Pre-employment Psychological Evaluation Guidelines

According to Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6700.0700, Subpart 1, a person eligible to be licensed must meet several minimum selection standards before being appointed to the position of peace officer. Section H., defines the standards for a pre-employment psychological evaluation as, “An evaluation, including an oral interview, shall be made by a licensed psychologist to determine that the applicant is free from any emotional or mental condition which might adversely affect the performance of the peace officer duties.”

The following procedure and evaluation guidelines are recommended as an outline for the pre-employment psychological evaluation process used for hiring peace officers.

**Procedure Guidelines**

Pre-employment psychological evaluations should be used as one component of the overall selection process. The evaluation should be conducted after the background investigation is completed.

It is best practice for an agency to develop and maintain a working relationship with a psychologist as early as possible in the hiring process. It is important that only licensed or certified psychologists trained and experienced in law enforcement assessments conduct and interpret the evaluation.

Duties the agency may expect the psychologist to perform are:

- Assist the agency to design interview questions used to identify the applicant’s psychological traits.
- Conduct an evaluation for employment purposes only with the new hiring agency. If an applicant is currently a peace officer with another agency, the results should have no bearing on the applicant’s current position.
- Work with the agency to generate a final report of the evaluation.
- Provide feedback to the agency, and also to the assessed individual if requested.
- Coordinate with the agency’s administration and training staff to help strengthen any developmental needs identified in the evaluation. Techniques such as coaching, simulation and evaluation of actual field performance may be used.
- Monitor the newly hired peace officer through their probationary period.
- Conduct follow up research as deemed necessary by the agency.
Evaluation Guidelines

A variety of instruments may be used including a comprehensive background investigation, an intelligence test, a personality assessment tool and a semi-structured interview. Recommended areas to be evaluated include:

- decisiveness/problem-solving skills
- team orientation
- life experience
- identification with community
- intelligence
- absence of serious psychopathology
- substance abuse potential
- moral development (integrity and honesty)
- stress resistance
- respect for authority
- tenacity
- interpersonal skills
- mental stability
- anger management
- absence of bias
- assertiveness/command presence

**HISTORY**

- criminal history
- psychiatric history
- family history
- chemical use history
- job/educational history
- social history

**SKILLS**

- problem solving skills
- interpersonal skills

The format of a final report may vary depending on the agency. Common sections generally included are:

- purpose of the evaluation
- types of traits/qualities examined for
- limits of reliability/validity of evaluation
- hire/no hire recommendation
- conclusion
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1. Purpose

1.1 The IACP Police Psychological Services Section (PPSS) developed these guidelines for use by public safety agencies, agency executives, and psychologists as well as other professionals who are charged with the responsibility of conducting, overseeing, and managing defensible Preemployment Psychological Evaluation (PPE) programs.

2. Limitations

2.1 These guidelines reflect the consensus-based professional practices of PPSS members and the agencies they serve when conducting preemployment psychological evaluations. As such, these guidelines are intended to balance agency and societal needs with the legal rights of candidates and the applicable professional standards of the examiner. These guidelines are not intended to establish a rigid standard of practice for preemployment psychological evaluations.

2.2 The decision as to what is or is not done in a particular instance is ultimately the responsibility of each hiring agency and examiner, provided it conforms to all pertinent local, state, and federal statutes, regulations, and case law and is consistent with the ethical standards of the examiner’s profession.

2.3 These guidelines are written to apply to agencies within the jurisdiction of the United States and, as such, may require modification for use by agencies in other countries.

3. Definitions

3.1 For the purposes of these guidelines, a preemployment psychological evaluation is a specialized examination to determine whether a public safety applicant meets the minimum requirements for psychological suitability mandated by jurisdictional statutes and regulations, as well as any other criteria established by the hiring agency.

3.2 In most jurisdictions, the minimum requirements for psychological suitability are that the applicant be free from any emotional or mental condition that might adversely affect the performance of safety-based duties and responsibilities and be capable of withstanding the psychological demands inherent in the prospective position.
3.3 Under the terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), medical examinations—which include the assessment of mental or emotional impairment—must be deferred until after a conditional offer is extended (i.e., post-offer). Therefore, the preemployment psychological evaluation must be conducted post-offer.

