

# **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

Directive: **6.50**

## I. Organization and Objectives:

It is the policy of the Wilmington Department of Police to evaluate the job performance of all police officers in accordance with the provisions set forth in the Supervisor's Guide to the City of Wilmington's Employee Performance Evaluation System.

These evaluations shall be implemented annually by the officer's immediate supervisor and/or any other person(s) best qualified to directly observe the officer's performance.

These evaluations shall be used by the Department to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of each member. The results shall be confidential and are available only to the employee evaluated, a representative of the evaluated employee, and the employee's supervisors.

The primary objective of the evaluation is to enhance the officer's career development. The evaluation shall further provide the Department and the officer with a record of hard-to-measure traits, such as the employee's stability, dedication, dependability, job knowledge, and attitude towards the job and fellow officers.

Results of the evaluation are designed to identify goals for individual improvement and to assist in determining transfers, promotions and training.

All full time employees shall be evaluated annually; four months prior to their anniversary date.

## II. Definition of Measurement:

Measurement definitions are definitions of traits that make up criteria. They are created and used by existing instruments. The Department shall weigh these criteria to

arrive at the appropriate characteristics needed to assess a performance evaluation. The definitions of the criteria shall be made as precise as possible.

The performance evaluation traits and their definitions are listed for the evaluator/rater to be used for determining trait weighing. All officers will be counseled as to the traits associated with their current position. Upon transfer to a new unit all officers will receive instruction as to any additional duties of that position and what is expected of them. The evaluator shall select the level of achievement that best represents the performance of the officer being evaluated. The completed data evaluation form can be upgraded and changed as performance goals change within the agency and evaluators change how they weigh each trait.

### III. Use of Forms:

#### A. Supervisor:

The performance evaluation forms are designed to maintain uniformity in the evaluation. The job performance evaluation form lists the job performance traits, their definitions and five different levels of achievement. The evaluator shall indicate what level of achievement the officer falls under with a check mark in the proper block. The evaluator then writes in any pertinent comments he/she feels are necessary.

#### B. Employee Self-Evaluation:

The officer shall conduct a self-evaluation by completing the same evaluation form as his/her supervisor. The supervisor and employee shall meet to discuss any agreements, disagreements, or concerns regarding the evaluation given by the supervisor and the self-evaluation conducted by the employee. The evaluation form is then signed by the evaluator, the employee and the evaluator's supervisor. A copy of the evaluation form is then given to the employee. The employee's signature shall indicate that he/she has read and discussed the evaluation with a supervisor. It is not a verification that the employee agrees with the evaluation given.

The employee shall be counseled about the tasks of the position he/she occupies, the level of performance expected, and the evaluation rating criteria. This is to ensure that the employee fully understands specific duties and responsibilities of the position and what is expected of the employee in carrying out these duties and responsibilities.

IV. Performance Review:

A Performance Review is a planned, private discussion and exchange that shall be organized as follows:

A. Definitions:

1. WHO: Between each subordinate and the person they report to.
2. WHAT: To cover objectives, current performance, results, accomplishments, and areas for improvement.
3. WHY: To recognize progress, to develop mutual understanding, to plan for even more effective performance by the individual and the group.
4. WHEN: As often as needed; at least annually.

B. Job Performance Criterion:

1. Mandatory Factors:
  - a. Attendance - Faithfulness in coming to work daily and conforming to work hours.
  - b. Quality of Work - Accuracy, neatness, thoroughness, competence, in the work duties performed.
  - c. Work Habits - Observes work and safety rules; follows instructions.

- d. Initiative - Self- Starter; finds work to do; self motivated.
- e. Dependability - The degree to which the employee can be relied upon to get the job done.
- f. Relations with other employees - Cooperativeness, ability to get along with co-workers.
- g. Quality of Work - Amount of acceptable work accomplished.
- h. Adaptability - Ability to adjust to new or different assignments.

2. Optional Factors:

Effective  
time and

- a. Public Contact - Manner in dealing with and helping the public.
- b. Planning and Organizing Work -  
and efficient utilization of  
resources.
- c. Communications {oral and written} -  
Effective expression; how well ideals  
can be conveyed to others.
- d. Supervisory Ability - Leadership,  
getting work done through others;  
training subordinates.
- e. Management Ability - Effective and  
economical management of work time.

V. Rater Responsibilities:

The evaluation shall be completed by the officer's last immediate supervisor. This supervisor should have had the employee under his supervision for at least 90 days. If the evaluator is not the present supervisor, he will consult

with the present supervisor.

In preparation for the evaluation of each officer, the evaluator should review the overall objectives of the Department and clearly set forth the relationship of the officer's performance to these objectives. The critical factor in this segment is the evaluator's ability to keep personal attitudes and prejudices out of the evaluation.

The supervisor conducting the evaluation must maintain the greatest level of objectivity of which he/she is capable. Performance factors evaluated as; "needs improvement", "unsatisfactory", or "outstanding" must be explained in the comments section of the form. Each evaluator must be able to substantiate his/her assessments.

When completing the narrative section of the performance evaluation, supervisors shall specify the actual dates covered by the evaluation in order to provide a continuity of the record of performance during a specified period. The performance evaluation shall be based on the individual's performance during the specified evaluation period and the employee will only be rated on the position occupied during the period of time rated.

#### VI. Rater Training:

This consists of an initial training session and periodic additional training sessions. The material covered in these sessions will focus on the objectives of the Department and points to keep in mind during evaluations to provide the officer being evaluated with the most realistic appraisal.

