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# INTRODUCTION

The information contained in this booklet will serve as a guide for board members interviewing applicants. The interview content has been carefully prepared and the format for rating scales has been developed in conjunction with this content. When conducting interviews, board members must follow the information in this booklet, consisting primarily of a structured interview, which requires that the interview board adhere to the same general format with all applicants. The board need not limit the interview to the question areas suggested in this booklet. In many situations, it will be appropriate to ask additional, clarifying questions that are related to the applicant's qualifications. Such clarification is not only appropriate, but may be necessary to provide the most accurate rating of the applicant. However, board members should avoid asking questions that are irrelevant or not directly related to the job requirements.

Board members must become thoroughly familiar with this booklet and with the interview content before beginning the oral interviews. Any questions about this material that may arise during the course of the interviews should be thoroughly discussed with the other board members to ensure a common understanding regarding these interviews.

# INTERVIEW FORMAT

Once notified of the need for an oral review board for a Police Cadet, Telecommunicator, or Lateral Police Officer the Chief of Police must select the board chairperson and the board members.

The board chairperson will receive the applicant files and interview questions. Questions should not be developed that may lead an applicant into an admission of past alcohol or drug addiction or any mental/physical disability. Although questioning may proceed into these areas if an applicant blatantly reveals information that is not solicited, the board chairperson shall exercise proper judgment and discretion before allowing such questioning. The board chairperson will be responsible for discontinuing improper questions before they are answered by the applicant.

An applicant's selection ranking will be determined by his/her total score. The applicant's total score will be the average of each score on each dimension submitted by the board members.

# INTERVIEW DIMENSIONS

## DEPENDABILITY

The dependability of an applicant is evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* report for work on time
* refrain from taking or making excessive personal phone calls
* be accurate and thorough in handling the details of an assignment
* submit work on time
* follow through on all assignments
* not abuse sick time

## INITIATIVE

The initiative of an applicant is evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* strive to always put forth his/her best effort
* diligently and conscientiously carry out his/her assignments,
* care about his/her competence and want to improve his/her skills
* see himself/herself as responsible for learning the job and staying abreast of new developments in his/her occupational field
* proceed on assignments without waiting to be told what to do
* recognize his/her own deficiencies and strive to correct them

## INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

The interpersonal skills of an applicant are evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* understand the motives of people and usually be able to anticipate how people will act in each situation
* consider individual differences when dealing with people rather than treating everyone alike
* interact with people in a wide variety of circumstances without arousing antagonism
* work effectively as a member of a team
* speak clearly and intelligibly to individuals
* communicate effectively with persons of widely divergent cultural and educational backgrounds
* communicate effectively with supervisors and other employees in relaying needed information

## SITUATIONAL Reasoning ABILITY

The situational reasoning ability of an applicant is based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* demonstrate good "common sense"
* know how to analyze a situation, identify the important elements and make a logical decision
* have little difficulty deciding what to do in most situations
* uses reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation
* demonstrate officer safety consciousness

## INTEGRITY

The integrity of an applicant is based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* demonstrate what to do when faced with moral dilemma
* know how to deter others from engaging in poor decisions
* uphold the peace officers ethics
* foster trust within department as well as in the community

## OVERALL SUITABILITY

The overall suitability is based off of the totality of the applicant’s demeanor, interview answers, background, and likelihood to succeed at the police department.

# INTERVIEW GUIDE

## DEPENDABILITY

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence indicating:

1. Willingness of others to place their confidence in applicant’s ability

2. Applicant’s success or failure to honor obligations

3. Applicant’s success or failure to perform

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Degree of responsibility |
|  | * Growth of responsibility |
|  | * Recognition by employers/supervisors |
|  | * Raises/promotions |
|  | * Major accomplishments |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |
|  | * Attendance/tardiness |
|  | * Work quality |
|  | * Reasons for leaving jobs |
|  | * Employers/supervisors satisfied |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unemployment Record | * Number of jobs in recent years |
|  | * Time unemployed |
|  | * Length of unemployment |
|  | * Use of time while unemployed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Job responsibilities |
|  | * Promotions |
|  | * Medals/awards |
|  | * Specialized training |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Academic accomplishments/problems |
|  | * Awards |
|  | * School clubs or activities |
|  | * Elective office |
|  | * Positions of trust |
|  | * Disciplinary problems |
|  |  |