3.4 In accordance with the ADA, non-medical information should be obtained and analyzed at the pre-offer stage whenever possible. However, because the assessment of normal-range personality traits, behaviors and characteristics (such as judgment, stress resilience, anger management, integrity, conscientiousness, teamwork, and social competence) is an integral part of the assessment, it may be included in the psychological examination conducted at the post-offer stage.

3.5 Normal-range personality traits, behaviors and characteristics may also be assessed at the pre-offer stage, provided the assessment is neither designed for, nor capable of, detecting or diagnosing disabilities, nor required to be administered by a health care professional.

4. Examiner Qualifications

4.1 Preemployment evaluations should be conducted only by a licensed, doctoral-level psychologist or other mental health professional where permitted by law.

4.2 Examiners provide assessment services only within the boundaries of their competence based on their education, training, supervised experience, consultation, study, and professional experience. In all cases, the examiner should have expertise in clinical assessment as well as in the assessment of normal personality characteristics, skills, and abilities relevant to personnel selection.

4.3 Agencies should utilize examiners who are trained and experienced specifically in the provision of preemployment psychological evaluations for public safety positions, and who participate in regular, ongoing continuing education and training that is specific to preemployment screening in addition to that of a more general police psychology nature.

4.4 Examiners should base their work on established scientific and professional knowledge of the discipline. Examiners should be familiar with the research literature available on psychological testing for public safety positions.

4.5 Examiners should be familiar with employment law impacting the conduct of preemployment psychological evaluations, including but not limited to the ADA, ADAAA, GINA, and other federal and state laws applicable to the practitioner’s jurisdiction. Examiners should consult with legal counsel when appropriate.

4.6 Examiners must adhere to ethical principles and standards for practice in their profession and jurisdiction.
4.7 Examiners should decline to accept a PPE referral when personal, professional, legal, financial, or other competing interests or relationships could reasonably be expected to: (a) impair their objectivity, competence, or effectiveness in performing their functions; or (b) expose the person or agency with whom the professional relationship exists to harm or exploitation (e.g., conducting a PPE on an applicant who had previously been in counseling or therapy with the examiner, evaluating an individual with whom there has been a business or significant social relationship).

5. Job Analysis

5.1 Information about the required duties, responsibilities, working conditions, and other psychologically relevant job characteristics should be obtained from the hiring authority prior to beginning the psychological evaluation. This information should be directed toward identifying skills, behaviors, attributes and other personal characteristics associated with effective and counterproductive job performance.

5.2 The examiner should be familiar with the overall hiring/selection process of the hiring agency, agency assessment standards, and procedures required by law.

5.3 The examiner should consult with the hiring authority regarding agency-specific risk management concerns, and seek clarification as to whether the evaluation should go beyond the identification of unsuitable candidates to include information about other specific selection criteria and/or specialized characteristics not covered in the job-analytic data referenced in 5.1.

6. Disclosure

6.1 Prior to the administration of any psychological instruments and interview, the examiner and/or hiring agency should disclose information to the applicant that includes: (a) the nature and objectives of the evaluation; (b) the intended recipients; (c) a statement that the hiring agency is the client; (d) the probable uses of the evaluation and the information obtained; and (e) the limits of confidentiality.

6.2 The disclosure should be documented in writing and signed by the applicant.

7. Testing

7.1 A written psychological test battery relevant to the purpose of the evaluation should be administered to the applicant. The test instruments should have documented reliability, validity, and other empirical evidence supporting their use in the preemployment evaluation of public safety applicants.
7.2 Psychological test materials should be administered in a manner consistent with publishers’ guidelines and professional standards.

7.3 Test scales, profiles, and reports used for selection purposes should be produced using current software or scoring keys licensed by the test publisher.

7.4 The results of the written test battery should be verified and reviewed by the examiner before the interview is conducted. Psychological test results should be interpreted in accordance with guidelines provided in their professional manuals and as warranted by the findings reported in peer-reviewed literature. Specific cut-off scores should be used only when there is adequate statistical evidence that such scores are predictive of personality, mental health concerns and/or behavior relevant to job performance.

