

St. Joseph, Missouri Police Department



DIRECTIVE TYPE: GENERAL ORDER		INDEX NUMBER: GO0116
SUBJECT: Performance Evaluations		
ISSUE DATE: March 27, 2001	REVISED: 7/04/05, 12/14/07, 11/03/10	AMENDS/RESCINDS: GO #22 of Jan. 1, 1996
REVISIONS CONTINUED: 1/24/2020		DISTRIBUTION: A

I. Policy:

It is the policy of this Department to maintain an ongoing performance evaluation system. The system is designed to improve member performance by identifying strong and weak points of individual performance and applying appropriate guidance and reinforcement. Its purpose is to serve both the member and the Administration by providing fair and objective measurements of individual performance.

II. Procedure:

A. Evaluation System Management:

1. All members will be evaluated annually during the month of their anniversary date.
 - a. The Human Resources Department will notify the Police Department when an evaluation report is due. The ratings period shall cover the one-year period prior to the anniversary date, with the **following exceptions**:
 - 1) Newly promoted Supervisors who are evaluated after the first six months of their promotion will be evaluated again at the end of their first year and every year, thereafter.
 - 2) Entry level probationary members should be evaluated at least quarterly (See also II.C. of this General Order) during their probationary periods.
 - 3) Any officer moving to a different shift or assignment. In this occurrence, the former supervisor shall send a collective evaluation to the new supervisor where the officer is transferring to within six (6) months of transfer.
 - b. The ratings shall be based on criteria specific to the assignment of the member during said ratings period.

2. Division Commanders shall be responsible for management and oversight of the evaluation system for their Division. Sworn members (up to the rank of Commander) will be evaluated by their immediate Supervisor(s) using the "Police Officer Annual Evaluation Report". Civilian members will be evaluated using the "City of St. Joseph Performance Appraisal Form for Administrative, Staff, and Personnel". Each Supervisor will be assigned a designated number of subordinates to evaluate. The subordinate's other Supervisors (during the same ratings period) may act as "Corresponding Evaluators". The Supervisor acting as the "Primary Evaluator" shall determine how many (up to four) and which Corresponding Evaluators will most accurately reflect the subordinate's performance throughout the ratings period. Evaluators from different Shifts or Divisions may be used proportionately for members who worked in those positions for a part of the ratings period. In circumstances in which a member's performance is not regularly observed by multiple Supervisors, the Primary Evaluator will notify his/her Watch/Division Commander who may authorize completing the Annual Evaluation Report independently (**See Section II.A.4.**). However, to ensure a consistent quality of evaluations throughout the Department, multiple evaluators will be used, when feasible.

3. **Procedures for the Use of Corresponding Evaluators/Forms:**

It will be the responsibility of the Primary Evaluator to obtain ratings and/or comments from all Corresponding Evaluators on a Collective Evaluation Form (see section 2 and 3 of the Evaluation Form, which is comprised of five numerical ratings scales for each category, and spaces for the initials of each rater. A comment and signature section is also provided). The evaluation scale utilizes categories ranging from one to five, as demonstrated below:

- **Unacceptable:** Performance is well below an acceptable level in this area. A great deal of improvement is needed.
 - **Marginal:** Performance is somewhat below the minimum acceptable level on this job dimension. However, there appears to be a potential to improve the ratings within a reasonable time frame.
 - **Satisfactory:** Performance is what one would expect from experienced, competent employees. Performance is regularly at or above the minimum acceptable standards. Most ratings will fall in this category.
 - **Very Good:** Performance is one of the better performances in the Division. Markedly better-than-average performance.
 - **Outstanding:** This person has performed so well in the particular job criteria that special note should be made. Performance is *regularly* of excellent quality and would be considered in the top ten (10%) when compared with the usual standards and the rest of the Department.
- a. The numerical ratings will then be averaged by the Primary Evaluator and rounded to the closest whole number rating. In the event of a half-

number score (example 2.5), the score will be rounded in the direction of the Primary Rater's assessment in that category.

- b. The completed Collective Evaluation Form will then be sent to the rater's immediate Supervisor for review. Inconsistencies or other problems with the evaluation may be addressed at this time to ensure that the rating(s) averages and comments accurately reflect the member's performance.

