U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice
Office of Communication and Research Utilization

National Institute of Justice / *Issues and Practices*

Investigators Who Perform Well

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system, and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

Authority for administering the Institute and awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements is vested in the NIJ Director. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help solve them.

James K. Stewart
Director

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice
Office of Communication and Research Utilization

Investigators Who Perform Well

by

Bernard Cohen

and

Jan Chaiken

June 1987

Issues and Practices in Criminal Justice is a publication of the National Institute of Justice. Designed for the criminal justice professional, each *Issues and Practices* report presents the program options and management issues in a topic area, based on a review of research and evaluation findings, operational experience, and expert opinion in the subject. The intent is to provide criminal justice managers and administrators with the information to make informed choices in planning, implementing and improving programs and practice.

Prepared for the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, by Abt Associates Inc., under contract #J-LEAA-011-81. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Foreword

Law enforcement administrators looking to improve their agency's performance often ask me how best to organize and manage their investigative operations. What is the latest word on changes they should consider? Over the last 15 years, the National Institute of Justice has sponsored a series of studies that revealed many of the keys to solving more crimes and making better cases for prosecution. Most police chiefs and sheriffs have changed their operations in directions that were recommended by those studies: enhancing the role of patrol officers in initial investigations, screening cases before assigning them to be handled by detectives, targeting special investigative units on highly active, serious criminals, increasing the level of monitoring and supervision of investigations, improving interactions between law enforcement officers and prosecutors, and focusing follow-up investigations on activities shown to be most likely to be productive in yielding case solutions.

Yet despite all these operational changes, administrators still recognize there is room for further improvement. Interviews conducted for this study showed that managers and line personnel alike could identify some officers who were much better investigators than others. Studies bear out their observation: a small proportion of officers in any department are responsible for the majority of cases that successfully result in convictions. Perhaps, the interviewed administrators felt, future improvements in detective divisions would come not from operational changes but from personnel changes. Few agencies have procedures they consider entirely satisfactory for selecting, recognizing, and rewarding good investigators, and all can learn from the best practices of other agencies.

We sponsored this study to search out for you the best methods that agencies use to select investigators and evaluate their performance. The authors found many different imaginative practices have been developed, but they are not yet in wide use. They describe them for you and provide sources for further information if you are interested in following up on them. No agency will need or want to use all of the methods described here, but you should be able to find procedures that will fit in well with your own management goals and are appropriate under the regulation and laws that guide personnel practices in your department.

Looking back over the past ten years, all of us can identify important enhancements that were made in practices for hiring and promoting police officers and sheriffs' deputies. But progress in procedures for selecting and rewarding detectives has been much slower. Now, with this report in hand, the time has come to turn some attention to selecting and rewarding investigators for good performance.

James K. Stewart
Director
National Institute of Justice

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

High quality criminal investigations are important to the performance of all law enforcement agencies. Obviously it is impossible to solve every crime, but the work of investigators is critical to solving many of the most important crimes that come to an agency's attention. And most managers agree on the key to quality investigations: selecting investigators who perform well. Although various changes in investigative policies, equipment, techniques, or organizational procedures have been suggested over the years as ways to improve the quality of criminal investigations, most detectives and their administrators say that choosing the right officers to be detectives is much more important than any of these practices or procedures.

How can agencies best choose officers who will perform well as investigators? Opinions differ greatly among experienced managers in police and sheriffs departments concerning the traits of good investigators, the procedures that should be followed to select investigators, and the characteristics to consider favorable signs that candidate officers will become good investigators.[1]

Research and common sense tell us that quality can make a difference in the outcomes of investigation, both in terms of the number of crimes that are solved and the chances that cases will be solid enough for the arrestee to be prosecuted and convicted. Indications are that only a small proportion of officers, perhaps twenty percent of the force, are responsible for the majority of arrests that result in convictions. Many of these officers are not detectives, but are assigned to the patrol division or are on undercover or other special assignments. Keeping track of officers' rates of producing arrests that result in convictioins has been suggested as a good way to screen officers

who are candidates for assignment as detectives. Many other traits and performance measures have also been suggested for this purpose.[2]

This report reviews the methods that are used by law enforcement agencies to select officers for investigative assignments and to evaluate investigators' performance. Although procedures for identifying qualified candidates to be hired as police officers are gradually becoming increasingly standardized throughout the nation -- a result of civil service legislation and a series of court decisions -- virtually no meaningful guidance is currently available to law enforcement administrators on how to select detectives who will perform well. For example, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies has formulated 940 standards of police organization and management, but not one of them specifically discusses how to identify qualified officers for investigative assignments.[3]

Nonetheless, carefully planned, efficient, equitable, and valid selection procedures are available for ensuring appointment of highly productive detectives and diminishing the proportion of ineffective personnel. This report examines state-of-the-art methods for selecting and promoting police personnel and then explains how these techniques may be applied specifically to investigators. It is designed to be useful to detective supervisors and upper management in municipal and county law enforcement agencies, the heads of personnel departments, and attorneys who deal with equal employment opportunity litigation.

The process of selecting and promoting detectives differs from choosing patrol officers. Past performance increases in value as an indicator of later performance as an officer advances from patrol to special assignments, to detective units, and finally to the upper echelons of investigative work. Personnel units possess little information on how newly appointed recruits will perform as police officers, because candidates for entry to the force are rarely engaged in jobs similar to police work. In contrast, patrol officers perform many tasks common to investigative work, including gathering evidence, questioning victims, witnesses and suspects, and preparing cases for prosecution. Officers on special assignments typically spend more time on investigation than patrol officers do, and newly assigned, inexperienced detectives perform many of the same tasks performed by more weathered or higher grade detectives. Therefore, past police performance can be an excellent indicator of how well an officer would perform at a higher level.

To prepare this report, we conducted a thorough review of the literature on selection, assignment, and promotion of law enforcement personnel. We assembled information and materials on current detective selection procedures through telephone and personal interviews from a dozen police jurisdictions situated throughout the United States. Moreover, we conducted on-site visits

at three agencies where we interviewed or observed police personnel knowledgeable in detective selection, including police psychologists.

The report first describes typical detective selection styles characterizing law enforcement agencies. The behaviors and attributes essential for effective investigative work are then discussed. Next, useful personnel techniques for detective selection and advancement are presented. Afterward, legal and administrative restrictions on these procedures are explored. Finally, recommendations are offered for readers who are interested in improving detective selection and evaluation procedures.

Notes

1. In this report we use the terms "detective" and "investigator" interchangeably to refer to law enforcement officers whose primary functions include following up preliminary investigations and gathering evidence leading to apprehension, prosecution, and conviction of offenders. The report does not deal with officers having the designation "detective" or "investigator," but whose major activities are undercover operations, anticrime patrol, community relations, or other sensitive duties.
2. Details and references are given in later chapters.
3. Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, *Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies: The Standards Manual of the Law Enforcement Accreditation Program*. Fairfax, Virginia: December 1985. *Accreditation Program*. Fairfax, Virginia: December 1985.

Chapter Two

Agency Styles for Selecting Investigators

Based on our review of the literature and the information assembled from law enforcement agencies about their current procedures for selecting detectives, a variety of different departmental styles for selecting detectives emerged. The surveyed agencies ranged in size from about 100 sworn personnel to thousands of officers. On the whole, law enforcement agencies appear to have wide discretion for implementing procedures for the selection and advancement of investigators. In only one of the twelve study departments was detective selection actually controlled by civil service procedures.

Four Management Styles

Detective selection and advancement policies can be summarized in terms of four basic styles, ranging from highly structured civil service procedures through structured, semistructured, and unstructured styles (Table 1). Of course, most departments have some combination of both formal and informal procedures and do not exactly match any particular style displayed in Table 1. The degree of formality in detective selection procedures is consonant with the level of bureaucratization of other procedures in the department and thus tends to increase from East coast to West. The four basic styles of detective selection procedures are discussed in the sections that follow.

Unstructured Style

Not too many decades ago, the predominant selection method for detectives allowed complete discretion to the chief of the department or the chief of detectives. Promotion of an officer to detective could be used to

Table 1
Investigator Selection Styles

	Unstructured	Semistructured	Structured	Highly structured (Civil Service)
Criteria for Selection	Specified years of experience (e.g., 3, 4, or 5)	Specified years of experience	Specified years of experience	Specified number of years in lower rank.
		Record check	Record check	
			Peer evaluation	Score on written exam
	Quality of work			
				Supervisory rating score
	Praiseworthy achievement	Satisfactory rating on supervisory evaluation	Staff evaluation	
		Education requirement	Education requirement	Education requirement
			Pass an exam (or qualify for sergeant)	
		Interviews and recommendations		
			Interview	
Selectors	Based on recommendation of a supervisor, deputy chief, or chief	Current Supervisor	Patrol Officers	Chief
		Captain	Sergeant	Promotion board
		Supervisor of Department	Lieutenant	
			Section Commanders	
		Deputy Chief		
			Chief	
Vacancy Posted	No, or only technically required	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seniority credit for selection	No	Yes	Yes	Usually
Extra Pay	Yes	—	—	Yes
Training	On-the-job	Some training	Specified training required	Specified training (e.g., hours and curriculum)

reward nearly any form of behavior, accomplishment, or special service that the top management of the department wanted to encourage. This promotion "system" was rarely described in written manuals, so perhaps the best descriptions occur in fictional accounts. For example, in the novel *One Police Plaza*, one character reminisces:

> ...One morning after a late tour he received a telephone notification at home. He had been transferred to the Detective Division. The sudden promotion was not the result of a blazing gun battle or a spectacular arrest but came about because of the intercession of his Uncle Pat with the then chief of detectives. His uncle and the chief had been radio car partners. That was how men became detectives — contacts.[1]

Agencies characterized by an unstructured detective selection style are modern variations on this traditional theme. They have few, if any, written materials or rules about selecting detectives. The criteria for selection are undefined, discretionary, and subject to frequent change and interpretation. Two key factors in one large municipal department with an unstructured detective selection style were "previous experience" and "quality of work." Previous experience usually means 3 to 5 years as a police officer; quality of work mainly refers to arrest activity.

Although agencies with an unstructured style commit few regulations to writing, many do consult the performance records that are routinely available in departments, including supervisory ratings, commendations, absences, and complaints. There are typically no rules on how these records are to be applied in the selection process in agencies with the unstructured style. One detective supervisor reported that in his department the main criteria for detective selection were arrest activity and informal endorsement by the immediate supervisor or one or two additional "bosses" who recently supervised the candidate. Afterward, the captain of detectives usually visits the unit where the candidate works and informally observes his or her performance. The captain might also check with other zone commanders who offer their opinion of the officer. Finally, the candidate's personnel records are then sent to a board consisting of high ranking commanders who make the final decision.

Semistructured Style

Most detective selection procedures lie somewhere in between the unstructured and highly structured models. Departments with semistructured procedures often define and formalize general steps for detective selection, but they allow substantial latitude in their application. Moreover, the weight given to each part of the process is left to the discretion of the staff member

who is carrying out the assessment. One of our study departments illustrates the semistructured style. It requires a minimum of 3 years' experience as a police officer, and candidates must have one year of college education.

Moreover, an overall rating of "satisfactory" or higher is required on the last previous evaluation, and the officer's current immediate supervisor must recommend assignment to an investigative position. The rating focuses on various personal traits such as judgment, motivation, integrity, and appearance. The candidate is interviewed by both the current and receiving commands, and questions to be posed by the receiving command must first be approved by the Personnel Division. In other departments exhibiting a semistructured style, the format of questions is left to the discretion of the interviewers. Objective measures of performance, including disciplinary actions, awards, and sick leave, are also commonly checked in departments exhibiting the semistructured style.

Structured Style

Departments having structured detective selection styles define in writing their rules, requirements, and procedures; they allow little discretion in the process. One relatively small department of some 100 officers illustrates the structured style. Its detective selection mechanism consists of three main components:

1. A **peer evaluation**, in which ten fellow officers rank order each candidate, assigning "1" to the individual best suited for the specified assignment, "2" to the next best qualified, and so forth. A weight of 40 percent is given to this component.
2. A **staff evaluation**, where sergeants and lieutenants rank order the candidates. This component is also weighted 40 percent.
3. **Interviews** conducted by the section commander or the supervisors (worth 15 percent). The 15 candidates scoring highest on the previous two steps are interviewed. Information from personnel files for the previous three years may be brought up at this interview. The personnel section coordinates and compiles the rating lists, and an applicant's position is determined strictly by the weighted scores from the peer assessment, staff evaluation, and interview. Then the Division Commanders review the final candidates and make recommendations to the Chief of Police, who reserves the final authority for appointment regardless of an applicant's score.

Departments with highly structured regulations are more likely to be middle-sized or smaller agencies that utilize "investigators" or "specialists" instead of detectives. The investigator position in these agencies may be perceived as a lateral transfer, not strictly a promotion involving extra pay.

Civil Service Style

The detective selection process for some agencies leads to promotion mandated by civil service. The entire selection process is highly structured with virtually no discretion. In one such agency studied, the job title is "police specialist," not detective investigator. In this department, the time and place of the civil service examination is announced, and openings for "police specialist" are read at roll call and posted for seven days. Qualifications include 3 years of service in the department, specified minimum service ratings, and accumulated points toward promotion. The candidate must then pass a written examination, which is weighted 90 percent and combined with the most recent service rating, worth 10 percent. A maximum of seven percentage points for seniority may be added to the total score. The Police Chief makes the final selection after reviewing the candidates' personal qualifications and competence.

Tenure

In some law enforcement agencies, the investigative position is essentially a permanent appointment. Detectives may be formally the same civil service rank as patrol officers in these agencies, and the possibility does exist that the department's command staff might return a detective to the status of patrol officer, but removal of an officer's detective badge is unlikely to occur except for serious misconduct. Essentially, once officers are appointed to be detectives in these agencies, they remain detectives unless they are promoted to a higher civil service rank such as sergeant.

At the opposite extreme are agencies with the policy that detective assignments are never permanent. In these agencies, officers who are assigned to investigative positions and have the same formal rank as patrol officers will later return to the patrol division or a different kind of specialized assignment (e.g., motorcycle patrol, youth division). Rotation to a new assignment may occur after a specified period of years, or as openings occur. One of the departments we studied maintains a rigid three-year maximum tenure for all detectives, including even the heads of investigative units and the chief of detectives. This three-year rotation policy was initiated at the recommendation of the officers themselves through the department's procedures of participatory management. It is reportedly highly popular even though it does limit the detectives' ability to gain specialized skills needed for certain types of investigations, such as those involving homicide or complex frauds.[2]

One advantage of rotation is that it opens up the detective slot to large numbers of department employees. Potentially nearly all officers can eventually serve three years as detectives during their career in the police force.

Another advantage is that the patrol force becomes sophisticated in its knowledge of investigative techniques, methods for carrying out good preliminary investigations, requirements for presenting cases to the prosecutor, and the importance of collecting and preserving crime-scene evidence. Research has shown that patrol officers can play a vital role in solving crimes, especially when they coordinate well with the follow-up investigators.[3]

Of course, many departments fall between the two extremes. In these agencies, detectives are sometimes reassigned to other units without any implication that they have performed poorly as detectives. We did not find that agencies' policies concerning tenure for detectives appeared to be related to the degree of structure of their detective selection process.

Selecting Investigators

The prerogative to select investigators in nearly all departments studied rests with upper police management and ultimately with the head of the agency. However, as shown in Table 1, departments with structured styles and defined procedures usually request additional input from various levels of management, including sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and senior commanders. Agencies having unstructured styles tend to rely on a decision by a single commander, either a high ranking administrator or the candidate's future immediate supervisor. In departments governed by civil service, the authority to reject an eligible candidate usually rests with the chief.