## INITIATIVE

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of the applicant's:

1. Willingness to improve his/her own skills and knowledge

2. Desire to improve his/her own performance level

3. Motivation to do more than the minimum requirements of a situation

4. Interest in finding improved ways for doing a job or task

5. Inability to fulfill the requirements of the job

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Efforts to improve job skills |
|  | * Efforts to improve methods/procedures |
|  | * Recognition by employer/supervisor for initiative |
|  | * Doing more than the job required |
|  | * Desire to assume increased responsibilities (promotion) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Interest in training/acquiring new skills |
|  | * Desire to seek meaningful work |
|  | * Better ways to do a job or task |
|  | * Take advantage of educational opportunities while in military |
|  | * Doing more than the bare minimum |
|  | * Positive attitude about service |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Advanced training (voluntary or required) |
|  | * Educational accomplishments |
|  | * Personal sacrifice to obtain education |
|  | * Extracurricular activities |
|  | * Failure to complete courses/schooling |
|  | * Low grades due to failure to prepare properly |

## INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Ability to deal effectively and positively with others

2. Interest in working with people

3. Desire to be of service to others

4. Fairness in dealing with all segments of society

5. Ability to handle more than one project at a time

6. Ability to handle stressful situations

7. Attentiveness

8. Ability to practice active listening

9. Patience

10. Confidence

11. Communication Style

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Relations with co‑workers |
|  | * Attitude of employers/supervisors |
|  | * Team orientation |
|  | * Responsible use of authority |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Sensitivity to other's feelings |
|  | * Problems in dealing with authority |
|  | * Reason for job changes related to people |
|  | * Ability to relay information in a professional manner |
|  | * Ability to engage in conversation with employers/supervisors |
|  | * Consistency |
|  | * Body Language |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Speech |
|  | * Attentiveness |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary actions in relation to communication failures |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Educational History | | | * Relationship with teachers and students | |
|  | | | * Activities requiring working with others | |
|  | | | * Leadership experience | |
|  | | | * Sports or other team activities | |
|  | | | * Ability to interact with teachers and students | |
|  | | | * Discipline problems | |
|  |  | |

## SITUATIONAL REASONING ABILITY

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Judgment abilities

2. Officer Safety consciousness

3. Responsible use of authority

4. Ability to consider alternatives

5. Ability to recognize when a crime has been committed

6. Ability to handle stressful situations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * considerable difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation |
|  | * stops and thinks things out when the situation requires fast action |
|  | * exercises reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation |
|  | * takes unnecessary risks |
|  | * seldom knows which way to go if faced with a difficult situation |
|  | * when time permits, they carefully consider all alternatives before acting |
|  | * ability to recognize when a situation is deteriorating |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Job responsibilities |
|  | * Promotions |
|  | * Medals/awards |
|  | * Specialized training |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |
|  | * Convictions |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Academic accomplishments/problems |
|  | * Awards |
|  | * School clubs or activities |
|  | * Elective office |
|  | * Positions of trust |
|  | * Disciplinary problems |

## INTEGRITY

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Judgment abilities

2. Responsible use of authority

3. Ability to do the right thing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * considerable difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a moral dilemma |
|  | * demonstrates past actions where they addressed their integrity being challenged |
|  | * stops and thinks things out when the situation requires fast action |
|  | * exercises reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation |
|  | * demonstrates making the right decision |
|  | * when time permits, they carefully consider all alternatives before acting |
|  | * ability to recognize when a situation is deteriorating |
|  | * ability to talk to others when their integrity is challenged |
|  | * reported wrongdoing when they observed it |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Job responsibilities |
|  | * Medals/awards |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Awards |
|  | * School clubs or activities |
|  | * Elective office |
|  | * Positions of trust |
|  | * Disciplinary problems |

