-2007 2007-077 |
| RELATED DOCUMENTS: PER-103, ROC-002 | DISTRIBUTION: All employees maintaining an ISP Directives Manual All holders of the ISP Field Manual Office/desk copy |
| RELATED CALEA STANDARDS: 26.1.4, 26.1.5, 26.1.8, 52.1.1, 52.1.2, 52.1.3, 52.1.4, 52.1.5, 52.1.7, 52.1.9, 52.1.10 | |

Summary punishment may be imposed for any violation of Illinois State Police (ISP) policies, procedures, rules, regulations or its generally recognized standards and practices, where the officer's superiors consider the conduct to be of a nature, or to have occurred in circumstances, that may not warrant more severe discipline.

Examples of conduct that may result in summary punishment include, but are not limited to:

1. failure to comply with personal hygiene and grooming standards of the ISP.
2. failure to comply with the dress and uniform standards of the ISP.
3. periodic absenteeism or tardiness.
4. failure to give adequate attention to duties.
5. failure of an officer to appear in court or to notify superiors of his inability to appear.
6. failure to wear or properly maintain official equipment.
7. failure to comply with weapon regulations under conditions which do not justify action under other policies.
8. failure to report back in service immediately upon completion of an assignment or to notify the telecommunicator when leaving the location of assignment for any reason.
9. taking excessive time for meals or personal reasons.
10. failure to provide prompt, correct and courteous service.
11. transporting persons in a department vehicle except for a proper police purpose or on department business.
12. being absent from or leaving an assigned post or area without proper authorization or before the prescribed time at the end of the tour of duty.
13. failure to perform assigned tasks.
14. reading commercial publications in public view while on duty.
15. holding a cigarette, cigar, or pipe in mouth while in uniform and in official contact with the public.
16. failure of a supervisory officer to take appropriate action upon observing a less serious transgression.
17. failure to wear a properly adjusted and fastened seat safety belt when either operating a department motor vehicle or riding as a front seat passenger in such vehicle.

Inclusion of conduct on the foregoing list does not preclude the imposition of more severe discipline by an officer's supervisor or by higher authority where such further or greater discipline is deemed warranted. More severe discipline will generally be warranted where an officer develops a history or pattern of such conduct.

-End of Addendum-