7.5 Psychological assessment instruments not yet validated for use in evaluating public safety applicants may be utilized to develop the requisite norms and validation evidence, but should not be used for decision making during the data gathering process. This research should be carried out in accordance with relevant ethical standards, including safeguards to protect participant confidentiality.

7.6 The examiner is responsible for ensuring that the security and confidentiality of all testing materials (e.g., test booklets/items), psychological reports and raw data are maintained in a manner consistent with pertinent law and standards of professional conduct. The examiner should reach an agreement with the hiring agency regarding the custody of testing material and the distribution, sharing, protection and retention of test results.

8. Interview

8.1 Individual face-to-face interviews with applicants should be conducted before a final determination of the applicant’s psychological suitability is made. The purpose of the interview is to provide relevant interpersonal and mental status information about the candidate, and to confirm and/or clarify test scores, personal history, and related information collected during the psychological evaluation.

8.2 Interviews should be conducted in a consistent, comprehensive manner and focused exclusively on the collection of information relevant to the purpose of the evaluation (Guideline 3.1) and agency-specific selection criteria (Guidelines 5.1 and 5.2).
9. Technology Considerations

9.1 Examiners who make use of electronic technology take steps to ensure: (a) their competence with the technologies used; (b) that relevant authorizations and safeguards are in place; and (c) adherence to professional and industry standards.

10. Background Information

10.1 Information regarding the applicant’s relevant history (e.g., school, work, interpersonal, family, legal, financial, substance use, mental health) should be collected and integrated with psychological test and interview data in a standardized manner.

10.2 When available, relevant information from the background investigation and methods used for the detection of deception should be shared with the examiner. If background investigation findings are not provided to the examiner in advance of the evaluation, it is desirable for the examiner to communicate with designated hiring agency staff prior to making a final suitability determination in order to compare and reconcile information obtained from the applicant. In all cases, substantive discrepancies between information obtained in the psychological evaluation and other stages of the hiring process should be reviewed thoroughly with the hiring agency before a final hiring decision is made.

10.3 If relevant to psychological suitability, health records should be obtained from treating healthcare professionals and reviewed before a final determination is made of the applicant’s suitability. When such records are unavailable, consideration should be given to deferring the suitability determination until the health record can be reviewed or the basis for the concern is otherwise resolved.

11. Reports

11.1 The hiring agency administrators directly involved in making employment decisions should be provided with a written report of the examiner’s evaluation. The report should contain, at a minimum, a clear determination of the applicant’s psychological suitability for employment based upon an analysis of all psychological assessment materials, including background information, test data, and interview results. Any agency-specific restrictions or other requirements relevant to the format or content of the written psychological report should be communicated to the examiner in advance of the evaluation.

11.2 Ratings and/or recommendations for employment based upon the results of the evaluation should be expressly linked to the job-analytic information referenced in paragraph 5.1.
11.3 Clinical diagnoses or psychiatric labeling of applicants should be avoided unless relevant to the examiner’s conclusion, necessary for the hiring agency to make an employment decision, and/or required by law. In all cases, the report should be focused on the individual applicant’s ability to safely and effectively perform the essential functions of the position under consideration.

11.4 Conclusions concerning an applicant’s qualifications should be based generally on consistencies across data sources rather than a single source; examiners should justify exceptions to this guideline.

11.5 Recommendations regarding an applicant’s suitability for employment should be valid for no longer than one year from completion of the evaluation unless another time period is established by policy or regulation. The report should clearly state the period of time for which the evaluation is considered valid.

11.6 The written report provided to the agency should be securely maintained in accordance with federal, state, and professional requirements.

12. Use of the Evaluation

12.1 Efforts should be made to inform the hiring agency’s administrators about the strengths and limitations of preemployment psychological evaluations.

12.2 Preemployment psychological evaluations should be used as one component of the overall hiring process.

12.3 The use of preemployment test results for purposes other than making preemployment decisions should be justified by consideration of relevance, reliability, and informed consent. The hiring agency should not use the preemployment evaluation for promotional evaluations.