Posting of Vacancies

Agencies having unstructured detective selection styles tend not to announce openings for the investigator position. Eligible candidates learn about the openings informally, usually by "word of mouth," and they are brought to the attention of the powers that be by immediate supervisors or middle-level management. Also, detective positions in these departments tend to be permanent and accompanied by higher pay. Detective selection styles governed by civil service also result in permanent positions with higher pay. Most departments allow credit for seniority regardless of the detective selection style. Only one department in the survey had varying promotion grades within the detective rank.

Training

Departments with structured detective selection procedures require candidates to attend formal courses and classes. Some also assigned the detective trainee to senior investigators for several weeks of highly structured and elaborate training. Departments with undefined selection procedures tend

to rely more upon on-the-job experience, waiving a formal training period.

Nearly all departments preferred candidates with prior field experience, including several months in investigative assignments. Overall, the style of detective selection seemed to conform closely to a department's overall managerial style. Professional management styles were associated with more structured detective selection procedures, while traditionally-oriented departments exhibited less formal processes.

Notes

1. Caunitz, William J., *One Police Plaza*, New York: Crown Publishers. Copyright 1984. Permission granted by the publisher.
2. Detectives who have rotated into patrol or some other assignment can once again apply to return to the detective division at their next available rotation. If successful, they can then continue to build their investigative skills.
3. See, for example, Greenwood, Peter W., Chaiken, Jan M., and Petersilia, Joan, *The Criminal Investigation Process*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1977; Eck, John E., *Solving Crimes: The Investigation of Burglary and Robbery*, Washington D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, 1983.

Chapter Three

Investigator Performance Attributes

Activities of Detectives

Investigators specialize in activities primarily related to law enforcement, whereas patrol officers also routinely expend efforts on order maintenance and the provision of general services (e.g., emergency aid, finding lost children, traffic control, etc.). Nonetheless, the diversity of tasks and skills required by detectives is quite substantial. Table 2 provides a brief overview of important and frequent behavioral tasks, work outcomes, traits, and qualifications essential for investigative work. Detectives gather crime information, effect arrests, and prepare cases for prosecution and trial. They must remain law abiding and satisfy the victim and public while conducting these tasks.

Many supervisors who select detectives, especially in agencies with unstructured or semistructured selection styles, believe that the few performance qualities in Table 2 that can be measured quantitatively, such as number of arrests, absenteeism, intelligence, or awards, are poor measures by which to judge whether an officer will become a good investigator. Instead they emphasize the more intangible traits of motivation, initiative, and good communication skills. This chapter discusses the various performance qualities in Table 2, and the next chapter describes how they may be incorporated in detective selection procedures.

Gathering Information

Important tasks performed by detectives include rapid response to crime scenes, searching the area, as well as identifying, collecting, and preserving

Table 2
Qualities for Investigative Performance

I. Gathering Information

- Crime scene management
- Communication skills

II. Field Operations

- Stakeouts
- Patrol
- Crime pattern analysis
- Developing informants
- Street knowledge

III. Arrests

- Quantity
- Quality

IV. Public and Victim Satisfaction

- Crime reduction
- Diminution of fear

V. Prosecutions

- Quantity
- Presentation of testimony in court
- Percent leading to conviction

VI. Personnel Performance

- Absenteeism
- Complaints
- Awards

VII. Personal Traits

- Motivation
- Stability
- Persistence
- Intelligence
- Perseverance
- Initiative
- Judgment
- Teamwork
- Involvement
- Dedication

VIII. Qualifications

- Education
- Training
- Previous assignments in department

tangible evidence. The officer must know how to use a department's computer and manual records containing such information as mug shots, fingerprints, intelligence and stolen property files. Detectives must be able to follow up leads by various means, including visits to pawn shops, suspected fencing locations, and places known to be frequented by criminals. Interviews may provide extremely useful information that often results in identification and apprehension of the suspect. Success of an interview often depends on the

verbal communication skills of the detective. The skilled investigator is also aware that victims and witnesses must not be unnecessarily inconvenienced. An officer ought to display genuine sensitivity and concern throughout the evidence gathering process. For example, repetitive questioning by different officers may be counterproductive and is unnecessary if information from the initial interview has been well documented. Victims and witnesses are more satisfied with the criminal justice system if they are informed of the progress and outcome of the case and if they are compensated for lost time. The capacity to communicate effectively is a prerequisite for interviewing and interrogating. It is also essential for sharing information with other officers and for developing informants.

Proficiency in writing is valuable for managing investigations. Written reports are utilized at every stage of the criminal justice process from initial incident through trial. Often they are the primary source of information available for case processing. Officers and prosecutors managing the investigation may rely heavily on written reports. Studies have shown that favorable outcomes of investigations are dependent on detectives' preparing legible, concise, accurate, comprehensible, and complete reports.

Investigators must be able to anticipate the later stages of each case including evidence needed to convict the suspect. This requires careful and competent case preparation from the moment the offense was reported to the final disposition. Information concerning rules of evidence, requirements for search and seizure, and knowledge of the information requirements at each stage of the criminal justice process is vital for reaching a satisfying judicial outcome.

An investigator should conduct crime pattern analysis utilizing information gathered from all available sources. At this stage of the investigation the officer attempts to identify a *modus operandi* and crime patterns which will be useful for identifying suspects and for clearing other related cases.

Field Operations

Investigators must demonstrate proven ability in field operations such as patrol and stakeout. They may sometimes perform undercover operations to acquire information on illegal activities including fencing operations, drug dealing, and corruption. These activities may require an investigator to know how to operate complicated electronic surveillance equipment. Knowledge, stamina, and willingness to work long hours are also important attributes for conducting field operations.

Arrests, Prosecutions, Convictions

Arresting is a significant objective for all police officers, but more so for detectives because they spend substantial time gathering information on serious crimes that leads to the apprehension of the offender. Thus quality of arrests is an important consideration, since an officer who makes a large number of poorly prepared arrests is not a good candidate to be a detective. Part of the assessment for each arrest is its contribution to crime reduction and diminution of citizen fear. These factors clearly influence the victim's opinion of how the case was managed and in turn effect general community perceptions of the police. But a major purpose of an arrest is to obtain a conviction. Therefore the quality and number of prosecutions and convictions are critical elements for assessing the performance of investigators.

Objective Data Found in Personnel Records

Daily professional work behavior is essential for effective police performance. It provides a long term overview of each officer's performance, and it is reflected by objective measures routinely assembled, including absenteeism, complaints, and awards. These factors are merely indicators of typical behaviors, including punctuality, safe driving, courteousness, relying only on necessary force, restraint in using weapons, physical fitness and constantly pursuing excellence in all functions related to law enforcement, order maintenance, and the provision of services.

Subjective Traits

Virtually every law enforcement agency has developed a mechanism for measuring subjective traits that identify the range of effectiveness among officers. A supervisory performance appraisal system usually is implemented for this purpose. Traits include motivation, stability, street knowledge, persistence, intelligence, perseverance, integrity, intuition, judgment, teamwork, reliability, involvement, and dedication. Motivation has been widely perceived as one of the most crucial traits for effective investigative work.[1] Motivated officers are interested and take pride in their work, make the extra effort to solve crimes, and tend to derive satisfaction from doing their best.

Qualifications

Many departments require specified levels of experience and education for investigative work. Criteria may encompass several years on the force, varied assignments that include investigations, and at least a year of college. These qualifications are logically and empirically related to overall superior police performance, specifically to investigative performance.

Characteristics that Predict Good Performance

Roe and Roe[2] compiled a comprehensive summary of selection validity studies focusing on factors that predicted future police performance. They classified these factors into some 50 categories, including I.Q. tests, civil service examinations, background, oral interviews, and verbal abilities.

We reorganized and reanalyzed the Roes' findings, stressing predictive elements and performance criteria relevant for investigators.[3] We omitted relationships between personal characteristics and performance in the police academy and in other instances where the information is not relevant for the selection of detectives. And we retained only those predictors that were determined valid in two or more studies; thus each factor reported here has been cross-validated by at least one other study. The aim of this reanalysis is to identify tests or factors utilized for the selection of police officers that might also be applied in the investigator selection process. By knowing the kinds of behaviors and capabilities that are desirable for investigators, we can then see the appropriate tests for predicting good performance in these areas.

Cognitive Tests Such as Civil Service Examinations

The data in Table 3 present factors that successfully predicted police performance. The most striking finding is that written civil service examinations best predicted arrest activity and investigative skills, including gathering evidence and crime scene management.[4] These behaviors are crucial for the successful performance of investigative functions. The civil service examination was also associated with higher supervisory ratings and career advancement, indicating that those who score high on the entrance exam tend to repeat this performance on exams for promotion. The civil service tests are designed to measure cognitive abilities or the capacity to know, perceive, and think. These traits lead in turn, to creativity, abstract reasoning, memory, and intelligence, all of which are considered vital for recreating crime scenes, pursuing crime leads, and organizing crime information logically and clearly.[5]

Few departments utilize written cognitive tests for detective selection, although these instruments appear to have real potential. The analysis suggests that a test be developed specifically for measuring intellectual functioning, inductive reasoning and comprehension, even if it is not governed by civil service. Flexibility in detective selection is a tradition in American law enforcement; civil service control over the test process might be considered an unwelcome trend toward developing an unnecessarily rigid system. Rather, the type and form of cognition test ought to be left to the discretion of each agency.

Table 3
Validated Predictors of Police Performance

Favorable Performance Measures	Performance Tests
*Arrests	Civil Service Exam
*Investigation skills	Civil Service Exam Verbal Ability
*Communication Ability	Civil Service Exam
*Supervisory Rating	Civil Service Exam Verbal Ability Education Academy Performance Oral Interviews Prior Work Experience Age I.Q.
Civil Service Advancement	Education Civil Service Exam Academy Performance Early Family Responsibility
Tenure	Married
Unfavorable Performance Measures	
Disciplinary Charges	Prior Work Discipline Unsatisfactory Probation Low Education
Assaulted	Short Officers
Resignation	Education Single

* Asterisk indicates a trait considered important for performance as a detective or investigator.

Tests of verbal ability, which are often components of civil service examinations, constituted the only other factor that predicts a capability crucial for the detective role — communicating information well. Verbal ability was also correlated with higher supervisory ratings. These kinds of tests could be adapted for the detective function and administered in conjunction with other tests that determine the level of cognitive skills.

Disciplinary Actions

Misconduct on previous jobs was predictive of later disciplinary complaints. An officer who had disciplinary problems prior to joining a police agency or as a probationary police officer or afterward was likely to receive complaints as a detective. Also, our data indicate that officers with less formal education received more disciplinary charges than officers with more formal education. These complaints were found to be initiated mostly by civilians, suggesting strongly that higher education contributes to better relations with the public.[6] Education was also associated with better supervisory ratings and more rapid advancement through civil service ranks. It tends to diminish authoritarianism, broaden one's perspective, instill self-discipline, and increase reasoned thinking.[7]

Height

Patrol officers, male or female, who are short in stature are more likely to be assaulted than tall officers (Table 3). But it does not seem likely to us that officers short in stature who perform investigative functions would be assaulted more often than their taller counterparts. In fact, short stature might be an added advantage in detective work, not only for undercover operations but for routine investigative functions such as interviewing because the specter of authoritarianism is diminished. No other physical characteristic, e.g., strength, agility, speed, etc. passed the standards of validation required by the present report, and they ought not be utilized for detective selection.

Several other test factors predicted above average supervisory ratings in addition to civil service examinations, verbal ability and education. These included superior performance while in the police academy, oral interviews, prior work experience, numerical ability, I.Q. and age. These nine predictors probably reflect intelligence, knowledge, ability to articulate, and experience; traits visible to supervisors.

The data in Table 3 also show that academy performance and early family responsibility were predictive of advancement in rank. This means that test taking ability in the police academy is a predictor of later successful test taking. Also, officers with young children are more likely to concentrate on promotion because they need extra pay to support their families. Married

officers were more likely than their single and more educated counterparts to remain on the force perhaps because of family needs. Single and more educated individuals also tend to be highly mobile.

On balance, our reanalysis of validity studies concerning police selection suggests that a meaningful detective selection process should incorporate a test to measure cognitive capacity and include screening procedures for identifying officers with positive employment histories and at least some college. A single selection process for males and females and for members of minority groups should be developed because test factors shown to be valid in predicting police performance were not substantially different for officers of varying race or gender.

Notes

1. Rossman, Henry, *Qualities of Investigative Officers*, Unpublished Manuscript, 1985.
2. Roe, Allan V., and Roe, Norma, *Police Selection: A Technical Summary of Validity Studies*, Utah: Diagnostic Specialists Inc., 1982.
3. We have not included information about test factors and performance measures that resulted in ambiguous or conflicting findings in different studies. Personality and interest tests, including the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), The California Personality Inventory, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the Rorschach test, fell into this category. These tests are useful for screening extreme cases, but not for the vast majority of police candidates.
4. In addition, stand-alone cognitive tests are available, such as the Army General Classification Test and the Nelson-Denny Reading Test.
5. Hancock, Barry W., and McClung, Curtis, "Abstract-Cognitive Abilities in Police Selection and Organization," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1984, pp. 99-104; Dorfman, Dolores, and Zeins, Wallace W., "Selection and Training of Undercover Personnel," *Law and Order*, Vol. 31, No. 9, September, 1983, pp. 53-57.
6. Cohen, Bernard, and Chaiken, Jan M., *Police Background Characteristics and Performance*, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1973.
7. Dorfman and Zeins, op. cit.

Chapter Four

Detective Selection Techniques

In addition to the cognitive tests discussed in Chapter Three, methods for measuring the behaviors, outcomes, and traits essential for effective detective performance include behaviorally anchored scales, peer assessment, peer review, assessment centers, personal interviews, arrest convictability, and expected case outcomes. Each method is described here to a sufficient degree that you will know whether you want to obtain further details for implementation by consulting the references given in the footnotes.

Behaviorally Anchored Scales

Virtually every police agency utilizes a subjective supervisory rating system to supplement objective or countable measures of performance like test scores, awards, arrests, complaints, and absenteeism. Supervisory ratings measure key traits or general performance dimensions such as motivation, articulation, teamwork, or dedication.

Typically, a supervisor is required to rate a subordinate on several abstract dimensions using a numerical scale, frequently from 1 to 5. An alternative approach is for the supervisor to compare each subordinate with all the others — a technique known as paired comparisons.[1] A major problem for agencies utilizing either of these methods is that the rating levels have varying meanings for different supervisors. Even common words like "poor," "average," and "superior" may be interpreted in many different ways. Associating numbers with these measurement words offer little guidance, because individuals still perceive differently distances between numbers and words.

One solution is to break down general judgmental concepts into concrete behaviors to aid the rater in targeting what must be measured. Concrete behaviors provide conceptual anchors for the more generalized dimension. This method, often referred to as behaviorally anchored scales (BAS), is superior to conventional judgmental scales, because concrete behaviors define and standardize the general trait.

Suppose teamwork is the trait to be measured. Table 4 presents a definition of "teamwork," but it also provides several concrete examples that illustrate the meaning of various points on the scale. The rater can immediately decide that the ratee is either poor, average, or superior in "teamwork" by comparing his or her actual behavior with behavioral anchors on the scale. This concrete scale is superior to the "old fashioned" abstract rating scales utilized by many law enforcement agencies.

