



**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM**

**PERSONNEL PROCEDURE #355**

Responsible Executive:  
Chief of Police  
Responsible Office:  
Vice President for Public Safety  
Approved by:  
Dr. Branville G. Bard Jr.  
Issued: 07/25/2024  
Revised: N/A

**Table of Contents**

**POLICY STATEMENT ..... 1**

**WHO IS GOVERNED BY THIS POLICY? ..... 1**

**PURPOSE ..... 1**

**DEFINITIONS ..... 2**

**PROCEDURES ..... 2**

**POLICY ENFORCEMENT ..... 7**

**RELATED RESOURCES ..... 7**

**CONTACTS ..... 7**

**Policy Statement**

The Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD) Early Intervention Program (EIP) is intended to serve as a systematic approach to identify whether officers of the JHPD are meeting the JHPD’s performance expectations.

**Who Is Governed by This Policy?**

All sworn police officers, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201, in service with the JHPD are governed by this Directive.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this Directive is to establish a formal system to effectively identify and monitor actions taken by officers in order to recognize early indicators of the officer’s performance. The early and continual evaluation of each officer’s performance, and conformance to the JHPD’s directives, will allow the JHPD to appropriately intervene when officers are failing to meet the JHPD’s performance standards, and recognize those that are meeting the standards. As a result, the EIP will increase JHPD officer accountability and provide all officers the opportunity to develop their skills and abilities.

## Definitions

---

<b>Member:</b>	All members of the JHPD, including employees, officers, and volunteers, unless the term is otherwise qualified (e.g., member of the public, member of the Baltimore Police Department, etc.).
<b>Officer:</b>	All sworn police officers, at any rank, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201, in service with the JHPD.

---

## Procedures

### I. General

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director or their designee, along with an officer's chain of command, shall be responsible for monitoring the performance of all officers of the JHPD.
- B. Officers who demonstrate deficiencies in JHPD competencies will be provided assistance through the EIP in achieving proficiency in any area of deficiency.
- C. Officers who demonstrate proficiency or exceed expectations in JHPD competencies will be regularly acknowledged.
- D. The EIP is a performance improvement process designed to ensure that each officer of the JHPD is able to perform their duties in a manner that is consistent with JHPD directives.

### II. Supervisory Responsibility (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) 35.1.9.f)

- A. The EIP is simply a tool to assist JHPD leadership in monitoring and improving officer performance. The availability of the EIP does not alter the critical role of line supervisors to directly monitor the performance and behavior of officers under their command on a daily basis. Along with daily monitoring of officer work activities, supervisors must take proactive measures to address identified deficiencies, and acknowledge achievements, in officer performance or behavior at the earliest practical time.
- B. Supervisors must remain alert to behavioral indicators that suggest the need for follow-up review, intervention, or acknowledgment related to officer performance.
- C. The goal of good supervision is to identify whether the officer is regularly following the JHPD's directives, particularly related to interactions with Johns Hopkins community members, and provide positive reinforcement to those who are and management intervention to those who are not.

- D.** Supervisors should monitor their officers for behavioral indicators. Behavioral indicators are behaviors that JHPD supervisors can use to assess the competencies of the officers they supervise and their adherence to the JHPD's directives.
- E.** Competencies are the key abilities necessary to perform the officer's job, which can be evaluated based on an officer's application of those competencies in their interactions with members of the public and coworkers.
- F.** There are two main varieties of behavioral competencies: negative and positive. Negative indicators demonstrate a lack of competency, while positive indicators can show that an officer has and is applying the required competency. (CALEA 35.1.9.a.b) Some of the competencies that supervisors should be considering, and assessing positive and negative behavioral indicators of, on a daily basis, are:
- Preparedness (i.e., is the officer arriving for work on time, with the appropriate equipment and a positive attitude?),
  - Legitimacy (i.e., is the officer following the law and JHPD directives?)
  - Courtesy (i.e., is the officer interacting with their coworkers and officers of the public with the level of courtesy required by the JHPD's directives?),
  - Procedural justice (i.e., is the officer interacting with members of the public and their coworkers in a procedurally just way, as required by JHPD Directive #109, Procedural Justice, and other directives?),
  - De-escalation (i.e., is the officer de-escalating conflict, as required by JHPD Directive #401, De-escalation, and other directives?), and
  - Documentation (i.e., is the officer activating their body-worn camera and in-car camera appropriately, completing appropriate reports, and issuing appropriate documentation related to enforcement actions and stops?).
- G.** The following shall be reviewed by supervisors on an ongoing basis for behavioral indicators in order to identify officers' competencies:
- Incident Reports,
  - Body-worn camera footage,
  - Citizen contact receipts,
  - Attendance records, including required court appearances,
  - Use of Force Reports,

- Complaints of misconduct (including civil complaints),
- Vehicle accidents,
- Vehicle pursuits,
- Transportation Code violations,
- Disciplinary actions,
- Criminal or traffic enforcement actions and results thereof,
- Performance evaluations,
- Community feedback about the officer, and
- Observations.

**H.** Where a supervisor identifies negative behavioral indicators of JHPD competencies, supervisors shall intervene and attempt to course-correct with their officers. (CALEA 35.1.9.b) Additional interventions may include:

- Additional supervisory coaching, or
- Referral and voluntary participation in supportive services provided by the [Johns Hopkins Employee Assistance Program](#). (CALEA 35.1.9.h)

**I.** When direct supervisory intervention does not result in the officer's increased competency, the supervisor shall promptly provide all necessary documentation relating to behavioral indicators to the Public Safety Human Resources Director for consideration for the EIP.