# RATING SCALES

## DIMENSION 1 – DEPENDABILITY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Dependability** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to not respond to a call for assistance on a crime in progress |
|  | * could be expected to ignore the police radio or telephone for a while because he/she is tired of one minor complaint after another |
|  | * could be expected to be suspended at least once in his/her first year because he/she consistently would not follow procedures |
|  | * could be expected to occasionally fail to make court appearances when he/she is a key witness |
|  | * could be expected to consistently miss important details in an assignment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to be late for work about half the time |
|  | * could be expected to make excuses when faced with an unpleasant assignment |
|  | * could be expected to call in sick along with other employees to protest some working conditions |
|  | * could be expected to be unpredictable in his/her court appearances |
|  | * could be expected to be late in submitting about half of his/her reports |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to turn in all assignments on time |
|  | * could be expected to take average time on routine assignments |
|  | * could be expected to get his/her work in on time even if incomplete |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to do his/her share of the paperwork even though he/she thinks it's boring stuff |
|  | * could be expected to read a suspect his/her rights at the appropriate time |
|  | * could be expected to turn in required paperwork without being reminded |
|  | * could be expected to have his/her weapon serviceable at all times |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “**5**” | * could be expected to quickly finish a regular assignment |
|  | * could be expected to remain awake and alert throughout an entire shift where there is no activity |
|  | * could be expected to always be present and on time for scheduled appointments |
|  | * could be expected to be an employee who can always be counted on |

## DIMENSION 2 -- INITIATIVE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Initiative** |
|  |  |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to think he/she has learned all there is to know about his/her work and not seek any more training |
|  | * could be expected to not try to learn anything new during in-service training programs |
|  | * could be expected to refuse remedial training in an area of weakness if he/she doesn't get paid overtime for it |
|  | * could be expected to not initiate any work on his/her own until told what to do |
|  |  |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to be satisfied if he/she just barely meets minimum requirements on an assignment |
|  | * could be expected to think all employees have about the same chance of getting ahead no matter what they do |
|  | * could be expected to sign up for voluntary training programs, but not complete very many of them |
|  |  |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to volunteer for an assignment |
|  | * could be expected to think all employees have about the same chance of getting ahead no matter what they do |
|  | * could be expected to sign up for voluntary training programs, but not complete very many of them |
|  |  |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to volunteer for difficult assignments |
|  | * could be expected to develop good, reliable resources to help them do his/her job |
|  | * could be expected to work hard preparing for promotional opportunities |
|  | * could be expected to spend extra time on his/her own improving his/her work skills |
|  | * could be expected to keep track of crime trends in other areas that might affect his/her own area |
|  |  |
| “**5**” | * could be expected to request additional training in an area where he/she may be weak |
|  | * could be expected to actively look for an evaluation of his/her performance in order to improve his/her abilities as an officer |
|  | * could be expected to maintain his/her own set of departmental memos with notes and his/her own cross-reference system worked out |
|  | * can handle more than one assignment at a time |
|  | * able to maintain his/her work‑load |