13. Follow-Up

13.1 Collaborative efforts by the hiring agency and examiner should be made to continually assess the accuracy of final suitability determinations. Follow-up data should be collected in accordance with strict confidentiality provisions protecting individual applicant identities and in accordance with ethical research guidelines and the law.

13.2 The examiner and the hiring agency should evaluate whether final suitability ratings have an adverse impact on protected classes of candidates.

13.3 Examiners should base their findings on established scientific and professional knowledge sufficient to substantiate their procedures, conclusions, and recommendations and should be prepared to defend such procedures, conclusions,
and recommendations if a decision based on psychological evaluation findings is challenged.

**14. Appeals and Second Opinions**

14.1 Hiring agencies that permit second-opinion evaluations as part of an appeal process should require that these psychological evaluations be based upon the same criteria used for the initial psychological evaluation.
1.1


Standard 32.2.8 Emotional Stability/Psychological Fitness Examination in CALEA Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies stipulates, “An emotional stability and psychological fitness examination of each candidate for a sworn position is conducted and assessed by a qualified professional prior to appointment to probationary status.”

http://www.calea.org/content/standards-titles.

Bonsignore v. City of New York, 521 F. Supp. 394, aff’d 683 F.2d 635 (2nd Cir. 1982). (Failure to adopt meaningful psychological testing results in $300,000 compensatory and $125,000 in punitive damages. Off-duty officer wounded wife, then killed self; officers required to carry weapons while off duty.)

Hild v. Bruner, 496 F. Supp. 93 (D.N.J. 1980). (Civil rights action brought against a town for injuries suffered by the victim of an assault by the town’s police officers; Court held that jury could reasonably have inferred that the town’s failure to conduct some kind of psychological testing of its officers constituted gross negligence.)

Lewis v. Goodie, 798 F. Supp. 382 (W.D.La. 1992) (Individuals arrested and assaulted by two officers; police chief held personally liable for general and punitive damages; chief found to have failed in his duty to properly supervise and train officers, one aspect of this was the fact that he had not required the two officers to undergo psychological screening.)

Woods v. Town of Danville, WV, #2:09-cv-0036, 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 47666 (S.D.W.Va.). (In an unlawful detention lawsuit, “a reasonable jury could find that [the town] did not adequately investigate [the officer’s] military service, conduct a psychological [preemployment] evaluation, or adequately follow up on [his] references. Given the information about [his] propensity toward anger, his spotty employment history, and the facts surrounding his other-than-honorable discharge from the Navy, the plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged genuine issues of material fact on their claims of negligent hiring and retention.”)

Miller v. City of Springfield, 146 F.3d 612, 1998 U.S. App. Lexis 13385, 8 AD Cases (BNA) 321. (8th Cir.). (Federal appeals court found that a rejected applicant was not disabled, nor was she perceived as disabled, simply because she scored 66T on the Depression scale of the MMPI-2. The court concluded, “Miller is not disabled under the Act. She therefore cannot base a claim of discrimination on this regulation because she was not screened out on the basis of any disability. In any event, we easily conclude that appropriate psychological screening is job-related and consistent with business necessity where the selection of individuals to train for the position of police officer is concerned.”)
Nilsson v. City of Mesa, #05-15627, 503 F.3d 947, 2007 U.S. App. Lexis 21912, 101 FEP Cases (BNA) 901, 19 AD Cases 1418 (9th Cir., 2007). (Ninth Circuit affirmed dismissal of a suit filed by a rejected police applicant that failed a psychological evaluation that cited her stubborn nature and impulsivity. The appellate panel enforced a preemployment waiver of legal rights “for any acts, or omissions in the course of the investigation into background, employment history, health, family, personal habits and suitability for employment ....”)

Matter of Murray v. Co. of Nassau Civ. Serv. Cmsn., #000132/07, 2007 N.Y. Misc. Lexis 2579 (Nassau Co. Sup.). (New York court rejected a judicial challenge brought by a police applicant. Although his personal doctor found no disabling conditions, two psychologists and a psychiatrist found that he lacked the skills necessary to carry out the functions of a police officer. The opinion of the applicant’s privately retained expert was not controlling.)