**J.** Negative behavioral indicators may also lead to a misconduct investigation or nonpunitive corrective action (NPCA), pursuant to JHPD Directive #350, Complaints Against Police Personnel, or JHPD Directive #351, Nonpunitive Corrective Action. Nothing in this Directive releases a supervisor from their obligation to refer observed or alleged misconduct violations to the Public Safety Accountability Unit (PSAU) for a formal disciplinary investigation. Because the EIP is, by definition, related to performance of the JHPD's core competencies, JHPD members may participate in the EIP in addition to discipline or NPCA. (CALEA 35.1.9.d)

**K.** When a supervisor identifies positive behavioral indicators, they shall regularly document and acknowledge them with officers.

### **III. Assessment for Behavioral Indicators** (CALEA 35.1.9.c)

**A. Discretionary EIP:** The Public Safety Human Resources Director shall monitor complaints against officers, nonpunitive action, discipline, attendance, vehicle accidents, pursuit reports, and supervisory reports of behavioral indicators and may institute the EIP at their discretion.

- B. Mandatory EIP:** In any given 12-month period, on a rolling basis, the following behavioral indicators require a mandatory referral for the EIP:
- One or more complaints from officers of the public resulting in administrative charges,
  - Three or more complaints from officers of the public, regardless of disposition,
  - Two or more NPCAs or expedited resolutions of minor misconduct,
  - Two or more Use of Force Reports,
  - Two or more vehicle accidents in which the employee is at fault,
  - Two or more unexcused attendance-related incidents,
  - Two or more vehicle pursuits,
  - Two or more notifications of unsuccessful prosecution of enforcement actions related to officer deficiencies or attendance,
  - Two or more notices from supervisors regarding behavioral indicators for the officer,
  - Four or more unexcused late arrivals for their shift, or
  - A combination of three or more instances of any of the events identified above.

#### **IV. EIP Notices & Preliminary Review** (CALEA 35.1.9.c)

- A.** The Public Safety Human Resources Director or their designee will provide a written EIP notice to alert the officer's immediate supervisor and appropriate Command Staff officer whenever an officer will be put in the EIP.
- B.** EIP notices are intended to assist supervisors in evaluating and guiding their officers and will not, standing alone, form the basis for disciplinary action. EIP notices will contain the officer's name, their employee ID number, and competencies that will be subject to the EIP. EIP notices shall draw no conclusions nor make any determinations concerning job performance.
- C.** EIP notices require that the officer's chain of command (sergeant, lieutenant, and captain) officer meet to conduct a preliminary review of the EIP data, as well as other recent information regarding the officer's performance, to develop a draft performance improvement plan (PIP).
- D.** The PIP will include setting objectives for the officer to achieve proficiency in the deficient competencies, identifying intervention

strategies to improve performance, and establishing regular meetings between the supervisor and the officer to review performance.

- E. Interventions that may be included in a PIP are attendance monitoring, additional training and testing, peer mentoring, supervisor ride along, or additional levels of report review.
- F. Officers will be informed they have been placed in the EIP and scheduled to meet with the supervisor to discuss the proposed PIP.
- G. The supervisor will meet with the officer to discuss the PIP. The officer can provide feedback that will be considered for inclusion in the PIP by the supervisor.
- H. The final PIP will be submitted to the Public Safety Human Resources Director for approval.
- I. Once the PIP is finalized, the officer and their chain of command will be provided with a copy of the PIP.

## **V. Formal EIP Reviews** (CALEA 35.1.9.c)

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director will conduct monthly EIP reviews. EIP reviews will include meetings with the affected officer and relevant supervisors.
- B. The minimum EIP time period is 90 days. The officer will remain on the EIP until they achieve proficiency in the deficient competency for 3 consecutive EIP reviews within the following 12-month period.
- C. As part of the annual performance evaluation program, EIP reviews will be considered, and the failure of an officer to achieve proficiency in the deficient competencies for 3 consecutive monthly reviews in the 12-month period may be grounds for termination of an officer's employment.

## **VI. Acknowledgment of Positive Behavioral Indicators**

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director or supervisors shall ensure that positive behavioral indicators, or the lack of negative behavioral indicators, are acknowledged in the annual performance evaluation process.
- B. Positive behavioral indicators and successful completion of the EIP shall be considered with regard to noncompetitive and competitive promotions, as well as in award recognition.

## VII. Annual Evaluation (CALEA 35.1.9.e)

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director will conduct an annual evaluation of the EIP for submission to the Chief of Police. The evaluation will include but is not limited to the following:
- Statistical data about EIP activity during the past year,
  - Assessment of the overall effectiveness of the EIP, and
  - Any recommendations for changes in the EIP directive.
- B. The EIP annual evaluation will be made available to all supervisors for review and comment.

## Policy Enforcement

<b>Enforcement</b>	Police Department managers and supervisors are responsible for enforcing this Directive.
<b>Reporting Violations</b>	Individual violations of this Directive should be reported to PSAU.

## Related Resources

<b>University Policies and Documents</b>
Conduct & Responsibility #109, Procedural Justice Administrative Procedure #350, Complaints Against Police Personnel Administrative Procedure #351, Nonpunitive Corrective Action Operational Procedure #401, De-escalation
<b>External Documentation</b>
<b>Police Department Forms and Systems</b>

## Contacts

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Policy Management	(667)306-8618	<a href="mailto:jhpdpolicyinquiry@jh.edu">jhpdpolicyinquiry@jh.edu</a>