The main drawback of behaviorally anchored scales is that they are difficult to develop. The anchors are derived from a complicated task analysis requiring several steps.[2] These include:

- Experts familiar with the investigative role develop critical incidents which reflect specific examples of on-the-job behaviors. They also define high, average, and low performance. *Performance dimensions* are inferred and developed from the critical incidents and they are grouped into categories.
- Another group of job experts provide concrete *behavioral examples* of each performance dimension.
- A third group is presented with a randomized list of the behavioral examples and performance dimensions and *retranslates* and reinterprets them. Only those behavioral and performance dimensions which display high agreement, e.g., 70 percent of the classifiers, are retained.
- Another group familiar with the job constructs a *scale* which includes only those behavioral measures that are reliable.
- The final behaviorally anchored scale is developed from *items* that survive routine statistical tests of validity and concurrence.

Behaviorally anchored scales tend to be more reliable and valid than simple "traditional" supervisory rating systems and should be utilized by law enforcement agencies for assessing subjective traits. Rating scores based upon *future potential* in the new position are more pertinent than the appraisals of performance in the current job.

Table 4
Behaviorally Anchored Scale

Teamwork: The capacity to work and cooperate with fellow officers; accepts and gives constructive criticism; shares knowledge and crime information with peers.

Poor	Average	Superior
◦ Is a loner.	◦ Is friendly and supportive of other officers.	◦ Encourages other officers to participate in police work.
◦ Rarely shares significant crime information with peers.	◦ Is willing to be a team player.	◦ Always shares significant crime information with other officers.
◦ Always tries to take credit for a team arrest.	◦ Periodically shares some crime information.	◦ Is cooperative and supportive.
◦ Is disruptive and uncooperative with other officers.		

Peer Assessment

Peer assessment usually involves three separate measurement techniques: *peer nominations*, in which a detective nominates several detectives who are believed to be the most effective performers in a specified performance area; *peer ranking*, where a detective rank orders his colleagues on a certain dimension of performance; and *peer ratings* in which the investigator rates all other members of the unit using a rating scale, e.g., from one to five.[3] One argument for these forms of assessment is that peers often are in the best position to observe and judge significant aspects of performance. This is because much investigative work is highly mobile, and involves field work

which is geographically dispersed and out of sight of the supervisor. Detectives probably have the best sense of how adept fellow investigators are in interviewing witnesses and victims, interrogating suspects, gathering evidence, and preparing cases for prosecution. Also, they often share keen insights on mutual levels of motivations.

One important study of a police department found that peer assessment provided accurate and consistent performance appraisals and that friendship did not interfere with the process of evaluation.[4] Other studies have shown that peer nominations produce the most reliable results, that peer ratings are most useful for modification or correction of behavior, and that peer rankings are the most discerning.[5] An example of the instruction sheet for a peer ranking form, from the Fremont, California, Police Department, is given in Appendix A.

Peer assessment has diminished value in departments where levels of trust, honesty, and openness are low, and competition among fellow officers is extremely intense. In these situations officers may resent rating their peers, and reliable and valid assessments are highly improbable. Agencies that rely on peer evaluations must ensure that peer raters perceive the method as useful and that their judgments are free from prejudice and bias. Detective supervisors interviewed for this study in some agencies also claimed that nonsupervisory police officers are unaccustomed to making judgments about the quality of their fellow officers' performance, because they have no responsibility for personnel assignments. Thus the results of peer assessment are claimed to be not useful when supervisory sergeants or lieutenants are already familiar with the work product of the detectives under their command. Some interviewees also claimed that peer assessments constituted an invitation to dishonesty and officers' trading favors among each other. One said, "peer nomination is a political, social, popularity, and payoff contest."

Thus peer assessment may not be suitable in all agencies, although it has proved useful in many. It is only one form of appraising candidates utilizing the various measures described above. Behaviorally anchored scales could of course also be developed for similar purposes. The best strategy is to use several different methods suggested in this report, choosing ones that seem appropriate within the department's overall management style.

Peer Review

Peer review, in contrast to peer evaluation, involves a thorough review and check of work output by members in the same profession. This method has been applied in the medical profession to assess the performance of individual physicians. Physicians belonging to *Peer Review Organizations* or *PROs* evaluate the treatment that was provided to individual patients,

based on the information in hospital records.[6] In law enforcement agencies, peer review involves a complete review of the case file for a particular investigation, and perhaps even a debriefing of the investigators involved, with the objective of making judgments on the extent to which each investigator contributed to the solution of the case and the apprehension of the offender,[7] and determining areas where investigative performance could have been improved. The case review can be undertaken by detectives having the same rank as the investigators being evaluated, by supervising officers, or by a combination of officers of different ranks. Peer review is particularly useful where officers spend time in the field conducting investigations. Police peer review focuses on work productivity and output, but it also includes a built-in mechanism for providing feedback to improve behavior. This method works best when applied frequently and when feedback to correct deficiencies occurs immediately.[8] Evidently peer review is more pertinent for promoting or reassigning detectives than it is for selecting detectives from inexperienced candidates. In addition, the process can be designed so that effective reviewers also receive credit for their work.

Peer review has been shown to be effective for improving writing skills. This is particularly relevant for investigative work because written reports are crucial for successful prosecution. Several techniques for peer review have been formulated utilizing information on crime scenes, suspects, victims, witnesses, evidence, and relations with citizens and the community.[9] One representative method involved a system of peer review for the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Force.[10] Interviews were conducted with detectives and prosecutors to determine the key components of reports crucial for follow-up investigations and prosecution. The key items included information on identification of victims, crime classification, description of suspects, statements by witnesses, and a narrative of the incident. A report writing manual was distributed to all program participants. The report checklist is presented in Table 5.

Each day two reports covering incidents in each police district were randomly selected and evaluated by sergeants who provided corrective feedback. After two months, lieutenants reevaluated one report from each sergeant and offered their own feedback. The supervisors identified errors and items that were incomplete, missing, and illegible. Also, they noted each item on the checklist that was correctly entered. Each report was given a score based upon the total number of correct items. Sergeants were required to meet with all officers, commend those with accurate reports and have the other officers correct or rewrite the faulty reports.

Overall, the peer review program resulted in improved report writing with substantially lower error rates. The number of reports containing three or more errors was reduced from 94 percent to 12 percent. The peer review

Table 5
General Report Checklist

1. Victim: Name (person or business), business phone, temporary address, one victim per report, if incident reported by person other than victim then give Position or relationship of person reporting (owner, clerk, neighbor, friend, etc.).
2. Location of Incident: Street name and number is best, if intersection then describe which corner.
3. Offense and Classification.
4. Date/Time occurred: Two times (and dates) unless suspect was seen by victim or witness.
5. Loss Value: Some estimate of the value of property taken.
6. Suspect(s): Description, Field Description Report, who gave description, why suspect is a suspect, whether person who gave description has seen suspect before, whether person who gave description can identify suspect again.
7. Witnesses: Exactly where officers looked for witnesses, what witnesses saw and heard.
8. Point of Entry: Point of entry, point of exit, exact description of force used (broken window, kicked door in, no signs of force, etc.), if no sign of force then whether structure was secured, if no sign of force then who has access to structure.
9. Serial Numbers: Record the serial number or identifying marks for each item taken.
10. Victim's Actions: What the victim was doing before, during and after the crime up until the time the police were called.
11. Suspect's Actions: What the suspect did before, during and after the crime up until the time the police were called.
12. Condition of Victim: Describe injuries, damages to clothing, sobriety, willingness to prosecute.
13. Officer's Investigation: Physical evidence found by officer including signs of forced entry, ransacking, footprints, bloodstains, etc.
14. Other Units Summoned: Tell whether ID called to scene and why or why not.
15. Status: Box checked, if cleared or unfounded then state why.

16. Reporting Officer: Name of officer who wrote report in box, name of other officer(s) present in narrative.

Source: Carr, Adam F., Schnell, John F., Kirchner, Robert E., Larson, Lynn D., and Risley, Todd R., "Effective Police Field Supervision: A Report Writing Evaluation Program," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* Vol. 8, No. 2, 1980, pp. 212-219.

program also induced officers to conduct more thorough preliminary investigations, confirming that close supervision of written work products also provides control over field behavior.

The peer review process could be targeted on cases that are rejected by the prosecutor because of faulty report preparation or for any other "police reason." A study on case attrition has shown that the two most frequent determinants of case rejection by the prosecutor were poor management of evidence and problems with witnesses.[11] These two factors accounted for over 50 percent of case attrition in eight of eleven jurisdictions. The Metropolitan Police Department in Washington D.C. also undertook peer review of all arrests before presenting them to the prosecutor.[12] This procedure ensured that the crime charged was adequately described and that all forms and papers were properly filled out. Cases rejected by the peer review board were reviewed in order to promote feedback to the arresting officer. Overall, the rate of arrests rejected by the prosecutor declined.

As with peer assessment, peer review has its strong detractors. Supervisors of detectives who closely monitor the activities of the officers in their command claim that peer reviews do not add to their knowledge of the performance of their detectives, and they take up a great deal of time and produce additional unnecessary paperwork. This argument is probably correct in small departments and in departments that have very slow turnover in their detective divisions. The advantages of peer review are much more apparent in large, impersonal departments, or where detective supervisors are often rotated or reassigned to other geographical commands. In those situations the peer review files permit fair evaluation of the detectives in their previous commands, and the gradually accumulating personnel records of the detectives provide a good substitute for personal knowledge that supervisors have in smaller agencies.

Assessment Center

An assessment center is not a place but a procedure. It utilizes several appraisal methods administered during a period of one to three days.[13] The

people who participate as assessors receive extensive training on how to conduct proper evaluations of the candidates. Their judgments are based on various situational exercises, which might include leaderless group discussions, writing exercises, and role-playing where participants pose as subordinates, peers, and supervisors of the officers being evaluated. These exercises are intended to be simulations of events that candidates would actually face in their new jobs, so that relevant behavioral responses are being observed by the assessors. Additionally, in some assessment centers, one or two personality tests may be administered.[14]

Many police agencies have used assessment centers to select chiefs, upper-level executives, and mid-level managers. Assessment centers are introduced into these selection procedures because paper-and-pencil tests or oral interviews do not measure many important dimensions related to job performance of managers.[15]

An assessment center can potentially be an especially useful tool for selecting and promoting detectives because it identifies behavioral dimensions that are known to be desirable in detectives, including oral and written communication skills, self control, motivation, persuasiveness, analytical ability, resistance to stress, decision-making capacity, and planning.[16] The Minneapolis Police Department has used an assessment center structured exclusively for detectives. Candidates participated in a multi-part exercise that simulated a homicide investigation. They were required to investigate the scene of a crime, interview witnesses, interrogate suspects, write reports, and prepare the case for trial.[17]

Assessment centers are also useful for advancing detectives to higher pay levels, and candidates for detective supervisory positions can be tested in this way for leadership potential. The Minneapolis assessment center included a written exercise in which candidates had to decide the appropriate action in response to difficult hypothetical situations. It also included an exercise for detective trainers which required candidates to draft proposals for an hour-long training program. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's assessment center for promotion to supervisory or managerial positions is called the Management Aptitude Program (MAP). A complete description of this program is found in Appendix B.

Assessment centers have many advantages. First, job simulations evaluate skills that are difficult to observe.[18] Second, substantial data may be gathered in a short time period.[19] Assessment centers have been praised for matching the individual to the position and meeting EEOC standards more than other conventional forms of employee selection procedures.[20]

Yet, assessment centers also have significant flaws. First and foremost, they are expensive. Additionally, critics argue that this technique has yet to

be proven more valid than paper-and-pencil tests, employee performance ratings, panel interviews, and psychological profiles.[21] All supervisors know that some police officers have good test-taking abilities and yet are not good performers; whether assessment centers really identify characteristics beyond good test-taking is open to question.

In substance, assessment centers may not be suitable for every police department, even though their cost is small compared to the consequences of selecting or promoting ineffective detectives. A consortium of local police departments could be served by a single assessment center, thus reducing overall costs.[22]

Personal Interviews

Many police agencies conduct personal interviews as part of the detective selection process. Interviewers range from individual supervisors to boards or panels consisting of law enforcement practitioners, personnel selection professionals, and community members. Some employ highly structured sessions where the questions are standardized for fairness and impartiality. Others record interview results on standardized forms, employ uniform rating scales, and strive to achieve agreement among raters for the same response.[23] On the other hand, many departments implement unstructured interviews where the interviewers may raise any questions perceived useful and candidates are free to express thoughts that might place them in a favorable light.

Evidence concerning the validity of various forms of personal interviews is conflicting. A department ought to select the interview style most consistent with its overall objectives.

Arrest Quality

Although arrests are widely recognized as an important work product of investigators, many departments avoid using arrest statistics to evaluate investigators or candidates for investigative positions because some officers with high arrest activity also make low-quality arrests. But Forst's research[24] on assessing outcomes essential for effective police work shows how to combine information about convictions with arrest statistics, yielding more meaningful and valid evaluation data. His procedure can be easily adapted to selecting and promoting investigators, even though the research focused primarily on the performance of patrol officers.

Forst analyzed data from seven police agencies and found that *arrest convictability*, when properly monitored and measured, was a useful technique for assessing the performance of police. He then showed that few

agencies actually formulated measures or even possessed procedures for systematically gathering data for assessing arrest convictability. Forst recognized that the number of arrests alone is a perfunctory indicator of police effectiveness if information about the quality of the arrests is not collected. Also, many times *not* making an arrest but taking an alternative action is wiser, like providing instructions to a juvenile or defusing a highly volatile situation. An officer pursuing this alternative approach would obviously suffer if arrests alone are considered an important indicator of effective police performance.

Forst proposed two measures of productivity; the *number of convictions* and the *conviction rate*. The number of convictions refers to the total number of convictions obtained regardless of the number of arrests. It is one measure of the volume of activity for each officer, and is indicative of an officer's ability to make arrests that end in conviction. This simple productivity measure reflects the *quantitative* dimension of arresting. The conviction rate, on the other hand, reflects the *quality* of the officer's actions. It is obtained by dividing the total number of arrests ending in conviction by the total number of arrests, or:

$$\text{Conviction Rate} = \frac{\text{Arrests Ending in Conviction}}{\text{Total Arrests}}.$$

The conviction rate is a measure of an officer's awareness of responsibility for preparing cases against arrestees so they can be successfully prosecuted, and for *not* making unwarranted arrests. In this sense it reflects the *qualitative* aspects of arrests.

Forst documented a fascinating pattern among police officers for the seven cities he studied. A small group of officers accounted for the majority of arrests that resulted in conviction; and they also displayed the highest number and rate of convictions. In Los Angeles, for example, 19 percent of the officers accounted for half the arrests that ended in conviction; in Manhattan, 8 percent of the officers made 50 percent of the arrests resulting in conviction. In all seven jurisdictions covered by the study, 12 percent of the 10,200 officers studied were responsible for more than half of all convictions, while 22 percent effected not a single arrest that ended in conviction during the study period.

An examination of several background characteristics, including age, sex, education, rank, time on the job, and marital status did not differentiate the officers with high arrest productivity. Different assignments might have accounted for some variation, but this factor was not examined in detail. The arrest mix for each officer was controlled, but more precision in

controlling for officer assignments would enhance the usefulness of the arrest convictability measure. Through data analysis, selected interviews, and questionnaires distributed to a sample of those officers with high and low arrest rates leading to conviction, Forst uncovered three main factors that best explained variation in these patterns. Officers with high rates of conviction responded more rapidly to calls for service, appeared to manage more effectively the immediate crime scene, and were more adept at locating, questioning and managing witnesses. Apparently, officers with high rates of conviction recognized the importance of avoiding delay in arriving at the scene of a crime or the location of a suspect. The research found that arrests made within 5 minutes of the crime, or at least within the first half-hour, were more likely to result in conviction.