## DIMENSION 3 -- INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Interpersonal Skills** |
|  |  |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to laugh at the parents of a child who is missing | |
|  | * could be expected to ignore information received from persons of a different race | |
|  | * could be expected to be discourteous and insulting to other persons | |
|  | * could be expected to verbally insult and/or strike at someone who calls him/her names | |
|  | * does not pay attention to others when they are speaking | |
|  | * uses obscene language in conversation | |
|  | * speech is rambling or confused | |
|  | * appears to have difficulty understanding and/or comprehending | |
|  |  |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to be considered by other employees as a “real loser” | |
|  | * could be expected to be indifferent to other people’s problems | |
|  | * could be expected to appear as arrogant, cold, or indifferent | |
|  | * speech is muffled or difficult to understand | |
|  | * speaks too rapidly to be understood | |
|  | * stares at one place while speaking | |
|  | * volume of speech is so low that it is difficult to hear | |
|  | * speaks in voice that is abnormally loud; appears to be shouting | |
|  |  | |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to tell participants in a neighborhood dispute that he/she would arrest them all if he/she was called back again | |
|  | * could be expected to work better as a “loner” rather than with a partner | |
|  | * could be expected to ignore an angry citizen complaining about a speeding ticket that the officer issued two years ago | |
|  | * appears to respond to some questions with a “canned” or memorized speech | |
|  | * nasal voice; talks through nose | |
|  | * uses colorful or flowery language | |
|  | * uses lots of “big” words in speaking to others | |
|  |  | |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to ignore someone who insults him | |
|  | * could be expected to convince a hardened criminal that a police officer is really his/her friend | |
|  | * could be expected to change his/her behavior as appropriate when dealing with individuals of a different ethnic background | |
|  | * could be expected to satisfy a complaining citizen that the police department is doing a good job | |
|  | * does not struggle to make self-understood | |
|  | * is very familiar with “street lingo” | |
|  | * has a pleasant tone of voice | |
|  |  | |
| “**5**” | * could be expected to be considered by other employees as a “really fine person” | |
|  | * could be expected to issue a citation in a manner such that the violator would actually be grateful for receiving the ticket | |
|  | * could be expected to always be friendly and helpful | |
|  | * could be expected to cooperate fully with other in working on a team project | |
|  | * waits for others to finish before starting to talk | |
|  | * speaks slowly and distinctly | |
|  | * has clear, strong voice | |
|  | * verbal presentation is logical | |
|  | * answers to questions are brief but thorough | |
|  | * maintains good eye contact when speaking or listening | |

## DIMENSION 4 -- SITUATIONAL REASONING ABILITY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Situational Reasoning Ability** |
|  |  |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to shoot at a car containing bank robbery suspects and their hostages | |
|  | * could be expected to “lose his/her cool” in a tight situation | |
|  | * could be expected to act first and think later in all situations | |
|  | * could be expected to think he/she has a solution before he/she even knows what the problem is | |
|  |  | |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to seldom know which way to go if faced with a difficult situation | |
|  | * could be expected to take unnecessary risks | |
|  | * could be expected to not recognize when a situation is deteriorating | |
|  |  | |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to make correct decisions in simple situations, but generally “blow” the tough ones | |
|  | * could be expected to fail to recognize some obvious alternative courses of action in many situations | |
|  | * could be expected to make snap decisions when the situation does not require it | |
|  | * could be expected to have considerable difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation | |
|  | * could be expected to stop and think things out when the situation requires fast action | |
|  |  | |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to exercise reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation | |
|  | * could be expected to know when a situation requires additional help | |
|  | * could be expected to change his/her approach to a situation if his/her first idea is not working | |
|  |  | |
| “**5**” | * could be expected, when time permits, to carefully consider all alternatives before acting | |
|  | * could be expected to have almost no difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation | |
|  | * could be expected to generally take the correct course of action in a touch situation | |
|  | * could be expected to never fail to do the right thing in every situation | |

## DIMENSION 5 -- INITIATIVE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of INITIATIVE** |
|  |  |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to shoot at a car containing bank robbery suspects and their hostages | |
|  | * could be expected to “lose his/her cool” in a tight situation | |
|  | * could be expected to act first and think later in all situations | |
|  | * could be expected to think he/she has a solution before he/she even knows what the problem is | |
|  |  | |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to seldom know which way to go if faced with a difficult situation | |
|  | * could be expected to take unnecessary risks | |
|  | * could be expected to not recognize when a situation is deteriorating | |
|  |  | |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to make correct decisions in simple situations, but generally “blow” the tough ones | |
|  | * could be expected to fail to recognize some obvious alternative courses of action in many situations | |
|  | * could be expected to make snap decisions when the situation does not require it | |
|  | * could be expected to have considerable difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation | |
|  | * could be expected to stop and think things out when the situation requires fast action | |
|  |  | |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to exercise reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation | |
|  | * could be expected to know when a situation requires additional help | |
|  | * could be expected to change his/her approach to a situation if his/her first idea is not working | |
|  |  | |
| “**5**” | * could be expected, when time permits, to carefully consider all alternatives before acting | |
|  | * could be expected to have almost no difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation | |
|  | * could be expected to generally take the correct course of action in a touch situation | |
|  | * could be expected to never fail to do the right thing in every situation | |

# INTERVIEW SCORE SHEETS

The form below is the DP11, Individual board member score sheet. All the sheets from board members will be kept at the Institution Police Department in the applicant/future employee’s file.