2.1


3.2

For example, see California Govt. Code 1031(f) and POST Commission Regulation 1955(a); Alaska Police Standards Counsel: 13 Alaska Administrative Code 85.010. Basic Standards for Police Officers; Kansas Law Enforcement Training Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training: Law Enforcement Training Act 74-5605-Qualifications of Applicant for Training Course, Requirements; Wisconsin Law Enforcement Standards Board: Administrative Code and Register – LES 2.01 Recruitment qualifications; New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council: Revised Statutes 188-F:27: Education and Training Required; and Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6700.0700, Subpart 1.

3.3


Leonel v. American Airlines, Inc., 400 F.3d 702 (9th Cir. 2005).

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=12385648287772142702&hl=en&as_sdt=6&as_vis=1&oi=scholarr

“An employer need not limit the number of conditional offers to the number of vacant positions, but may take into account reasonably anticipated vacancies. Additionally, if an employer can demonstrate that a number of individuals will be disqualified based on information obtained post-offer, it may extend more offers than spaces available or anticipated vacancies. Accordingly, a police or fire department may extend more conditional offers of employment than spots vacant if it can demonstrate that it needs to give more offers to actually fill vacancies or reasonably anticipated openings (e.g., if it could be demonstrated that a certain number of offerees will be disqualified based on information learned post-offer or will voluntarily withdraw
from consideration)." Disability-Related Inquiries and Medical Examinations, EEOC Letter of February 14, 2002.


3.4 and 3.5


4.1

4.2


4.3


4.4
EPPCC Standard 2.04.

SGFP Guideline 2.05.
4.5


4.6

EPPCC Introduction & Applicability.
4.7

EPPCC Standard 3.05.

SGFP Guidelines 1.03, 4.02.

5.1


California POST Psychological Screening Dimensions http://www.post.ca.gov/peace-officer-psychological-screening-dimensions.aspx The only terms used there are “attributes” and “behaviors.”

“Work Analysis” by Pearlman and Sanchez, in Handbook of Employee Selection, Farr, J.L. and Tippins, N.T., (eds.). 2010, Routledge, NYC.


5.3


6.1

EPPCC Standards 3.11, 9.03, 9.10.

SGFP Guidelines 6.01, 6.03.

6.2

EPPCC Standards 3.10, 9.03.

Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital, 211 N.Y. 125, 105 N.E. 92 (N.Y. 1914).
Various state laws and regulations mandate the use of written psychological tests in preemployment evaluations of peace officer applicants [cf. Iowa Law Enforcement Academy Council, Code 501-2, California POST Regulation 1955 (e)(2)]. The use of psychological testing as an adjunct to the clinical interview is also required by several state regulations [cf. New Hampshire Administrative Rules, Pol 301.07; California POST Regulation 1955 (e)(4)]. See California POST Regulation 1099 (e)(2); Delaware Administrative Code Section 1901; Kentucky Administrative Rules 503 KAR 1:140, Section 4.

See Oklahoma Statute, Title 70, Section 3311 et seq., Subsections E.1 and E.2.b; California POST Regulation 1955 (e)(2). See also EEOC ADA Enforcement Guidance: Preemployment Disability-Related Questions and Medical Examinations (10/10/95).

8.2


9.1


EPPCC Standard 4.03.


10.1


11.1

EPPCC Standards 4.04, 8.06, 9.01, 9.02.

SGFP Guidelines 11.02, 11.04, 12.01, 12.02, 13.04.


11.02

EPPCC Standards 2.04, 9.01.


Principles for the Validation and the Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (SIOP, 2003).


California POST Standards.

11.3

EPPCC Standard 4.04.

SGFP Guidelines 10.01, 11.04.


EPPC Standards 9.01 and 9.02.


11.4


11.5

EPPCC Standard 6.02.

SGFP Guideline 10.02.


The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (P.L.104-191) Privacy Rule requires healthcare providers to “protect the privacy of personal health information (PHI) and sets limits and conditions on the uses and disclosures” of PHI.

12.1

EPPCC Standards 9.02, 9.10.

SGFP Guidelines 5.01, 6.01.
12.2


12.3

EPPCC Standard 9.02a.