Officers with high rates of conviction exerted substantial effort to pursue, recover, and preserve tangible evidence at the scene of the crime. They also searched the surrounding area and followed-up all leads. These same officers appeared to possess more knowledge concerning procedures and techniques for obtaining evidence. Officers exhibiting high rates of arrest ending in convictions immediately canvassed the neighborhood and expended more effort in locating witnesses. Often they sought multiple witnesses who either observed or knew about the crime. They attempted to create an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual support, while at the same time, displaying care, concern and sensitivity for their special problems. Moreover, they continued to maintain contact with the witnesses throughout the investigation. Finally, officers with high rates of conviction displayed superior techniques of interviewing and interrogation utilizing questions directly related to the investigation rather than psychological techniques. Overall, officers displaying high rates of conviction appeared highly motivated, knowledgeable, confident, and persistent. Yet, in spite of these characteristics and higher rates of convictions, both they and their counterparts exhibiting lower conviction rates received similar evaluations and commendations.

Conviction rates and number of convictions ought to be carefully considered when selecting patrol officers for investigative work or for promoting detectives. Also, work behaviors including rapid response, crime scene management, and handling witnesses should be carefully assessed during the selection process.

Expected Case Outcomes

In 1983, John Eck published a two-year study of criminal investigations of burglary and robbery in DeKalb County, Georgia; St. Petersburg, Florida; and Wichita, Kansas, under the auspices of the Police Executive Research Forum. As part of this study, he formulated an evaluation system for selection

and advancement of detectives based on a series of probabilities that a particular case with a specified "difficulty score" would result in positive outcomes, including arrest, prosecution, and conviction. In common with other studies of the criminal investigation process,[25] Eck found that cases most likely to be solved were those in which substantial information was provided by the patrol officer who had conducted the preliminary investigation. Conversely, the probability of a solution decreased as less information was provided in the preliminary report.

The probability that a case will be solved can be determined from the level of information derived from the preliminary investigation. This can be accomplished by examining different case reports with varying difficulty levels and determining the percentage of like cases that have been solved. The different gradations of "solvability" include "suspect identified," "warrant issued," "suspect arrested," "case not accepted by prosecutor," "case accepted by prosecutor," and "conviction."

A department should be able to calculate its own unique "expected case outcomes" based on solvability. (How to do so is explained by Eck in his 1979 publication.) But if it chooses not to undertake the analysis needed to perform these calculations, it can alternatively use a model developed by the Stanford Research Institute (SRI). The SRI "solvability" model has been tested widely and is easily implemented.[26] Sample results of the SRI case screening model are presented in Table 6. It contains the percent of cases that will lead to arrest, based on a particular case difficulty score arrived at by examining the amount of information in the preliminary investigation report.[27] Suppose, for example, the preliminary investigation report contains virtually no information. The case then is scored "0". The chances of making an arrest are very small in such cases — only 5.7 percent. On the other hand, when the preliminary investigation report contains substantial information, the case score jumps to 24, with an attendant probability of arrest of 48.5 percent.

Expected case outcomes can be used to evaluate the performance of individual investigators, as illustrated in Table 7. Suppose a detective is assigned nine cases with "difficulty" case scores of 7, 10, 18, 18, 22, 27, 27, 28, and 29. Applying the percentage shown in each line of Table 7 to the number of cases assigned yields the expected number of arrests in the column on the right. (These are not rounded off, because they must be added together first.) The total expected number of arrests for the nine cases is 3.093. In other words, the investigator would be expected to solve three of the nine cases by arrest, even though we can't say exactly which three. An officer who apprehended the perpetrator in six of the nine cases would exhibit an arrest rate twice as high as expected. An investigator with only one arrest would have an arrest rate below the expected level.[28]

Table 6
Chances that a Case with a Given Score Will Result in an Arrest

Case Score	Percent leading to Arrest
0	5.7
1	6.4
2	7.1
3	7.9
4	8.8
5	9.7
6	10.8
7	11.9
8	13.2
9	14.5
10	16.0
11	17.6
12	19.3
13	21.2
14	23.1
15	25.2
16	27.4
17	29.8
18	32.2
19	34.7
20	37.4
21	40.1
22	42.8
23	45.6
24	48.5
25	51.3
26	54.2
27	57.0
28	59.7
29	62.5

Source: Eck, John E. *Managing Case Assignments: The Burglary Investigation Decision Model Replication,* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1979.

Table 7
Example Calculation of Expected Number of Arrests

Case Score	Number of Assigned Cases	Percent Leading to Arrest	Expected Number of Arrests
7	1	11.9	.119
10	1	16.0	.160
18	2	32.2	.644
22	1	42.8	.428
27	2	57.0	1.140
28	1	59.7	.597
29	1	62.5	.625
	Total: 9		Total: 3.093

This method controls for the large variety of cases of varying degrees of complexity and difficulty. Deviations from the expected solvability levels indicate how well or how poorly detectives are performing, taking into account the difficulty of the caseloads they are assigned. A detective with a comparatively easy caseload will not receive an artificially high performance evaluation. At the same time a detective with a difficult series of cases will not be underrated because of few arrests. A similar method can also be developed to determine probabilities for expected prosecutions and convictions. Investigators could then be evaluated and compared on these criteria as well. The performance of investigators ultimately must be linked to convictions.

The research by Eck and Forst suggests concrete outcome measures for assessing individual performance, including arrests, prosecutions, and convictions. Unfortunately, using these procedures can provide disincentives for individual investigators to cooperate and share information. This disadvantage can be partly remedied by providing incentives to work as a team. Tangible rewards and/or credit could be given to officers who cooperate with colleagues by providing information leading to an arrest. Peer review, discussed previously, is a useful technique for this purpose.

Emphasis on productivity should not preclude other important measures of performance. Observers of the investigative process agree that detectives

must also be evaluated based upon their treatment of victims, witnesses, suspects, and the public and by their willingness to abide by legal constraints. Citizen dissatisfaction may result even when a suspect is arrested if, during the process, innocent people are mistreated. On the other hand, the police may be viewed with great satisfaction in situations that did not result in an arrest but the investigator displayed sensitivity and concern. One way to measure citizen satisfaction is to provide victims with a postcard containing entries that assess the investigator's attitude, behavior, and overall performance.

Promotion

The position of detective is almost universally perceived as an advancement, even though it may involve only a lateral move without higher compensation. Working in plainclothes, concentrating on law enforcement, greater independence, and enhanced prestige make "detective" a coveted position. Other promotions in investigation include *detective-trainer*, whose main function is to instruct, supervise, and evaluate detective candidates while in training; *upper-grade detectives*, who are assigned the "heavy" cases; and *detective supervisors*, who are in charge of a squad of detectives. In many departments, the position of detective supervisor is governed by civil service.

The selection techniques described in this section apply not only to detective, but also to each of the foregoing promotions. *Upper-grade detectives* usually conduct similar work to that of detectives. The main difference between these two positions may be higher pay, increased prestige, and greater independence. The key for selecting upper-grade detectives is to ensure that they have exhibited superior performance as investigators. Behaviorally anchored rating scales, peer evaluations, peer review, and quantitative measures of arrest quality are ideal for this purpose. Rates of conviction and expected case outcomes are particularly important in promotion decisions, because investigators ought to be judged and promoted on the basis of their demonstrated past performance.

The main traits or qualities sought in a *detective-trainer*, aside from routine excellence, include humanism, tolerance, and a capacity to instruct and supervise detective candidates. Assessment centers are particularly useful for evaluating attitudes, perceptions, and knowledge-sharing among officers. Most techniques utilized for higher ranked detectives are also applicable for selection as detective-trainers.

A *detective supervisor* must have mastered each work dimension and job skill required by other detective ranks. Also, detective supervisors must display excellence in leadership and management. They must be intelligent and knowledgeable about every aspect of investigations. A written cognitive examination, in addition to the other techniques described in this section,

is useful for measuring these characteristics. However, jurisdictions will inevitably differ in judging whether or not this cognitive exercise should be governed by civil service regulations.

Detective Management Appraisal System

A selection procedure utilizing multiple evaluation instruments and scores derived from objective measures of past performance, such as awards, arrests resulting in convictions, absenteeism, complaints, and safety habits, generates substantial information which is extremely difficult to retrieve and digest. A workable selection system must have the capacity to compare each officer on various scores even though they consist of values of differing magnitude. One solution to these problems is a computer-based detective career-path appraisal system. This system automatically maintains up-to-date information on each officer's career assignments, rating scores, education, and other routine personnel measures, including absences, commendations, and notations for misconduct. These criteria can be converted to standardized scores (Z-scores) which permit simple comparison among performance measures of different magnitude.[29] This method was devised for captains and above in a large municipal police department and it is readily adaptable for selecting and promoting detectives.[30]

Detective Selection System: An Illustration

The Boulder Police Department in Colorado, provides an illustrative example of a well articulated detective selection system.[31] This system strives to achieve the main elements of an effective selection program, including equal access or opportunity, validity, job relatedness, utility, efficiency and a period of training and evaluation. The key aspects of the Boulder Police detective selection system are presented in Table 8.

A concise job description, precise qualifications, and exact deadlines for filing an application are publicized at briefings, on bulletin boards, and in the "Troop News" to ensure that each qualified officer has an equal opportunity to apply for the position. A master list of eligible applicants is drawn up; applicants termed ineligible are formally notified of the reasons for this action by the Detective Division Chief. Next, the Detective Division Chief appoints a Review Panel comprised of one detective and two officers at the rank of sergeant or above. This panel is responsible for two of the three main examination procedures. These include an oral interview covering previous training, experience, general knowledge of criminal statutes, and other job related factors, worth 35 points; and a presentation by the candidate on an assigned subject focusing on investigation, worth 40 points. An objective rating system devised for each part of the selection process must be approved by the Detective Division Chief. The Chief also is in charge of

Table 8
Detective Selection Process:
Boulder, Colorado Police Department

Eligibility

3 years as a patrol officer

Announcement

Job Description
Minimum Qualifications
Deadlines

Posting

Bulletin Boards
"Troop News"
Briefings

Master Applicant List

Eligible Applicants
Ineligible Applicants

Examination Procedures

Interview - 35 points
Presentation - 40 points
Personnel File Review - 25 points
(Sick leave - 5 points)
(Performance Evaluations - 15 points)
(Sustained Internal Affairs Investigations - 5 points)

Training and Evaluation Period

5 Weeks
Multiple Trainers

---

the personnel file review which consists of three components worth a total of 25 points. The first part assesses sick leave measured by standard deviations; for example less than average sick time would add up to 5 points to the officer's score. The second component includes combined scores on the two previous behaviorally anchored supervisory ratings, and is worth 15 points. These ratings are based on 10 items derived from a job/task analysis.

The items include investigative skills, report writing, interviewing, punctuality, street sense, criminal law, knowledge of referral agencies, ability to follow instructions, cooperation, and observance of work hours.

The final element of Boulder's examination procedure is a count of serious and nonserious sustained internal affairs investigations. A candidate receives a total of 5 points in the absence of complaints. But a specified number of points are lost for each serious and nonserious complaint so that this component can result in a minus value (subtracted from the overall examination score). For example, a candidate with one serious complaint is penalized five points whereas another candidate having one nonserious complaint loses 2.5 points. A candidate with one serious and nonserious complaint loses 7.5 points, for a score of -2.5. Finally, the Detective Division Chief also checks informally the candidates' court performance, including whether their arrests tended to end in conviction.

Training and Evaluation Program

The final phase of the Boulder Police Department detective selection process is a thoroughly thought out *training and evaluation program.* The detective *trainee* is instructed and supervised for a five-week period by several different detective *trainers* who receive extra compensation. The program objectives are guided by fairness, professionalism, thoroughness, and feedback. A carefully structured selection process for identifying the most capable detective trainers includes a detailed personnel application, an oral exam, a personnel file review, and a supervisor's recommendations. The selection ultimately is a group decision by the Detective Training and Evaluation Program Sergeant, Project Coordinator, and Division Chief. The selection process for detective trainer is designed to identify individuals who are highly motivated and humanistic, have excellent teaching and supervisory skills, are tolerant of minorities and women, and who have a positive perception and attitude toward the program and the detective training role.

Evaluation of detectives, once selected, is carried out using a behaviorally-anchored evaluation form, reproduced in Appendix C. It covers 24 different areas of performance, and gives specific examples of the types of behavior in each area that should be evaluated as below standard (rated 1), standard (rated 4), or above standard (rated 7).

Notes

1. Baehr, Melany, E., Furcon, John, E., and Froemel, Ernest, C., *Psychological Assessment of Patrolman Qualifications in Relation to Field Performance*, Chicago: The Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago, 1968.
2. King, Patricia, *Performance Planning and Appraisal: A How-To Book for Managers*, New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1984; Landy, Frank J., and Farr, James L., *The Measurement of Work Performance: Methods, Theory, and Applications*, New York: Academic Press, 1983.
3. Love, Kevin G., "Accurate Evaluation of Police Officer Performance Through the Judgment of Fellow Officers: Fact or Fiction?," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1981, pp. 143-149.
4. Ibid.
5. Kane, J.S., and Lawler, E.E., "Methods of Peer Assessment," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 85, No. 1, 1978, pp. 555-586.
6. Komaroff, Anthony L., "Quality Assurance in 1984," *Medical Care*, Vol. 23, No. 5, May 1985, pp. 723-734.
7. Pogrebin, Mark, "Some Observations of the Detective Role," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1976, pp. 277-284.
8. Carr, Adam F., Schnelle, John F., Kirchner, Robert E., Larson, Lynn D., and Risley, Todd R., "Effective Police Field Supervision: A Report Writing Evaluation Program," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1980, pp. 212-219.
9. Lawther, Wendell C., "Successful Training for Police Performance Evaluation Systems," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1984, pp. 41-46; Glick, Barry D., and Riccio, Lucius J. "Productivity of Detectives: A Study of the Investigative Function of Police Juvenile Units," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1979, pp. 138-154; Carr, et al, 1980, op. cit.
10. Carr, et al, 1980, op. cit.
11. Boland, B., *The Prosecution of Felony Arrests*, 1980, Washington D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1985.
12. Forst, Brian, Lucianovic, Judith, and Cox, Sarah J., *What Happens After Arrest?, Promis Research Project*, Washington D.C.: Institute for Law and Social Research, Vol. 4, August 1977.
13. Brown, Gary E., "What You Always Wanted to Know About Assessment Centers But Were Afraid to Ask," *The Police Chief*, Vol. 45 No. 6, June 1978, pp. 60-67.

14. Ross, Joyce D., "Determination of the Predictive Validity of the Assessment Center Approach to Selecting Police Managers," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1980, pp. 90-96.

15. Filer, Robert J., "The Assessment Center Method in the Selection of Law Enforcement Officers," *Police Selection and Evaluation: Issues and Techniques*, Charles D. Spielberger (ed.), Washington D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corp., 1979, pp. 211-228.

16. Brown, 1978, op. cit.

17. Dunnett, Marvin D., and Motowidlo, Stephan J., *Police Selection and Career Assessment*, Washington D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, November 1976.

18. Thornton, George C. III, and Byham, William C., *Assessment Centers and Managerial Performance*, New York: Academic Press, 1982.

19. Filer, 1979, op. cit.

20. Brown, 1978, op. cit.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. Anderson, Barbara E., and Flynn, John T., "Seven Deadly Sins in Personnel Assessment Strategies," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1983, pp. 4-7.

24. Forst, Brian, Leahy, Frank J. Jr., Shirhall, Jean, Tyson, Herbert L., and Bartolomeo, John, *Arrest Convictability as a Measure of Police Performance*, Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, July 1982; Forst, 1977, op. cit.

25. Greenwood, Peter W., Chaiken, Jan M., and Petersilia, Joan, *The Criminal Investigation Process*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1977.