Raters are to be evaluated by their supervisors regarding the quality of ratings conducted on an employee. Each performance review shall answer these:

Question	in terms of
1. What is expected?	Objectives
2. How are we doing?	Results
3. How can we improve results?	Planned Action
4. Why is it important to improve?	Motivation

VII. Effects:

Below are some of the common pitfalls that supervisors run into in attempting to administer an objective performance evaluation.

1. Halo Effect: tendency of a supervisor to hang a halo over the rating of a favored officer.
2. Effect of Past Record: officer has done good work in the past and is assumed to be OK in the present also. His past work tends to be carried over into his present evaluation.
3. Compatibility: An officer is rated higher than he deserves because he has a pleasing manner and personality.  
  
ex. officers who agree with everything said {yes people}, and are skilled flatterers get better ratings than there performances justifies.
4. Effect of Recency: An outstanding job done last week can offset mediocre performance over the rest of the evaluation period  
  
ex. "Santa Claus" effect; behavior of kids the week before Christmas.
5. One Asset Officer: glib talker; the officer with the "nice looks"; officer with a degree gets a positive bias to his evaluation.
6. Blind-Spot Effect: supervisor not seeing certain types of defects because they are just like his own.
7. No-Complaints Bias: evaluator treats no news as good news in the performance evaluation.  
  
ex. officer who pesters us but gets the job done is rated lower than the solitary officer.

- officer
8. Horns Effect: supervisor is apt to rate an lower than the circumstances justify (hypercritical).
- so
9. Perfectionist: because his expectation level is high, supervisor is more often disappointed and rates officers lower than he should.
10. Contrary Person: supervisor is irritated by officers ability to freely disagree with him on too many issues and reflects it in the officers ratings.
11. Guilt By Association: officer who is not really known by supervisor, is judged by the company he keeps and ratings reflect such.
- recently
- months of
- most recent
12. Dramatic-Incident Effect: officer who has goofed can often wipe out the effect of good work and be rated low because of incident.
13. Self-Comparison Effect: officer who does not do the job well as we remember having done it ourselves will suffer more than those who perform work not entirely familiar to us.

#### VIII. Performance Evaluation Schedule:

Department employees shall be evaluated by their immediate supervisor on an annual basis, primarily to set goals for that individual based on his/her current job performance during the specified time period and to indicate targeted areas for improvement. Probationary employees shall be evaluated four [4] months after graduation from the academy, and again two weeks prior to the end of the probationary period, as well as weekly for the performance reports from their Field Training Officer.

Special evaluations shall be given at any time. An unsatisfactory annual evaluation will require a "special" evaluation in 3 months. An unsatisfactory final probationary evaluation shall cause the employee to be ineligible for permanent appointment.

IX. Review for Contested Evaluations:

When an employee and their supervisor can not come to terms or agree upon a point of evaluation the case shall proceed through the chain- of- command to the next highest supervisor for review.

Each evaluation shall be reviewed by the Chief of Police or his/her designee on an annual basis. The Department psychologist shall also be included to identify instances of extreme ratings, the reasons for them and contested evaluations. Performance evaluations shall be maintained in the officer's personnel file. These files may be automated and/or hard copied.

Evaluations are specific in nature, designed from tasks of each position as set forth in the job description and are, therefore, intrinsic to that position. Supervisors shall note in the narrative section of the evaluation, the specific position the employee was evaluated on (i.e., House Sergeant, Patrol Sergeant, Evidence Officer, etc.)

X. Unsatisfactory Evaluations:

Employees must be advised, in writing, whenever their performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory.

The written notification will (when possible) be given at least 90 days prior to the end of the rating period. (This allows the employee time to improve before the rating period ends.) The supervisor will define actions that should be taken to improve performance. An unsatisfactory evaluation will require a special evaluation in three months.

If unsatisfactory performance continues, this information should be included in the evaluation report given after the 90 day period.

XI. Employee Written Comments

Employees shall comment on their completed performance evaluation by submitting a departmental Information Report. A copy of this report will be maintained in the employee's performance evaluation file.

## *XII. Appeal Process*

*When an employee and their supervisor can not come to terms or agree upon a point of evaluation, the case shall proceed through the chain-of-command to the next highest supervisor for review.*

*The next highest supervisor shall review the evaluation with the employee and the immediate supervisor. An attempt should be made to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. If the employee and the immediate supervisor are unable to reach a mutually agreeable rating, the evaluation shall be submitted. The employee shall place his/her detailed disagreement on the comments section of the evaluation (if additional space is necessary a separate sheet of paper may be attached.) The employee shall then sign the evaluation. The employee's signature does not indicate agreement with the rating, but the mere acknowledgment of receipt of the evaluation.*

*The employee may then appeal the evaluation to the Division Commander. The Division Commander will then review the evaluation and speak with both the employee and his immediate supervisor. The Division Commander shall then make a decision to either uphold the evaluation as submitted, or return the evaluation for review. There will be no further review beyond the Division Commander. The only exception(s) will be if a Lieutenant or Captain are in disagreement with their review. In the event a Lieutenant disputes his/her evaluation, the Inspector within their chain-of-command will be the final level of appeal. If a Captain disputes his/her review, the Chief of Police will be the final level of appeal. If an Inspector disputes his/her review, the Director of Public Safety will be the final level of appeal. The appeal process will conform to current City of Wilmington/Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #1 collective bargaining agreements.*