- 1) Collective Evaluation Forms may be maintained by the rater's reviewing Supervisor for the purpose of evaluating each rater's ability to effectively carry out his/her role as a rater (See Supervisory section 3 of the Annual Evaluation Report).

- c. The Primary Evaluator will then complete the Annual Evaluation Report to reflect the ratings and comments in each category from the Collective Evaluation Form.
- d. The Supervisor and rated member shall then meet to review the completed form. Goals, expectations, and career objectives should be included in the "rater summary" sections of the report. Written comments may be made by the rated member in the "comments section" to supplement the report.
- e. The member's signature is required on the completed form, indicating that he/she has received the evaluation. Members may appeal an evaluation under the existing procedures for personnel grievances.
- f. Before being signed by the member, the completed Evaluation Form will be sent to the rater's Supervisor for approval and signing.
- g. The form will then be sent to the Chief of Police prior to being sent to Human Resources, for retention.
- h. A copy of the completed evaluation will also be provided to the member after administrative review and signature by the Director of Human Resources.

4. Procedures for the Use of a Police Officer Annual Evaluation Report When Corresponding Evaluators Are Not Used:

The Primary Evaluator will complete the Annual Evaluation Report to reflect his/her own ratings and comments concerning the subordinate. **Sections II.A.3.d.e.f.g.h. directly above** will also be followed. The evaluation scale utilized will be the same as noted in **Section II.A.3.** above.

- 5. Throughout the ratings period, Supervisors will maintain working files on each member assigned to them, which may contain Letters of Commendation, formal and informal documentation of performance and discipline, and other pertinent information. Working files may be reviewed by the affected member and/or his/her Supervisors (within the chain-of-command), upon request. Upon transfer of a member, the working file will be forwarded to the next appropriate Supervisor.
- 6. The Primary Evaluator shall be responsible for identifying progress towards expected results and areas of concern during the rating period. A written review must be provided by the supervisor at least 90 days prior to the annual evaluation if a rating of unacceptable for the employee's overall performance

is anticipated (this does not apply if the unacceptable categories have been formally addressed by documented counseling or discipline). A list of members' anniversary dates will be available through the administrative office to allow supervisors to keep abreast of the evaluation dates of personnel under their supervision.

B. Training:

Supervisors will be trained in the methods of rating subordinates as stated in GO0125 II.D.2, or when a new evaluation system is adopted.

C. Entry-level probationary members:

New members on probation (civilian and sworn) will be evaluated to determine, at the earliest point, their suitability for the current position. The principal objective of supervisors rating probationary members is to ascertain whether they can actually perform the required functions. Performance should be closely monitored, and frequent written evaluations (in accordance with sections **II.A.1,2,4.**) should be a part of this process. Evaluations during the probationary phase include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. New members going through the FTO (Field Training Officer) Program are evaluated daily, at the conclusion of each phase, and at the conclusion of the program by FTO Officers/Supervisors to determine their suitability for the position.
2. New members going through the CTO (Communication Training Operator) Program are evaluated daily, at the conclusion of each phase, and at the conclusion of the program by CTO Trainers/Supervisors to determine their suitability for the position.
3. Academic reports of recruits placed at law enforcement academies for certification.
4. Rating Period Performance Reviews
5. Police Officer Annual Evaluation Report for sworn personnel and City of St. Joseph Performance Appraisal Form for civilian personnel

D. Below Satisfactory Ratings:

Members who receive an overall rating of "unsatisfactory" (rating of 2 or below in three or more categories) shall be rated a second time at the end of six months following the unsatisfactory performance rating. Such ratings shall be prepared by the appropriate Supervisor, who will then discuss the rating with the member.

E. Disposition:

Once the evaluation is completed, it will be forwarded to the Human Resources Director where it shall be filed in the member's Personnel File. The Human Resources Director shall not accept for record, any member evaluation that has not been signed by the member. After all signatures are recorded, the Human Resources Director shall provide a copy of the completed report to the member (See also Section **II.A.6.** in this General Order and the City Personnel Code-Section 8).

Chris Connally, Chief of Police

Date