13.1

EPPCC Standard 8.


13.2

Civil Rights Act 1964 (Title VII); 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (Section 1B, Section 4D).

13.3

EPPCC Standards 2.04, 9.01.
SGFP Guideline 2.05.
The law states a law enforcement agency may not employ a person as a police officer or reserve unless the person has completed a psychological screening. (SB423). The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training (Board) is granted the authority to set the standard and requirements for the psychological screening. Key points of the screening are:

- The psychological screening process is used to identify mental conditions, personality disorders, personality traits or behavior patterns that may adversely affect the officer’s ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or reserve officer with reasonable skill, safety and judgement based upon the pre-employment psychological screening criteria established by the law enforcement unit.

- The psychological screening must be conducted by a licensed mental health professional who can demonstrate, to the law enforcement unit’s satisfaction, expertise in clinical assessment and the assessment of normal personality characteristics, skills and abilities relevant to public safety personnel selection.

   "Licensed Mental Health Professional” includes:
   - A psychologist who is licensed by the Oregon Board of Psychology or the licensing body in the state where the person provides the psychological services; or
   - A mental health professional who is licensed by the licensing body in the state where the person provides mental health services.

- The psychological screening must include:
   - A written psychological test battery relevant to the pre-employment psychological screening criteria established by the law enforcement unit. The results of the written test should be reviewed and verified by the licensed mental health professional prior to the in-person interview;
   - An in-person interview conducted by the licensed mental health professional; and
   - A report provided by the licensed mental health professional in the manner requested by the law enforcement unit.

- The psychological screening must conform to applicable standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title 42 USC 1210.

- Psychological screenings older than one year are no longer valid for the purposes of satisfying the pre-employment psychological screening requirement.

- Hiring decisions are the responsibility of each law enforcement unit. The law enforcement unit hiring the police officer or reserve officer maintains the discretion to determine how the information provided in a psychological screening report impacts the hiring decision.

**Hiring agencies have complete discretion, within the confines of the requirements detailed above, with respect to selecting a mental health provider, determining which psych screening to use and making hiring decisions based upon psych screening results.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1: Newly hired reserve or police officer.</td>
<td>Must complete a psych and report as new hire on F4. (along with F5 and F2a, if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2: Reserve or police officer transferring from one agency to another.</td>
<td>Must complete a psych and report as new hire on F4. (along with F5 and F2a, if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3: Police officer moving to a higher, lower or different rank in the police discipline within the same agency.</td>
<td>Psych not required. Report as a promotion/reclassification on F4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4: Employee moving from a non-police position (civilian) into a reserve or police officer position within the same agency.</td>
<td>Must complete a psych and report on F4. (along with F5 and F2a, if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5: Employee moving from another discipline to reserve or police officer within the same agency. (Telecom, Corrections, Parole and Probation)</td>
<td>Must complete a psych and report on F4. (along with F5 and F2a, if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scenario 6: Reserve officer moving into a police officer role within the same agency. | - If psych previously completed that complies with current OAR, no new psych needed. Reclassification reported on F4.  
- If no psych completed that complies with current OAR, psych required. Reported on F4 as reclassification. |
| Scenario 7: Police officer reclassifying to a reserve.                 | - If no break in service, submit an F4s indicating the reason for the separation from a certified role. Include, in the reason section, moving to reserve position and why. DPSST will administratively reclassify based on F4s. No psych required. No F4 required.  
- If there is a break in service, submit F4s separating officer and an F4 hiring officer as a reserve when appropriate. Psych must be completed. |
| Scenario 8: Police officer retiring and contracting back full-time.    | - If no break in service, do not submit anything. The officer has not separated from their certified role so there is no need for an F4s or F4.  
- If break in service, submit F4s separating officer and an F4 hiring officer when appropriate. Psych must be completed. |
| Scenario 9: Officer working for one agency and hires on as a reserve for a different agency | The agency hiring the person as a reserve must complete a psych and report as new hire on F4.                                                                                                                                 |
| Scenario 10: Reserve working for one agency and hires on as an officer for a different agency | The agency hiring the person as an officer must complete a psych and report as new hire on F4.                                                                                                                                 |