26. Greenberg, Bernard, Oliver, S. Yu, and Lang, Karen, *Enhancement of the Investigative Function—Volume 4: Burglary Investigation Decision Model Replication*, Virginia: National Technical Information Service, 1973.

27. The calculation of the score for any particular investigative case is explained by the reports by Greenberg, 1973, op. cit., or Eck, John E., *Managing Case Assignments: The Burglary Investigation Decision Model Replication*, Washington D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1979.

28. Any law enforcement agency that applies the SRI method without calculating its own solvability scores should at least determine the correct "average" number of arrests applicable to the department. Otherwise officers could be judged "above average" (using the SRI scores) when in fact they might be below average in arrest rate compared to other officers in their own department.

29. For example, the raw scores for a supervisory rating might range from 1 to 5 while the scores on a cognitive exam may vary from zero to one hundred. A Z-score standardizes these values so that they are comparable and immediately comprehensible. Calculation of standardized scores (or Z-scores) involves a simple procedure which is discussed in any introductory statistics textbook.

30. Cohen, Bernard, "A Police Career Path Management Appraisal System," *The Police Chief*, Vol. 42, No. 3, March 1975, pp. 62-65.

31. This description is drawn from the following sources: Boulder Police Department General Order No. 380, *Selection for Detective Position*, Boulder, Colorado: 7/22/85; *Job/Task Analyses for the Ranks/Classifications of Police Officer and Detective in the Boulder, Colorado Police Department*, Personnel Performance Inc., Los Gatos, California: January 1984; *Boulder Police Department Evaluation Manual: Patrol Officer, Detective and Special Assignment*, Boulder, Colorado: December 1984.

Chapter Five

Legal Constraints on Selection

Law enforcement agencies have been the subject of much litigation pertaining to discriminatory hiring and promotion practices. Many lawsuits have been supported by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). In most cases, minority groups and women have been among the plaintiffs charging that various aspects of the selection and promotion procedures (e.g., the written examination, oral interview, background screening, or physical agility requirements) disproportionately prevented them from appointment and advancement.

Civil Service procedures for the positions of patrol officer, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain have been most targeted by these lawsuits. The more informal selection procedures for investigative assignments have to date been essentially insulated from litigation. One reason may be the informality and flexibility characterizing selection, assignment, and promotion procedures for investigators; these may already provide enhanced opportunity for women and minorities to be assigned to desirable investigative positions. Moreover, women and minorities often are considered essential for special assignments such as certain types of undercover work. Interviews with representatives of law enforcement agencies contacted for this study confirmed that women and members of minority groups tend to be over-represented in investigative and related assignments.

In prior years, lawsuits charging discrimination in the investigator selection process were settled by consent decrees, where the plaintiffs and defendants entered into a formal agreement approved by the Courts.

However, recently the power of Federal agencies to implement consent decrees was curtailed, requiring instead that litigation proceed through trial.[1] Therefore, the same issues involving litigation in police selection and promotion are now directly applicable to detectives. This section examines these major issues, including adverse impact, validity, job relatedness, gender, and age.

Adverse Impact

Selection procedures involving hiring, promotion, or any other employment opportunity that results in *adverse impact* on members of any race, sex, or ethnic group are considered discriminatory unless the procedure has been validated by rules published as EEOC guidelines.[2] If whites consistently pass a selection procedure at a specified higher rate than blacks, the employer must demonstrate that this procedure is job related and that it predicts job performance.

Adverse impact is operationally defined in EEOC guidelines by the 4/5th rule. It occurs when a selection procedure achieves a selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group that is less than four-fifths (or eighty percent) the rate for the group exhibiting the highest representation. Court interpretations of EEOC guidelines argue that the 4/5 rule is a generous one that ought not be diminished by lax judicial decisions. Under certain circumstances, even smaller differences may constitute adverse impact: for example if an agency discouraged applicants from certain race, sex, or ethnic groups from undergoing a selection procedure, or if smaller differences are nonetheless significant in practical or statistical terms.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in the landmark case *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*,[3] first defined adverse impact and established that discriminatory intent was not an essential ingredient. The plaintiffs challenged the job requirements of a high school diploma and passing intelligence tests as criteria for certain positions in the company. The court held these requirements had an adverse impact on the selection rate of blacks. They were deemed discriminatory even in the absence of discriminatory intent because the employer could not show how these requirements were job related. The Court concluded that in the presence of adverse impact, the burden of proof falls on the employer to demonstrate that the particular selection procedure is job related and predictive of later job performance.

In *Albermarle Paper Co. v. Moody,*[4] an ability test had disproportionately excluded blacks from desirable positions. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the paper company's employment test was neither job related nor valid. The Court delineated two additional key rules for cases involving disparate impact. First, the selection device that exhibits adverse

impact on a selected group must be job related or otherwise meet a business necessity. An implication of this ruling is that any unusual job-related specifications for a special assignment (e.g., height, weight, or language requirements) should be clearly justified in writing in the department's personnel files. Second, the Court ruled that even if the procedure is job related or otherwise meets a business necessity, other selection devices with less adverse impact must be sought or developed.

Precedents established in *Griggs* and *Albermarle* have influenced many lawsuits dealing with police selection procedures. For example, in *Brotherhood v. Omaha,*[5], the Court found that the city's selection procedures for police officers had an adverse impact on minority applicants even though discriminatory intent was not present. All applicants were required to pass a two-hour examination consisting of reading comprehension and writing skills. One hundred and eighty-four of 615 white candidates, or 30 percent, passed the preliminary tests, compared to 7 of 140 blacks, or 5 percent. This constituted an inclusion rate for blacks of only 17 percent of that of whites, which was substantially below the 80 percent rate established by the *Guidelines.* The Court calculated that at least 34 blacks instead of 7 would have had to pass the initial procedures to have an inclusion rate of at least 80 percent the rate for whites. The Court held that Omaha's selection procedures were discriminatory by applying the "four-fifths" rule, and it ordered the city to appoint 27 to 35 additional black applicants so that the inclusion rate would equal or surpass the 80 percent inclusion rate for whites.

A similar remedy was rendered in *Paradise v. Prescott*[6] ending a 12-year dispute over claims of discriminatory hiring practices by the Alabama Department of Public Safety. The Court observed that the promotion procedures employed by the defendants had an adverse impact on blacks. It ordered the state public safety department to promote one black trooper for each white appointee until the trooper force was 25 percent black or until a nondiscriminatory method of promotion was developed.

A recent change in the *EEOC Guidelines* involved the "bottom line" concept. In previous years, an employer was not expected to ensure that every individual component of the selection was free of adverse impact, so long as the "bottom line," i.e., overall procedure, resulted in no adverse impact. In *Connecticut v. Teal,*[7] however, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the defendants because certain parts of the examination had negatively impacted minority and female applicants. Many were excluded from promotion even though the overall effects of the procedures did not work against the selection rates for minorities and women. The Court concluded that the primary intention of Title VII is to safeguard the *individual* employee, not the minority or female group. Therefore, every component of a selection process must be proven by the employer to be job related, and the "bottom line" is not an adequate defense.

Validity

Validity determines how a selection process measures what it intends, namely the predictors' (test scores') relationships to a criterion (successful job performance). It is achieved when a selection procedure is proven to be related to job performance. Any examination that accurately measures skills needed "on the job" is considered nondiscriminatory and valid despite adverse impact.[8] Validity must always be proven; it cannot be established by the reputation of the examination, the author, or its publisher.

Predictive Validity

Various techniques for validation are available to determine whether or not a test measures job relevance. One method preferred by the EEOC is *predictive* or *criterion-related validity*. Evidence is gathered to demonstrate that the exam predicts future job performance. Criterion validity requires substantial time, because the scores from the selection procedures must be correlated with subsequent measures of job performance, often requiring several years of study.

Concurrent Validity

Concurrent validity also is criterion related, but the time between exposure to the proposed selection procedures and the criterion for rating police performance is virtually eliminated. Concurrent validity is based upon a comparison between a selection procedure and an established means for identifying the levels of job performance. Officers on the job may be classified according to varying levels of performance utilizing the current rating system. Next, these same officers are scored on the proposed selection procedures. Then these scores are correlated with the current performance appraisal system to determine the level of association. If high and low scores on the proposed selection procedures are associated with the performance ratings, the proposed procedures are validated.

The major difference between concurrent and predictive validities is that in the former the proposed selection procedures and the performance rating criterion are given at about the same point in time—concurrently. In predictive validity new job applicants are first exposed to the proposed test procedures. After substantial time, usually a period of several years, the scores on the proposed selection procedures are examined together with current on the job performance measures to determine the degree of correlation, i.e., predictive validity.

Predictive validity leads to greater confidence in selection procedures than does concurrent validity, because it determines the relationship between the proposed procedures and actual later job performance. In concurrent

validity, the officers who now score high or low on the selection tests and on the criterion may have scored differently at the time they were first recruited. Despite this objection, concurrent validity is favorably viewed as appropriate for validating selection procedures. When criterion validity is not feasible, other forms of validation may be implemented.

Content Validity

Content validity depends on how well items comprising a selection procedure logically represent actual work, skills, and abilities required by a particular job. The designer of a selection instrument might interview or distribute questionnaires to a group of employees, requesting them to describe their most important job tasks and skills. Then an examination is constructed based upon the responses, utilizing factors that intuitively appear job related. The major flaw in this form of validity is that the final test factors may be subjective.

Construct Validity

Another approach for demonstrating job relatedness is *construct validity*. This form of validity depends upon how well a test or procedure measures an identifiable characteristic essential for job performance. Suppose we wish to assess intelligence in selecting investigators. Intelligence is a multidimensional concept not represented by any single concrete dimension. Intelligence may include logical reasoning, digesting and organizing a large body of facts, perception, memorizing difficult materials, analyzing information, etc. Construct validity consists of defining intelligence, for example, as logical reasoning, and then developing concrete items that presumably measure this underlying construct.

The EEOC considers construct validity a suitable alternative to criterion-related validity, although some psychologists disagree. A precise definition of construct validity remains to be formulated.

Police departments have been wrangling with the issue of proper validation. In *Bigby v. City of Chicago*,[9] the Court determined that the city had not properly validated its lieutenant's exam through content validity. The exam was based upon responses to interviews and questionnaires by approximately 50 field lieutenants. The Court found the sample of lieutenants nonrepresentative, since only the "best men" completed the questionnaire. Furthermore, the city lacked proper documentation of its selection procedure — a critical component of a validity study. The city had neglected to keep records of the procedures and data for the interviews, copies of the questionnaires, and the written examinations. In addition, the Court found that the lieutenant's examination measured test-taking ability rather than skills

needed for successful job performance. Consequently, the Court ruled Chicago's promotion procedure discriminatory.

The Justice Department initiated a suit with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in June, 1985, over its examination for the Nassau County Police Department in New York State. The Justice Department accused ETS of fixing data to prove that its test exhibited criterion-related validity. ETS was also accused of overstating the evidence of the test's validity. At issue was a study which showed a correlation between high test scores and future successful job performance for state troopers. The study was conducted in St. Louis, El Paso, Los Angeles, and Maryland. The Justice Department insisted that ETS failed to report a negative correlation between the exam and future performance in Los Angeles.

Job Relatedness

A selection instrument or procedure is valid in the presence of evidence that it is *job-related.* A detailed review of the job must be undertaken to determine measures of work behavior or performance directly relevant to the job. Also, the final selection procedure must consist of a representative sample of the work tasks. If, for example, the selection procedure is aimed at measuring a skill or ability, it must contain items that are representative of that skill or ability. Additionally, it must be demonstrated that the skill or ability is a critical work element and a prerequisite to the performance of that job. Even weights assigned to various parts of a selection procedure must be based upon job relatedness.

In *Brotherhood v. Omaha,* it was established that test procedures measuring reading and writing skills had an adverse impact on black candidates. The job analysis was challenged because the critical police behaviors had not been derived by people thoroughly familiar with the police occupation. The readings were not representative of typical job encounters. Moreover, the exam appeared to measure reading speed and test taking rather than skills necessary for the performance of the police job. The Court recognized that reading comprehension and writing unquestionably were significant aspects for effective police performance. In this instance the questions were taken from the Omaha Police Department's standard operating procedure manual (*SOP*), yet knowledge of *SOP* by officers currently on the job was not associated with more effective police service.

In *Bigby v. City of Chicago,*[10] 41 black sergeants in the Chicago Police Department successfully challenged the exam for lieutenant, charging disparate impact. The Court ruled that the exam, including the oral interview, was not job related. Evidence showed that the behaviors were not representative of what lieutenants actually did, and that the department failed

to document the procedures for the job analysis. The Court also found that many performance raters did not attend training sessions on how to conduct interviews. Moreover, the raters asked questions which were different from the prepared interview guide. It was determined that several interviewers had consistently assigned lower grades tc blacks in favor of whites. The Court ruled the test discriminatory and invalid because of these problems.

Gender

Sexual discrimination cases involving law enforcement primarily are concerned with *physical agility tests* and *minimum physical requirements* like height and weight. Law enforcement agencies have relied on bona fide occupational qualifications (BFOQ) as a defense against these type of allegations. An employer may specifically hire an individual on the basis of religion, sex or ethnicity, provided that the particular characteristic is a genuine or bona fide qualification needed for normal operation of the employer's business. A religious school or college, for example, may require its religion instructors to profess the same faith as the school's.

In practice, EEOC has adhered to a strict and narrow interpretation of the bona fide occupational requirement. For example, an employer cannot arbitrarily classify a job that entails heavy lifting as a "man's job" and deny women employment for that position. This requirement is discriminatory because it does not differentiate among individual female applicants.[11] Police departments view physical stamina and agility bona fide occupational requirements because of the physical nature of police work. However, the degree of physical agility needed for successful job performance by police officers has been long contested.

In *Cohen v. West Haven Board of Police Commissioners*,[12] a female applicant claimed that the physical agility portion of the West Haven Police Department's entrance exam was sexually biased. Cohen failed the exam, making her ineligible for employment. The test consisted of several physical activities, including a grip test, ladder climbing, standing broad jumps, and a swim test. Testimony revealed that no woman had ever achieved a passing score of 500 points or had ever been added to the eligibility list of candidates for appointment as a supernumerary police officer. The Court, upon examination, discovered serious flaws in the test. The West Haven Police Department had failed to perform a job analysis to determine the level of physical agility required by officers on the job. Moreover, the agility test was developed 27 years prior to the litigation, with no allowances made for women. The Court concluded that the West Haven Police Department had failed to demonstrate "business necessity" for that specific physical fitness examination. It prohibited the department from using the test, ordering the development of a new examination.

The Court in *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission*[13] ruled that a physical agility test was sexually discriminatory. As in the Cohen case, the Court found that the physical agility test given by the San Francisco Police Department had adversely impacted upon women applicants, and that the department lacked evidence that the test was iob related. This case is distinguished from *Cohen* in its remedy. Rather than enjoining the San Francisco Police Department from giving the exam, the Court ordered that the test be scored and *weighted* so that the discriminatory effects would be removed.

Performance on physical agility examinations for women has always been a persistent obstacle to employment for women. One remedy has been to remove altogether these types of tests and introduce on-the-job training. This strategy was utilized successfully by the New Jersey State Police.[14] Their physical training program emphasized lower body strength through karate and judo, because women have less upper body strength. Also, special exercises to strengthen hand grip resulted in better marksmanship. In addition, permission was granted for female recruits to wear low cut rather than ankle-high sneakers, virtually eliminating the recurrent problem of foot injuries among female recruits. Women were physically conditioned to equal their male counterparts without compromising standards of physical training. However, seventy percent of the 104 female recruits dropped out before the program's completion, thereby diminishing its impact.[15]

Undoubtedly, physical agility tests remain a source of controversy. Overall they have been shown to correlate poorly with later training scores and future job performance.[16] Few police departments currently require specific physical standards for refresher training of veteran officers. Poorly conditioned and overweight officers probably could not pass a current physical agility exam, and yet they remain on the force. Several police departments have resolved this problem by requiring medical checkups and participation in physical fitness programs.[17]

Other selection criteria that tend to affect women applicants disproportionately are *minimum* physical requirements like height and weight. In *Le Bouef v. Ramsey*,[18] the plaintiff was denied a position with the New Bedford Police Department because she did not meet the department's minimum height requirement (5 feet 6 inches). Le Bouef, who was 32 years old and 5 feet 3 inches, challenged New Bedford's minimum height and weight requirement by showing that the average height for the nation's women between 25 and 34 years was 5 feet 4 inches. The New Bedford Police claimed that Le Bouef suffered no sexual discrimination, because she was rejected on the basis of her height from a listing only of female applicants. The Court ruled that a violation of Title VII had occurred, as this requirement would

discourage the subclass of women who did not attain the specified minimum height. Moreover, the Court argued that New Bedford had not shown through validation studies how the height requirement was job related.

Similarly, in *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission*,[19] the Court prohibited the use of a minimum height requirement of 5 feet 6 inches, because it discriminated mainly against women, Asians, and Hispanics. This requirement not only excluded women from the position of patrol officer, but it also made lower grade police women ineligible for promotion to sergeant or higher.

Age

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended through 1978, prohibits employment discrimination involving *age limits* in *hiring* and *retirement*. In *Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia*,[20] the U.S. Supreme Court reversed a lower court decision and ruled in favor of a mandatory retirement age for state police officers, even though there was no evidence that Murgia was incapable of performing the duties of a uniformed police officer. The Court argued that risk of physical deterioration, particularly cardiovascular failure and inability to manage stress, increased with age. In *Mahoney v. Trabucco*,[21] the plaintiff, a sergeant in the Massachusetts State Police with over 26 years experience, reached his 50th birthday and was forced to retire because Massachusetts views age as a bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ) for state police officers. Mahoney brought suit against the defendants, charging that his forced retirement violated the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. The U.S. District Court sided with the plaintiff because his particular assignment involved administrative tasks that resulted in less stress than routine police work. However, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Circuit reversed the decision, arguing that distinctions ought not be made among different assignments within police work when age is a bona fide occupational qualification for the overall occupation. The Court felt that distinctions among assignments in police work would raise substantial administrative, morale, and legal problems.

Part of the issue involving age discrimination is that older applicants generally do not perform as well on tests as do younger people. This may be due to less skill or to lessened test-taking ability. The outcome of several pending court cases involving age discrimination in hiring and retiring will hopefully clarify these issues.[22]

Implications for Detective Selection and Promotion

All the legal issues discussed in this report, including adverse impact, validity, job relatedness, gender and age, are applicable to the detective

selection process. In case of litigation, the burden of proof that each part of the process is job related and valid rests with the employer. Protection from lawsuits may be achieved by hiring reliable experts conducting an accurate job analysis, and monitoring all segments of the process. These procedures also maximize equity and result in the appointment of competent investigators.

Judicial settlements are likely to become increasingly complex and time consuming. Already there are growing numbers of parties involved in litigation. In *Bigby v. Chicago*, for example, white and Hispanic police sergeants intervened on the grounds that their rights were violated under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

A possibly sound approach is to follow the lead of the private sector and avoid expensive and divisive litigation that might result in back pay, special seniority considerations, attorney's fees, a freeze on hiring or promotion, and quotas, goals and timetables. Recently, the University Cottage Club, the 100-year-old Princeton eating center, faced a sex bias suit and voluntarily agreed to admit women.[23]

During the seventies and early eighties, the direction of court decisions strongly favored the plaintiffs. Statistical evidence disclosing adverse impact was enough for the Court to infer discriminatory practices. Direct evidence of intentional discrimination upon individuals was not required, e.g., "I will not promote you because you are a woman, a black, or Hispanic."

Recently, significant shifts have occurred. In one case, the Federal Court ruled against the plaintiffs, rejecting their argument that Sears, Roebuck and Company was guilty of sex discrimination because women were under-represented in high paying sales and managerial positions. The Court accepted the argument by Sears that the scarcity of women in higher paying jobs was not due to discrimination, but rather to their reluctance to pursue highly competitive jobs. Since 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against affirmative action only in a few isolated cases, for example striking down a strict quota in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*[24] and defending seniority rights in *Memphis Firefighters v. Stotts*.[25]

The specter of litigation remains for most of the nation's police jurisdictions. EEOC expects approximately 100 discrimination suits in the next two or three years, many of which will involve law enforcement agencies. Litigation is already in progress in several jurisdictions, including New York City, Georgia, Wyoming, Massachusetts, and Missouri. It is likely that the late eighties and beyond will witness court decisions demanding "reasonable" representation of protected groups in all job positions based upon their representation in the community. Agencies that follow fair, equitable, and validated procedures will be able to reduce the chances of litigation and at the same time enhance their selection of investigators who perform well.

Notes

1. *The New York Times*, February 23, 1986, p. 27.
2. *EEOC Guidelines*, Part 1607—*Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
3. *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. at 431 (1971).
4. *Albermarle Paper Co. v. Moody*, 422 U.S. 405 (1975).
5. *Brotherhood v. City of Omaha*, 39 FEP Cases 152 (9/23/85), pp. 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160.
6. *Paradise v. Prescott*, 38 FEP Cases 1089 (10/28/83).
7. *Connecticut v. Teal*, 29 FEP Cases 1 (6/21/82), p. 7.
8. Gettys, Vesta S., and Elam, Joseph D., "Validity Demystified: Personnel Selection Techniques That Work,"*The Police Chief*, Vol. 52, No. 4, April 1985, p. 41-43.
9. *Bigby v. City of Chicago*, 38 FEP Cases 844 (4/18/84), pp. 844, 847, 848.
10. Ibid.
11. Townsey, Roi D., "Female Patrol Officers: A Review of the Physical Capability Issue," *The Criminal Justice System and Women*, Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff (ed's). New York: Clark Boardman Company Ltd., 1982, pp. 413-425.
12. *Cohen v. West Haven Board of Police Commissioners*, 24 FEP Cases 1121 (3/13/78), pp. 1121, 1124, 1125.
13. *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission*, 22 FEP Cases 1704 (4/16/79), pp. 1706, 1707.
14. Townsey, 1982, op. cit.
15. Townsey, 1982, op. cit.
16. Townsey, 1982, op. cit.
17. Thibault, Edward A., Lynch, Lawrence M., and McBride, R. Bruce, *Proactive Police Management*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1985, p. 227.
18. *Le Bouef v. Ramsey*, 26 FEP Cases 884 (9/16/80), p. 896.
19. *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission*, op. cit.
20. *Massachusetts v. Murgia*, 49 L Ed 2d 520 (1976).
21. *The New York Times*, January 11, 1986, p. 1.

22. *EEOC v. Iowa Department of Transportation*, Civil Action No. 86-419B (S.D. Iowa); *EEOC v. North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety*, Civil Action No. 85-1471-CIV-5.

23. *Mahoney v. Trabucco*, 138 F. 2d. 35 (1st Cir.), 1984.

24. *Bakke v. Regents of University of California*, California, 98 S Ct 2733, 438 US 265, 57 L Ed 2d 750 (1978).

25. *Memphis Fire Fighters v. Stotts*, 81 L Ed 2d 483 (1984); and see *The New York Times*, January 11, 1986, p. 1.

Chapter Six

Conclusions and Recommendations

The main conclusion of this report is that investigators' performance can be improved by upgrading and refining the selection process. An officer's potential as an investigator can be identified by using state-of-the-art selection techniques designed to test for desired characteristics. These methods are highly productive when properly constructed and administered by professionals knowledgeable in personnel selection and performance appraisal. The techniques discussed in Chapter IV capture the qualities and attributes essential for effective investigative work, such as gathering evidence, interviewing victims, questioning witnesses and suspects, effecting arrests that result in conviction, preparing a case for trial, obeying the law, and satisfying citizens and the public.

Key elements of a productive detective selection system should include fairness, validity, job relatedness, utility, and efficiency. A training and evaluation period can also help in deciding which officers ought to be retained for the detective position. Informing all officers of vacancies for the position of investigator is crucial. Officers must be given an equal opportunity to apply for investigative duties by advertising job openings through postings and roll call announcements.

Motivation is repeatedly mentioned as essential for effective investigative performance. Selection methods and techniques that measure this quality in officers should be implemented. Several methods described in this report have the capacity to identify highly motivated officers, including supervisory ratings based upon behaviorally anchored scales, peer assessment techniques, and assessment centers.

The maintenance of high levels of motivation long after appointment as a detective may be accomplished by a well planned system of incentives that recognizes superior performance and more complex levels of responsibility. This system of rewards, tailored specifically to the needs of each agency, may include increased pay, promotions, expanded fringe benefits, vacations, recognition, preferential assignments, and the privilege to choose specific days off and the time of a vacation. Eligible and effective officers should be promoted or preferentially assigned only if they are qualified and possess the specialized skills, capacity, and potential to perform effectively each task required by the *new* position.

Written civil service examinations and tests for verbal ability were the only two factors that achieved the standards of validity established by this report and are also specifically associated with important tasks performed by investigators. Civil service examinations were found to be correlated with high arrest activity and investigation skills. Verbal ability was associated with articulation and communication. Few departments have seriously considered the development and implementation of written cognitive tests for selection to investigative units. The information presented in this report suggests that such an objective is well worth the effort, time, and expense. Several reputable personnel testing firms are available for this purpose.[1]

Another possible qualification for eligibility to investigative units that ought to be considered is a minimum of two years of college education. The educational experience is not only related to investigative performance but also includes interaction with young adults and exposure to abstract thinking. Officers who choose to advance their education also demonstrate that they are motivated to achieve the assignment of detective.

Past performance on the job is a valid indicator of future performance. Our reanalysis of the Roes' inventory of validation studies demonstrated the truth of the principle, "once a disciplinary problem always a disciplinary problem." Officers who had displayed misconduct at work tended to perpetuate this pattern. Therefore prior work history ought to be fully assessed for each candidate to become an investigator. Also a training and evaluation period of reasonable duration is a good way to observe work performance and also identify potential disciplinary problems while a detective candidate is performing the specific functions required by the job.

Another way to improve the investigator selection process is to evaluate candidate officers according to their *rates of conviction* instead of their arrests. Furthermore, detectives should be evaluated for retention or advancement according to their *expected case outcomes*, as described in Chapter IV. Only officers displaying a record of quality as opposed to quantity of arrests should be selected for detective work. Police agencies

should establish procedures for monitoring whether arrests by a particular officer ended in conviction. At present, few agencies possess this arrest-to-conviction tracking capability.

No single detective selection procedure is likely to be applicable to all law enforcement agencies; therefore, variation in approaches is beneficial. Relatively small suburban agencies may encounter different experiences and problems than do large urban departments. This report presents a menu of selection procedures that, when properly implemented, will result in appointing the most qualified personnel as investigators. Every law enforcement agency should be able to improve its current procedures by reviewing the suggestions in this report and adapting them to local needs.

Note

1. For current impartial advice on firms that provide this type of service, the reader can contact the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Gaithersburg, Maryland; the Police Executive Research Forum, Washington, D.C.; or the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc., Fairfax, Virginia.

Acknowledgments

Henry H. Rossman initiated the work for this project, selected study sites, and conducted focus group interviews with over 40 police administrators, detectives, and patrol officers.

Police departments in jurisdictions listed below greatly aided our study by cooperating with Henry Rossman, with our telephone interviewer Peter Wolff, or with the authors. They welcomed our site visits, arranged for interviews — often including the chief of the department, the chief of detectives, and a representative of the personnel division — or provided us with information and documentation:

Boston, Massachusetts
Boulder, Colorado
Cincinnati, Ohio
Dade Metro Police, Dade County, Florida
Denver, Colorado
Fremont, California
Fort Collins, Colorado
Kansas City, Missouri
Minneapolis, Minnesota
New York City
Richmond, Virginia
Rochester, New York
San Diego, California
San Jose, California
St. Petersburg, Florida

In addition, Mark B. Codd, Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, provided information about the FBI's personnel selection procedures, and Henry Brull, Personnel Decisions, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota, explained his firm's testing methods.

Critical reviews and valuable suggestions for improvements at various stages of the study were provided by John Eck, Floyd Feeney, Chief Joseph McNamara of the San Jose Police Department, and Lt. Stephen Leinen of the New York City Police Department. Kevin Pogue gave us superb assistance on all phases of the research, including his excellent review of cases dealing with legal constraints on selecting and promoting police officers, and Peter Wolff collected and assembled information about personnel policies in the sampled departments.

We are also appreciative of the research and administrative assistance provided by Gail Goolkasian, Elizabeth Shapiro, Jeffrey Cohen, and Samuel Goldfeder.

The study greatly benefited from the guidance of the National Institute of Justice project monitors, Carol Petrie and Virginia Baldau.

About the Authors

Bernard Cohen is professor of criminology and sociology at Queens College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York. He served as director of the police personnel program at the Rand Corporation, where he conducted numerous research projects on police officers and criminal justice organizations. Recently, he was a consultant to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where he completed studies of patrol officers and detective investigators. He has written many monographs, reports, and articles on police, sentencing, crime, and juvenile delinquency. He is the author of *Deviant Street Networks*, coauthor with Marvin Wolfgang of *Crime and Race,* and coauthor with Jan Chaiken of *Police Background Characteristics and Performance.*

Jan Chaiken is deputy manager of the Law and Justice Area at Abt Associates Inc., in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He has worked closely with law enforcement agencies on numerous research projects, including planning for redesign of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. He developed a patrol car allocation model (PCAM) which is widely used by police and sheriffs' departments around the world; he recently prepared a version that operates on personal computers. He is coauthor of the widely respected Rand study of the criminal investigation process, and he worked previously with Bernard Cohen on evaluating police officer performance and the effects of civil service procedures on selection of minority police officers.

Appendix A

Administrative Assignment Selection
Peer Evaluation

Administration Assignment Selection
Peer Evaluation

You have been randomly selected to anonymously evaluate the following candidates for the administrative assignment of Investigator. The rating method you are to apply is the rank order one, where designating "1" by a candidate's name identifies the individual who is relatively most suited for that position. For example, if there are fifteen candidates, "1" identifies the most suited individual and "15" identifies the least suited individual for that particular position. This value should reflect your opinion of each candidate's capabilities, attitude, leadership, maturity, cooperation and commitment to the organization. IN ORDER TO ENSURE PROPER SCORING, EACH CANDIDATE MUST BE RATED BY EACH RATER. ANY EVALUATIONS SUBMITTED INCOMPLETE WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE FINAL RATING.

As an evaluator you must be as objective as possible, substantiating your rankings by professional experience and observation, and dismissing from your evaluation any speculative information about the candidates. As each segment of the selection procedure remains confidential throughout the process, you should refrain from discussing the candidates among your peers and supervisors. The final results or eligibility list will be posted shortly after completion of the third and final component--Interview with the Supervisor(s).

This revised selection procedure is intended to assure the selection of the candidate, or candidates, who have best prepared themselves for this assignment and are most qualified regarding training, experience, capabilities and personal attitudes. It is very important also that you remain anonymous and do not discuss your rating at any time. The purpose of this is to ensure the integrity of the system in future selections. Properly done, your cooperation and participation in this process will be a significant part of our selection process.

Appendix B

Management Aptitude Program
(Federal Bureau of Investigation)

MANAGEMENT APTITUDE PROGRAM

(MAP)

CAREER ASSESSMENT

Personnel Assessment Unit

TRAINING DIVISION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. WHAT IS AN ASSESSMENT CENTER

An Assessment Center is a formal procedure utilized to identify characteristics or dimensions of supervisory or managerial success which have been identified as important for a particular position or level of management. The procedure incorporates group and individual exercises in which participant behavior is carefully evaluated by trained assessors. The assessors employ group dynamics in reaching an overall evaluation of the participant and this summary is orally communicated to the participant in a special feedback interview. The overall evaluation can then be used by management for selection, development or training purposes.

The dimensions or behaviors to be evaluated in the assessment approach are carefully determined through the use of a front end analysis of the target level job in terms of concrete and specific behaviors necessary for successful performance. This form of analysis requires current position holders to furnish critical incidents of behavior, that is, actual outstanding occurrences of successful or unsuccessful job behavior. Once a suitable number of incidents is recorded, they are delimitated to specific dimensions of behavior. The following major classifications provide an example:

Personal Attributes	Administrative Skills	Interpersonal Skills
Motivation	Judgment	Leadership
Initiative	Planning	Sensitivity
Work Standards	Organizing	Flexibility
Stress Tolerance	Delegation	Oral Presentation
Tenacity	Problem Analysis	Oral Communication
Independence	Management Control	Written Communication
Decisiveness		
Personal Commitment		

A weighted importance of these dimensions is formulated by those currently holding the target level position and suitable exercises to elicit the appropriate behavior are developed for use in the Assessment Center.

II. WHY AN ASSESSMENT CENTER

The assessment technique can aid an organization in the early identification of supervisory or managerial potential as well as in the diagnosis of individual management development needs so that training and development efforts can be invested most efficiently. The technique can be a powerful stimulant to a Career Development Program by providing increased accuracy in the selection and promotion of supervisors and managers, and by identifying possible development actions.

With regard to selection, the technique employs simulations which provide behavioral challenges which the participant would potentially face in occupying the target level position. The accuracy of this method to choose appropriate candidates has been proven to be two to three times higher than promotion on the basis of supervisory judgment. Studies clearly indicate that competence on one work level does not insure competence on the next higher level.

Participation in the assessment process is an extremely powerful learning experience for both the participant and for the higher level managers who, as assessors, observe and record the participant's behavior. The assessor role is an observer skill which can be learned and is of tremendous value in real life managerial situations.

III. THE FBI MANAGEMENT APTITUDE PROGRAM (MAP)

A. Since assessment center is a generic term, most organizations have individualized their program with appropriate titles, e.g., Career Development Plan (J. C. Penney), and Talent Development Program (General Electric). The approved FBI plan is a two-phased program - supervisory level assessment and executive or mid-management level assessment. At the present time, the executive or mid-management level assessment is in the proposal stage and, if eventually approved, will require a separate front end analysis. In order to adequately encompass both levels of assessment, Management Aptitude Program (MAP) was selected as the most appropriate title.

1. Location - MAP is located at the FBI Academy, Quantico, Virginia. The site is particularly suited to the program for two reasons:

   a. It provides an off-site location away from organizational constraints, a psychological "break" from office interruptions, a factor which research indicates is an integral contributor to program success.

   b. The facilities offer an ideal setting for implementation of the simulation exercises and the inclusion of a five-day management training program.

2. Duration - A typical MAP schedule encompasses the following:

   a. One week assessor training.

   b. Three days of simulation exercises.

   c. Five-day management training course.

   d. Two days of feedback interviews.

B. Although there are three possible uses for MAP results, the application of the process at the present time will be directed at the first, selection.

1. Selection - The critical need of the FBI at the present time is to identify individuals who possess the capabilities for successful performance in supervisory or management positions and to provide an inventory of the potential managerial talent within the organization. The MAP report can provide important input to this process.

2. Development - Future use of the MAP reports will include developmental planning to augment the career development program. It is anticipated that a training matrix will be prepared to show alternate development recommendations for each dimension. This matrix would not provide specific course or program recommendations but rather areas of opportunity to be discussed by the participant and his supervisor.

3. Organizational Diagnosis - The entire assessment process, particularly the front end analysis, may be utilized as an organizational development tool. Research into the content of a job could conceivably result in the restructuring of the position. Manpower planning based on assessment results may also radically change current career paths.

IV. MAP DIMENSIONS

A. The front end analysis of the supervisory position within the FBI was conducted from September to December, 1974, in concert with a consultant, William C. Byham, Development Dimensions, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. A number of in-depth interviews were conducted in selected field divisions and at the FBI Academy. Those interviewed were either current supervisors or higher management personnel. Critical incidents of behavior on the job were recorded by the consultant. These incidents were categorized and, in December, 1974, all field supervisory and management personnel were asked to rank the dimensions according to importance and observability on the job. Those dimensions rated as most important to the target level position yet least observable in ordinary job performance were selected as the MAP dimensions.

B. The following dimensions while not listed in any rank order, are utilized in the MAP program and represent some of the behavior characteristic of an FBI supervisor who is entirely satisfactory in his performance:

1. Oral Communication Skill - effectiveness of expression in individual or group situations includes gestures and nonverbal communication).

2. Oral Presentation Skill - ability to make a persuasive, clear presentation of ideas or facts, given time for preparation.

3. Written Communication Skill - ability to express ideas clearly in writing in good grammatical form.

4. Stress Tolerance - stability of performance under pressure and opposition.

5. Motivation - importance of work in personal satisfaction, and the desire to achieve at work.

6. Work Standards - desire to do a good job.

7. Personal Commitment - willingness to make personal sacrifices, when appropriate, to realize organizational goals.

8. Leadership - effectiveness in getting ideas accepted and in guiding a group or an individual to accomplish a task. Appreciation of need for communications. Ability to motivate others.

9. Sensitivity - skill in perceiving and reacting to the needs of others. Appreciation of what motivates others. Objectivity in perceiving impact of self on others. Capability to recognize one's own strengths and weaknesses.

10. Flexibility - ability to modify behavioral style and management approach to reach a goal.

11. Tenacity - tendency to stay with a problem or line of thought until the matter is settled.

12. Initiative - actively influencing events rather than passively accepting; self-starting.

13. Independence - taking action based on own convictions rather than through a desire to please others.

14. Planning and Organizing - effectiveness in planning and organizing own activities and those of a group.

15. Management Control - appreciation of need for control over processes, subordinates and tasks.

16. Use of Delegation - ability to use subordinates effectively and to understand where a decision can best be made.

17. Problem Analysis - effectiveness in seeking out pertinent data and in determining the source of a problem.

18. Judgment - ability to reach logical conclusions based on the evidence at hand; establish priorities.

19. Decisiveness - readiness to make decisions or to render judgments.

V. MAP EXERCISES

A. The specific dimensions, generated through field-wide participation by supervisory and management Special Agents, have been incorporated into a variety of MAP exercises. While every dimension is not evaluated during each exercise, they are strategically located within a series of individual and group exercises which have been professionally designed and validated to ascertain the participant's aptitude for future managerial performance.

B. The MAP exercises are thoroughly related to the supervisory position but are not simulations of actual FBI experiences. In order to provide each participant with an equal opportunity, the exercises have been placed in another organizational environment. The dimensions contained in the exercises, however, are importantly job related and have a direct relationship to the FBI supervisory position.

C. MAP utilizes the following exercises:

1. Background Interview - a structured interview designed to elicit personal history, current accomplishments and future goals.

2. Management Problems - a leaderless group discussion with no assigned roles. Participants submit recommendations to assigned problems within a specified time.

3. National Executive Council - a leaderless group discussion with assigned roles. Participants must allocate funds and make other judgments on a variety of conflicting proposals within a specified time. This exercise is videotaped.

4. Press Conference - participant must formally present final recommendation of National Executive Council and answer press questions. This exercise is videotaped.

5. Interview Simulation - participant takes on supervisory role in a planned interview of a "problem" employee.

6. Analysis Problem - participant, as a consultant, is requested to analyze data, make written recommendations, and support them in an oral interview.

7. In-Basket - participant, as a state government executive, is asked to handle the accumulated letters, notes, requests, etc., found in a simulated in-basket. There is a time limit on this exercise.

VI. MAP PROCESS

For the participant in the MAP program, the process can be partitioned into three distinct categories - the assessment, supervisory training and feedback.

The assessment period consists of the first three days of the In-Service. During this time, the assessee participates in the MAP exercises and is observed by a trained observer usually two managerial levels higher than the participant. An assessor observes specific behavior in each exercise. A rotating schedule will be utilized to insure that the assessee is observed by a minimum of three assessors during the assessment exercises. Although there is competition included in some of the MAP exercises, the participants will be cautioned that their behavior is not being rated on a competitive basis but rather on the degree to which the dimension or behavior is observable in the exercise. The assessor will utilize highly structured rating forms when recording behavioral observations.

On the fourth day, the participant will begin a five-day supervisory In-Service. The course will include the following management elements: Nature and Importance of Management; Management Patterns; Organizational Behavior; Motivational Dynamics; Leadership; Administrative Communications; Problem Solving and Decision Making.

While the participants attend the supervisory training phase of the In-Service, the assessors will meet to discuss each participant. It is important that the assessors discuss the participants one at a time at the completion of all exercises to avoid a "steamroll" bias toward certain participants. It is also essential that the assessors limit their discussions to observed behavior not the process which was observed.

In reviewing each individual, only those assessors who observed behavior in the exercises participate in the group discussion. Each assessor, in turn, presents specific instances of behavior which he observed in the exercises, using the following numerical rating:

5 - A great amount of the dimension observed;
4 - Quite a lot of the dimension shown;
3 - A moderate amount of the dimension shown;
2 - Only a small amount of the dimension shown;
1 - Very little of the dimension shown;
0 - No opportunity to observe the dimension.

Each assessor in the group can question the quantity or quality of the observed behavior. After all assessors have reported on behavior, each assessor gives a numerical rating to each of the nineteen dimensions and communicates them to the group. If there is a difference of more than one point in the ratings, the conflicting assessors must attempt to support their rating. If a compromise cannot be reached, the final rating is carried as a split vote in the final report. This interchange among assessors is specifically designed to insure that any subjectivity in the final ratings is based on factual observations. The validity of the assessment process is based on the frank discussion of observed behavior by the assessors.

After a numerical rating profile has been established, the assessors carefully review each dimension in an attempt to formulate a general profile of the participant. In this regard, two words become crucial. Aptitude is the potential to successfully perform the target level function and demonstrate is the activity through which the participant conveys his aptitude. A final narrative rating is contained in the MAP synopsis and conforms to the following guide:

Demonstrated Exceptional Management Aptitude
Demonstrated High Management Aptitude
Demonstrated Management Aptitude
Demonstrated Management Aptitude Contingent Upon Development
Did Not Demonstrate Management Aptitude

The final two days of the in-service consist of two forms of feedback. First, there is the feedback interview with the MAP administrator based on the final report. Second, there is peer feedback gained through a videotape replay of a group discussion exercise.

The interview with the MAP administrator will focus on the assessor's consensus of managerial strengths and weaknesses. Developmental suggestions will be discussed, however, specific developmental recommendations must be made by an SAC. The Training Division is currently formulating programs to augment the developmental opportunities.

Although the participant will not receive a copy of his MAP report, he will have the opportunity to review the entire report and make notes on its contents during the feedback interview. In addition to initialing the report, the participant is afforded the opportunity to furnish his own personal observations and comments.

VII. REPORT FLOW

One copy of the MAP report, containing the consensus of the assessor's evaluation of managerial potential will be forwarded to the participant's SAC to be maintained by him in a separate career development file. The report will be the basis for a career development interview between the SAC and the participant and will be utilized by the Field Career Board as an element of the selection and promotion process. Although aspects of the report will be discussed with the participant's supervisor, he will not receive a copy of the MAP report. Research indicates that supervisors who receive copies of the assessment report invariably use its contents to evaluate the participant's current performance. The MAP report is not a measure of current performance but rather a demonstration of aptitude for a supervisory position.

A second copy of the report will remain in the participant's headquarters personnel file for review by the Headquarters Career Board during the promotional process. It should be stressed that although the MAP report is a thorough, detailed narrative of demonstrated behavior during a series of simulation exercises, it is only one element in the overall selection and promotion process.

Both the field and headquarters copies will be destroyed upon promotion to the target level position. The original report will, however, be maintained by MAP for research purposes.

Reevaluation will be possible three years from the date of the initial evaluation. A recommendation, complete with areas of personal development, must be made by the SAC.

VIII. SELECTION FOR ASSESSMENT

Since MAP is to serve initially as a supplement to the selection and promotion process within the FBI, the first participants will be drawn from the list of approved field relief supervisors. Once a reserve of eligible relief supervisors has been established, the supervisory level process of MAP will be redirected to the selection of relief supervisors.

It is anticipated that a management level assessment, possibly for ASAC level promotions, will be instituted in a few years within the guidelines of the Career Development Program.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

MAP has been professionally designed to supplement the FBI program for selecting the best qualified individual for a managerial role. The report can provide additional insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the participant as well as highlights of specific developmental needs. The MAP report should provide pertinent information in some areas not readily observable in the participant's current position.

A sound program of assessment will assist an organization in making more useful decisions about the careers of its employees. The MAP program will provide additional facts for the selection and promotion process. Research into the MAP program will lead to improved assessment techniques and will inevitably contribute to a better understanding of organizational personality within the FBI.

Appendix C

Boulder Police Department Detective Evaluation

Detective's Name _____ Employee # _____ Date _____

Evaluation Period: From: _____ To: _____

Date of Employment: _____ Assignment during evaluation period: _____

Rating Instructions: Rate observed behavior with reference to the scale below. While you are encouraged to comment on any behavior you wish, you are required to comment on, and support, all Above Standard and Below Standard ratings. Check the Not Observed box if the behavior was not observed.

RATER: Please initial appropriate line.

Below Standard: _____ Detective rated below standard in 3 or more tasks. Not eligible for merit increase.

Standard: _____ Detective rated below standard in no more than 2 tasks or has no below standard ratings, but has fewer than 8 above standard ratings. Eligible for 3½% merit increase.

Above Standard: _____ No below standard ratings and rated above standard in 8 or more tasks. Eligible for 4% merit increase.

(Circle Appropriate Number)

Categories	Below Standard			Standard		Above Standard		Not Observed
1. Knowledge, Use, and Care of Equipment/Work Area	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. Following Instructions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. Compliance with Operations Manual	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. Knowledge of Departmental Policies and Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. Knowledge of Criminal Code, Municipal Ordinances, Motor Vehicle Code and Civil Law	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. Knowledge of Community Events and Crime Patterns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. Knowledge of Crime Prevention Concepts/Alternative Resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. Driving Skills--Normal Conditions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9. Orientation to Community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

10.	Report Writing: Organization/ Details	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
11.	Report Writing: Grammar/ Spelling/Neatness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
12.	Report Writing: Appropriate Time Use/Punctuality of Assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
13.	Case and Time Management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14.	Problem Solving/Decision Making	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
15.	Performance Under Pressure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
16.	Investigative Initiative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
17.	Officer Safety	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18.	Control of Conflict	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
19.	Use of Radio	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
20.	Interviewing/Interrogating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
21.	Interpersonal Skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
22.	Investigative Skill/ Processing Crime Scenes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
23.	Teamwork	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
24.	Impartiality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Narrative Comments

Initials of Detective	Date	Initials of Rater	Date

NOTE: This form was adapted from the one actually used by the Boulder Police Department for inclusion in this publication.

DETECTIVE
EVALUATION ANCHORS
January 3, 1985

1. KNOWLEDGE, USE AND CARE OF EQUIPMENT/WORK AREA

Above Standard (7):

Always maintains equipment in proper working order/condition. Promptly reports deficiencies to supervisor and/or seeks replacement. Does more than own share in keeping work areas and vehicle clean and orderly. Makes suggestions for organizational improvement regarding equipment and work area.

Standard (4):

Generally maintains vehicle equipment/work area. Inspects equipment prior to use to ensure it is in working order. Exercises necessary care in handling equipment. Reports deficiencies. Demonstrates knowledge of available equipment through use.

Below Standard (1):

Fails to exercise care in the use of equipment. Does not clean vehicle or keep work area neat and orderly. Fails to report deficiencies and makes no effort to replace broken/missing equipment and materials. Fails inspections and does not remedy identified deficiencies.

2. FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS

Above Standard (7):

Receives instruction and follows through properly and completely with even the most complex instructions, and/or does not require detailed instructions. Asks pertinent questions; makes suggestions concerning options and presents logical, supporting information. Promptly obeys lawful orders. Can be relied upon to distinguish when an order may be questioned and when immediate compliance is required.

Standard (4):

Accepts routine instructions and follows through properly and completely. Asks pertinent questions when clarification is needed. Will offer suggestions and alternatives when requested to do so. Obeys lawful orders.

Below Standard (1):

Has frequent difficulty following through on lawful orders/instructions or is argumentative/uncooperative. Will not contribute with suggestions/alternatives even when asked. Reluctantly complies and/or violates the intent of the order/instruction.

3. COMPLIANCE WITH OPERATIONS MANUAL

Above Standard (7):

Has not been found to have violated any rule, regulation, or failed to follow any policy or procedure while on duty or while off duty if the violation affects subsequent on-duty performance. Or if there was a violation of policy or procedure, subsequent review found the violation to be necessary and proper.

Standard (4):

No more than one violation of rule, regulation, policy or procedure has been sustained and the sustained violation did not result in any action beyond formal counseling.

Below Standard (1):

Has received counseling for a violation of a rule, regulation, policy or procedure more than once, or if only once, then violation has resulted in more than formal counseling.

4. KNOWLEDGE OF DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Above Standard (7):

Demonstrates knowledge of all elements of the current Operations Manual. Is able to explain and apply its contents. Maintains manual in up-to-date condition.

Standard (4):

Demonstrates knowledge of the most-often used aspects of the current Operations Manual. Can explain and apply those sections. Understands difference between policy and procedures, rules and regulations.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently fails to demonstrate knowledge of the most-often-used elements of the Operations Manual. Does not maintain manual in current condition or cannot locate personal copy. Does not understand difference between policy and procedure, rules and regulations.

5. KNOWLEDGE OF CRIMINAL CODE, MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES, MOTOR VEHICLE CODE AND CIVIL LAW.

Above Standard (7):

Demonstrates complete knowledge of the elements of statutes through application and by being able to correctly explain the elements of those laws. Acts as a resource to others when called upon to do so.

Standard (4):

Demonstrates knowledge of the most-often-used statutes through application and by being able to correctly explain the elements of those laws. Is familiar enough with the statutes and can quickly locate sections and understands them as necessary. Keeps abreast of current criminal and civil procedures, and applies same properly.

Below Standard (1):

Fails to or cannot demonstrate knowledge of even the most-often-used statutes. Is unable to locate statutes and/or apply them after locating. Is not current with criminal and civil procedures.

6. KNOWLEDGE OF COMMUNITY EVENTS AND CRIME PATTERNS

Above Standard (7):

Is far more aware than the average officer concerning events occurring within the community and the potential effect they have on the Department and its efforts. Is proactive concerning making contacts and develops information concerning community events and crime patterns. Makes contacts based upon current crime patterns and roll call information.

Standard (4):

Is aware of many of the events occurring within the community and the potential effect they may have on the Department and its efforts. Follows up on crime pattern information provided by the Department by making arrests and contacts relative to that information.

Below Standard (1):

Is unaware of events occurring in the community and the effect those events may have on the Department. Fails to follow up on information provided by the Department, even when instructed and/or trained to do so.

7. KNOWLEDGE OF CRIME PREVENTION CONCEPTS/ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES

Above Standard (7):

Demonstrates extensive knowledge of a variety of crime prevention methods and the Department's crime prevention efforts. Is proactive in the application of these methods when making citizen contacts. Makes referrals to Crime Prevention Unit when appropriate. Represents the Department at crime prevention gatherings.

Standard (4):

Demonstrates familiarity with the current methods of crime prevention and makes use of this knowledge when contacting citizens. Knows about and, when reasonable, makes use of alternatives to enforcement action.

Below Standard (1):

Misrepresents or is unaware of the current methods of crime prevention and/or the Department's crime prevention efforts. Fails to provide crime prevention information when situation calls for same and opportunity exists.

8. DRIVING SKILLS - NORMAL CONDITIONS

Above Standard (7):

Sets an example for lawful, courteous driving. Maintains complete control of the vehicle regardless of circumstances. Is superior defensive driver. Is constantly alert to surrounding activity.

Standard (4):

Obeys traffic laws. Maintains control of vehicle. Is alert to most surrounding activity. Drives defensively.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently fails to drive defensively. Is involved in automobile collision(s) through negligence. Frequently violates traffic laws. Fails to maintain control of vehicle and/or displays poor manipulative skills in vehicle operation. Is unaware of surrounding activity.

9. ORIENTATION TO COMMUNITY

Above Standard (7):

Remembers locations from previous visits and does not need beat map to get there. Is aware of shortcuts and utilizes them to save time. High level of orientation to the city.

Standard (4):

Responds to arrive within acceptable amount of time. Effectively uses directions or maps. Can relate location to destination.

Below Standard (1):

Does not properly or effectively use maps, directions, or the beat map. Unable to relate location to destination. Gets lost. Spends too much time getting to destination. Frequently makes unnecessary requests for directions or location.

10. REPORT WRITING: ORGANIZATION/DETAILS

Above Standard (7):

Reports are a complete and detailed accounting of events from beginning to end, written and organized so that any reader understands what occurred.

Standard (4):

Completes reports, organizing information in a logical manner. Reports contain the required information and details. Few reports need correction, addition or clarification. Reports accurately.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently unable to organize information and reduce it to writing. Leaves out pertinent details in report or reports inaccurately. Many reports need correction, addition or clarification. Remedial efforts are not effective.

11. REPORT WRITING: GRAMMER/SPELLING/NEATNESS

Above Standard (7):

Reports are always neatly written and legible. Grammar and spelling is excellent.

Standard (4):

Reports are usually neat and legible. Makes few grammatical and spelling errors.

Below Standard (1):

Reports are frequently illegible and lack neatness. Officer makes frequent grammatical and spelling errors.

12. REPORT WRITING: APPROPRIATE TIME USED/PUNCTUALITY OF ASSIGNMENT

Above Standard (7):

Always completes reports on time. Makes extra effort to ensure that assignments are turned in at the end of scheduled shift. Uses minimal amount of time and properly and thoroughly complete reports.

Standard (4):

Submits reports on time as required/requested. Assignments turned in at end of shift or as instructed. Completes reports within acceptable amount of time.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently fails to complete reports on time. Assignments often late. Takes more time than acceptable despite supervisory action and/or instructions.

13. CASE AND TIME MANAGEMENT

Above Standard (7):

Always manages cases and caseload effectively, prioritizing as appropriate. Completes supplemental and case file reports before due date and/or well within expected time. Case file is always complete when turned in for review. Makes excellent use of available time.

Standard (4):

Normally manages cases and caseload effectively, prioritizing as approrpriate. Completes supplemental and case file reports in a timely manner. Case files are almost always complete when turned in for review. Uses available time to identify and initiate proper action. Appraises supervisors of case status.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently fails to manage caseload and/or to prioritize as necessary and appropriate. Often late in submission of supplemental and case reports. Case files often incomplete upon review. Does not use available time efficiently.

14. PROBLEM-SOLVING/DECISION-MAKING

Above Standard (7):

Able to reason through even the most complex situations and is able to make appropriate conclusions. Makes complex decisions with little or no assistance. Has excellent perception. Anticipates problems and prepares resolutions in advance. Relates past solutions to present situtations.

Standard (4):

Able to reason through a problem and come to an acceptable conclusion in routine situations. Makes reasonable decisions based on information available. Perceives situations as they really are. Makes routine decisions without assistance.

Below Standard (1):

Acts without thought or good reason. Is indecisive, naive. Is unable or unwilling to reason through a problem and come to a conclusion. Does not recall previous solutions and apply them in similar situations.

15. PERFORMANCE UNDER PRESSURE

Above Standard (7):

Controls feelings and emotions in even the most trying of situations. Always maintains composure in order to make sound, logical and rational decisions. Is always able to recognize the consequences of actions in even the most pressure-ridden situations.

Standard (4):

Controls feelings and emotions in most situations, including many of the most trying. Ordinarily maintains composure in order to make sound, logical and rational decisions. Recognizes the consequences of actions in pressure situations.

Below Standard (1):

Often fails to control feelings and emotions. Is unable to maintain composure and fails to make sound, logical and rational decisions in most situations. Unable to recognize the consequences of own actions.

16. INVESTIGATIVE INITIATIVE

Above Standard (7):

Superior in ability to develop leads from varied sources that either solve a case or develop a case further. Works to solve cases without guidance, while keeping supervisors appraised of case status. Always make effective use of available resources.

Standard (4):

Usually develops leads from varied sources that either solve a case or develope a case further. Works to solve cases with minimal guidance. Generally makes effective available resources. Avoids tunnel vision approach to investigation.

Below Standard (1):

Generally fails to develop leads from various available sources. Unable to solve many cases assigned although leads are available and others may/can solve them. Often needs guidance to solve cases. Has tunnel vision approach to investigation. Often fails to keep supervisors appraised of case progress.

17. OFFICER SAFETY

Above Standard (7):

Always follows accepted safety practices. Foresees potentially dangerous situations and prepares for them. Keeps partner(s) informed and determines best position/course of action for both. Maintains position of advantage and is alert to changing conditions. Prevents opportunities for danger from developing.

Standard (4):

Follows accepted safety practices, seldom making a mistake. Deals effectively with dangerous situations as they develop. Attempts to always maintain position of advantage. Recognizes the possibility of dangerous situations. Exercises reasonable care to avoid injury to self or others.

Below Standard (1):

Fails to exercise care necessary to avoid injury to self or others. Often fails to follow accepted safety practices which include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Avoids exposing weapons to suspect,
(b) Keeps gun hand free during enforcement situations,
(c) Does not stand in front of violator's car door,
(d) Controls suspect's movements,
(e) Keeps violator/suspect in sight,
(f) Uses illumination when appropriate and proper,
(g) Advises Communications when leaving vehicle,
(h) Maintains good physical condition,
(i) Is careful with gun and other weapons,
(j) Stands well out of the way of vehicular traffic,
(k) Handcuffs effectively and properly,
(l) Stands to side of doors when knocking,
(m) Covers other officers when appropriate,
(n) Avoids standing between vehicles at car stops,
(o) Searches patrol vehicle prior to duty and immediately after transporting prisoner,
(p) Pat searches suspects at contact.

18. CONTROL OF CONFLICT

Above Standard (7):

Completely controls with voice tone, word selection, inflection, bearing, physical force and restraints as required. Restores order in even the most demanding situations. Selects and uses the right tool to the right degree for each given situation.

Standard (4):

Usually controls situations with voice, words, bearing physical force and restraints. Is able to restore order in all but the most demanding situations. Usually correct in the selection of the tool and the degree of application.

Below Standard (1):

Speaks too softly or timidly, speaks too loudly, confuses or angers listeners by what is said and/or how it is said. Uses too little or too much force for the given situation. Is physically unable to perform the task. Does not use proper restraints. Is incorrect in the way to control the conflict or in the degree control applied.

19. USE OF RADIO

Above Standard (7):

Aware of own radio traffic and the traffic of others. Is constantly aware of status of radio traffic and related activities. Transmits in a clear, calm and concise manner in even the most stressful situations. Always follows procedure.

Standard (4):

Listens to and comprehends radio traffic and retains the essential information. Reacts properly to radio transmissions. Generally follows procedure. Transmits in a clear, calm and concise manner in most situations.

Below Standard (1):

Repeatedly misses own call sign and is unaware of other radio traffic. Frequently requires Communications to repeat transmissions. Does not accurately comprehend broadcasts. Broadcasts unitelligibly. Fails to transmit in a clear, calm and concise manner. Frequently fails to follow procedure/policy.

20. INTERVIEWING/INTERROGATING

Above Standard (7):

Always uses proper questioning techniques, differentiates between interviewing and interrogating. When possible, establishes rapport with victims/witnesses and suspects. Controls the interrogation of even the most difficult suspects and conducts successful interrogations of them. Makes accurate and complete notebook entries.

Standard (4):

Follows proper investigative procedures, recognizing when to use additional resources to aid in investigation. Is accurate in diagnosis of nature of offense committed. Collects, tags, logs and books evidence property. Connects evidence with suspect when apparent. Collects "readable" fingerprints from most surfaces.

Below Standard (1):

Fails to use proper questioning techniques. Fails to differentiate between interviews and interrogations. Does not elicit and/or record available information. Does not adequately establish rapport with most persons and/or does not control interview/interrogations. Does not follow proper Miranda procedures.

21. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

Above Standard (7):

Always communicates in an effective and appropriate manner using interpersonal skills.

Standard (4):

Normally communicates in an effective and appropriate manner using interpersonal skills which include but are not limited to: empathy, sincerity, humor, objectivity, flexibility, courtesy, firmness and patience. Uses active listening skills. Does not allow emotions to affect interpersonal relationships.

Below Standard (1):

Frequently fails to communicate in an effective and appropriate manner.

22. INVESTIGATIVE SKILL/PROCESSING CRIME SCENES

Above Standard (7):

Always follows proper investigative procedure, and is accurate in diagnosis of offense committed. Connects evidence with suspect even when not apparent. Properly collects and identifies evidence in even the most complex cases. Collects "readable" fingerprints from any possible surface.

Standard (4):

Follows proper investigative procedure in all but most difficult/unusual cases. Is normally accurate in diagnosis of nature of offense committed. Properly collects, tags, logs and books evidence. Connects evidence with suspect when apparent. Collects "readable" fingerprints from most surfaces. Recognizes when to use additional resources to aid an investigation.

Below Standard (1):

Does not conduct a basic investigation or conducts investigation improperly. Unable to accurately diagnose offense committed. Fails to discern readily available evidence. Makes frequent mistakes when identifying, collecting or booking evidence. Does not connect evidence with suspect, even when apparent. Lacks skill in collection and preservation of fingerprints. Does not protect scene. Contaminates scene/evidence.

23. TEAMWORK

Above Standard (7):

Is a leader in the development and maintenance of a variety of "teams" in and outside of the watch, category or division. Encourages the participation of others. Sets example of team-play for others.

Standard (4):

Maintains a productive and supportive working relationship with others in the course of carrying out responsibilities.

Below Standard (1):

Does not participate in a team even when appropriate. Is resistant and reluctant to cooperate even when necessary and/or when ordered. Disruptive to team effort. Withholds information inappropriately.

24. IMPARTIALITY

Above Standard (7):

Always treats others equitably and in a professional manner regardless of cultural, ethnic, sex or physical differences. Never makes cultural, ethnic or sexist slurs. Serves as a model for others. Actively discourages such remarks and behavior.

Standard (4):

Always treats everyone equitably and in a professional manner regardless of cultural, ethnic, sex or physical differences. Clearly avoids making cultural, ethnic or sexist slurs.

Below Standard (1):

Fails to treat persons equitably and in a professional manner regarding cultural, ethnic, sex or physical differences. Makes cultural, ethnic and/or sexist slurs.