Applicant: Position:

Evaluator: Date:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Traits | Score for each category:  (circle the score received) | | | | | Score |
| 1. Dependability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 2. Initiative | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 4. Situational Reasoning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 5. Integrity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 6. Overall suitability for employment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| TOTAL:  A total of 18 indicates a passing score by this evaluator.  A failing total score by this evaluator does not disqualify an applicant. | | | | | |  |

INTERVIEW RESULT: PASS FAIL

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Each applicant is rated on a scale of “1” (lowest) to “5” (highest). For each trait, circle the number that is closest to describing the predicted behavior/performance of the applicant if hired as a police officer. As a principle of rating, a “3” is given to an average applicant or when there is little or no significant evidence available about the dimension. The extreme ratings of “1” or “5” should be given only when strong positive or negative evidence of the applicant’s ability has been obtained. Applicant must receive a total raw score of 18 or higher to pass the interview, however if one evaluator fails the applicant this does not prevent the applicant from advancing. Each board member will complete a DP11 for each applicant being interviewed. **The average of all the scores must be an 18 or higher for the applicant to then proceed in the process.**

The chairperson of the board will be board member #1 and their score will count toward the applicant’s score. The chairperson will collect all DP11 forms and then enter their data into the DP12. The DP12 is a summary of all the scores received by all members on the interview board.

DP12 Interview Summary Score Sheet

The chart below is from the DP12, Interview summary score sheet. This form will be sent to the Office of Director of Police in the background investigation packet.

| Oral Board Trait | #1 Board Member (Chairperson) | #2 Board Member | #3 Board Member | #4 Board Member | #5 Board Member | TOTAL  for all members on board: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Dependability |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Situational Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Integrity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Overall suitability for employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | |  |
| Divide Grand Total by number of board members and score must be an 18 or higher  for applicant to proceed to next phase | | | | | |  |

INTERVIEW RESULT: PASS FAIL

Chairperson for the Interview Board: date:

**Written Test Results:**

N/A

Score: Date administered:

**Example of 5 board member interview on DP12:**

Applicant: Emily Gast

Position: Cadet Date: 10/7/21

| Oral Board Trait | #1 Board Member (Chairperson) | #2 Board Member | #3 Board Member | #4 Board Member | #5 Board Member | TOTAL  for all members on board: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Dependability | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
| 2. Initiative | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 20 |
| 4. Situational Reasoning | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 17 |
| 5. Integrity | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 17 |
| 6. Overall suitability for employment | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 18 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 105 |
| Divide Grand Total by number of board members and score must be an 18 or higher  for applicant to proceed to next phase. | | | | | | 21 |

INTERVIEW RESULT: PASS X FAIL

Chairperson for the Interview Board: A. Griffin date: 10/7/2021

**Written Test Results:**

N/A

Score: Date administered:

**Example of 4 board member interview with a failure on DP12:**

Applicant: Emily Gast

Position: Cadet Date: 10/7/21

| Oral Board Trait | #1 Board Member (Chairperson) | #2 Board Member | #3 Board Member | #4 Board Member | #5 Board Member | TOTAL  for all members on board: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Dependability | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 12 |
| 2. Initiative | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 10 |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  | 14 |
| 4. Situational Reasoning | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  | 11 |
| 5. Integrity | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 12 |
| 6. Overall suitability for employment | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 12 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 71 |
| Divide Grand Total by number of board members and score must be an 18 or higher  for applicant to proceed to next phase. | | | | | | 17.75 |

INTERVIEW RESULT: PASS FAIL X

Chairperson for the Interview Board: A. Griffin date: 10/7/2021

**Written Test Results:**

N/A

Score: Date administered: