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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate how police officers in a medium-size, suburban police department perceived performance appraisals and the effects of performance appraisals on job satisfaction and job performance. This study also examined the impacts of job satisfaction and job performance on organizations. One-on-one participant interviews were conducted, and thematic coding was utilized to capture the dominant themes associated with the police officers’ perceptions of performance appraisals. Twelve police officers from a medium-size, suburban police department in New Jersey participated in the study, and their anonymity was maintained to elicit transparent responses. This dissertation was conducted within a department of mostly Caucasian male employees. Future research conducted on this subject could utilize a sample pool with greater race and gender diversity. Studies could investigate the ways appraisals affect the world of policing and further explore the relationship of gender- and race-linked factors to job satisfaction and performance. This study may provide further incentive for job candidates of various genders and races to pursue the policing profession.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

New Jersey municipalities may issue ordinances to establish their own police departments, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:14-118 (1971). Once a police department is established, the local government is empowered to hire police officers invested with the legal authority of the state to enforce state statutes and local ordinances within the geographic boundaries of the appointing municipality (N.J.S.A. 40A:14-152 et. seq., 1971, 1977). Police officers appointed in all municipal police agencies must attend and complete mandatory training consisting of more than 800 contact hours spread across 22 weeks prior to certification and deployment by the New Jersey Police Training Commission (Police Training Act, 1961; N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et. seq).

The Mahwah Police Department was selected as the population for this case study due to its size and accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). To maintain accreditation, the Mahwah Police Department must meet CALEA’s requirements, which exceed those of the New Jersey Police Training Commission (Police Training Act, 1961; N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 supra). In 2003, the Mahwah Police Department became the third police agency in New Jersey to earn CALEA accreditation. It achieved re-accreditation in 2006, 2009, 2012, and 2015.

Mahwah, New Jersey, is a suburban municipality in northern Bergen County, which borders Suffern, New York. The Mahwah Police Department is tasked with providing police services to this 26-square-mile community. In 2017, 49 sworn law-enforcement officers of various ranks under the direction of Chief James Batelli served this predominantly bedroom community of 26,220 residents. It should be noted that state highways 202 and 17 bisect Mahwah, so commuters effectively swell the population by several thousand. The Mahwah Police Department responded to 22,048 calls for service in 2016.
Pursuant to statutes, the chief of police, once established, is the head of the police force and responsible to the appropriate authority for its “efficiency and routine day to day operations,” following policies established by the appropriate authorities (Title 40A-40A:14-118, supra). Although New Jersey State law does not require appraisals of police officers, the Mahwah Police Department conducts annual performance appraisals of officers to assist the police chief in reporting the department’s level of efficiency to the appropriate authorities. Furthermore, as one of seventeen CALEA-accredited police agencies in New Jersey, the Mahwah Police Department is bound by strict personnel appraisal protocols to maintain this coveted status (CALEA 5.23, section 16.3.8).

The goal of all police departments is to provide the best possible service to their communities. Hess, Hess Orthmann, and Cho (2014) stated that “the basic goals of most police agencies are to enforce laws, preserve the peace, prevent crime, protect civil rights and civil liberties, and provide services” (p. 121). Employee satisfaction is important to efficiently and effectively implement police services, while the measurement and improvement of employee satisfaction is important to the communities police officers serve, as well as the departments that employ them (Tomazevic, Seljak, & Aristovnik, 2014). Boyad, Lyndon, and Malekar (2012) stressed that employee satisfaction is key to the success of organizations and that employees are an organization’s greatest asset and should not be deprived of job satisfaction, which is crucial to organizational success.

Employee satisfaction is directly related to personal needs. As stated in Maslow’s (1943) paper “A Theory of Human Motivation,” people’s needs fall into three categories: basic, psychological, and self-fulfillment needs. Maslow’s (1943) theory starts with basic physiological essentials, such as food, water, and shelter. Before self-actualization can be achieved, these basic needs must be satisfied. People then want praise and recognition for a job well done in the quest for improved self-esteem (Maslow, 1943).
Although Maslow (1943) discussed people in general, police officers experience the same range of emotions and have the same needs as others. As Daniello (2000) stated, “people experience various forms of stress at home, work, and in social settings. Police officers experience stress the same as others, but also in ways much different than the average citizen” (p. 9). When called to a scene, police officers serve dual emotional and social functions (Jackson, 1987). Upon arriving, it is incumbent upon officers to project fearlessness and confidence and to instill feelings of safety and relief. Officers’ outward appearance, though, does not always accurately reflect how they feel. Their emotions, specifically pertaining to the need for safety, tend to be consistent with the second stage of Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of human needs.

Police officers who have high levels of self-esteem have very good coping mechanisms for threats and frustration. Increasing police officers’ level of professionalism has the added effect of increasing their self-esteem (Scotland, 1975). Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation addresses psychological needs, including self-esteem. His theories and their relevance to this case study are explored in greater detail in Chapter II.

Performance appraisals not only are designed to help employees realize their full potential in the jobs they perform but can also result in negative sanctions when employees’ job performance does not meet the standards established by employers (Freedland, 1993). In progressive discipline, employees are informed of the seriousness of problems and allowed opportunities to correct their performance. Positive discipline does not coerce compliance with rules but assists responsible employees through corrective counseling. Instead of punishing employees, positive discipline treats them as adults and encourages them to solve problems (Guffey & Helms, 2001).

At times, police officers are cynical about performance appraisals and believe their relationships with raters can affect the objectivity of appraisals in a phenomenon called the halo/horn effect (McCarthy, 2000). According to Hilgenfeldt (2004), “the purpose of a performance appraisal system is to ‘improve employee performance,’ yet too many police agencies
seem to treat employee appraisals as a ‘necessary evil’” (p. 1). Performance appraisals should be closely related to officers’ jobs, cover specific periods of time, and include objective descriptions of how employees have performed (Hilgenfeldt, 2004).

Moreover, performance appraisal systems should be based on variables rather than character traits (Gul, 2007). Employees should be part of the feedback process regarding the content and effectiveness of performance appraisals (Gul, 2007). Appraisals should contain organizations’ mission statements and note employees’ contributions to support said mission. Rater training is imperative, and employees should have an appeals process. A process that includes these elements fosters organizational effectiveness and efficiency and increases employee morale (Gul, 2007).

When officers are involved in controversial and high-profile incidents, their performance appraisals may come under scrutiny. Petrowski (2002) noted that first-responding officers’ reluctance to use physical force is well documented. Approximately 85% percent of police officers feloniously killed in the line of duty do not discharge their firearms during these events (Petrowski, 2002). This behavior is consistent with a more recent phenomenon known as the Ferguson effect. In this phenomenon, police fear backlash from their communities, media, politicians, and departments and consequently become less proactive in enforcement when interacting with minorities in urban environments (MacDonald, 2016a).

Indeed, “stress is the officer’s worst enemy in life-threatening situations because it distorts time perception and clouds judgment. Adrenaline levels can skyrocket to where it negatively impacts the ability to effectively fire a firearm” (Siuru, 1999, pp. 13–14). Stress and burnout can be detrimental to police officers and their departments because “physical and psychological reactions to stress and burnout can intensify irritability, impair judgment, and drain energy necessary to perform essential tasks such as chasing suspects on foot and accurate report writing” (Ivie & Garland, 2011, p. 50).
Attafar (1989) defined morale “as a condition of physical and/or emotional well-being in the individual that makes it possible for him to work and live hopefully and effectively” (p. 31). Loss of morale can be exacerbated by negative performance appraisals, potentially undermining officers’ effectiveness (Meyer, 1973). Indeed, “one maxim in the performance appraisal field is that official recognition of poor performance serves to decrease morale and efficiency—the complement being that recognition of exemplary performance increases morale and efficiency in certain organizations” (Meyer, 1973, p. 1). Officers’ perceptions of how their performance is appraised results in different emotional responses that affect their morale (Meyer, 1973). Morale directly influences job satisfaction, which, according to Boyad et al. (2012), is organizations’ greatest asset. Furthermore, employee satisfaction is key to organizations’ success (Boyad et al., 2012).

Finn (2000) explained how stress can affect officers’ job satisfaction and performance. The cumulative negative effects of stress on officers and their families typically affect the agency through impaired officer performance and the related problems of tardiness, absenteeism, and low morale. The consequence for the department is lower productivity. Stress-related performance inadequacies also may generate labor-management friction and lead to civil suits, disciplinary action, and union grievances. There may be adverse public reaction because of stress-related incidents, such as an officer’s suicide or a case of police brutality. Even problems that are confined to only a few individuals or that occur rarely can have major repercussions. For instance, a single incident in which a handful of officers abuse alcohol or other drugs can lower public confidence in the entire agency. (Finn, 2000, p. 21) Finn (2000) believed that stress on police officers also directly affects morale. Meyer (1973) found that low officer morale is reflective of low job satisfaction and performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Employee job satisfaction and performance are concerns for both public and private sector organizations. The law enforcement field, in which sworn officers have the legal right to take away
persons’ freedom, is no exception (40A:14-152.1, 2009). In certain circumstances, New Jersey police officers are authorized to use deadly physical force (N.J.S.A. 2C:3-7, 2015). With such authority given to individuals, it is imperative that supervisors and managers monitor employee morale and behavior.

However, there is a noticeable lack of research examining police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance in New Jersey medium-size police departments. A search of the Seton Hall University Libraries’ ProQuest multidisciplinary database using the search term “Performance appraisal and Police Officer and Job Satisfaction and Performance” returned 82,989 results. Limiting the results to the years 2010–2018 yielded 25,091 results, while limiting the search to dissertations and theses yielded 19,823 results, and finally, limiting it to the United States yielded 28 results. A Google Scholar search for similar research completed during 2010–2018 returned 17,300 results, but again, there were few studies on this specific topic. This review of recent research thus revealed a significant gap in knowledge related to police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this case study is to explore how officers in a medium-size, suburban police department perceive performance evaluations. Specifically, this case study explores how police officers perceive the effect of performance evaluations on job satisfaction and job performance and to what extent these two variables affect overall organizational operations. Drawing from Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation, the effect of performance appraisals on psychological and self-fulfillment needs and on officers’ job satisfaction and job performance are also explored.

Data were gathered from face-to-face interviews with a sample of twelve purposively chosen police officers from the Mahwah Police Department in New Jersey. The interviews were performed at the Mahwah Police Department Police Station (judges’ room), 221 Franklin Turnpike, Mahwah, New Jersey 07430. The Mahwah Police Department (2018c) is a New Jersey medium-size police
department and uses a guardian service model. In contrast, the Ocean City Police Department (2018), another New Jersey medium-size police department, has adopted the community policing model emphasizing partnerships with communities. Another New Jersey medium-size police department, the North Brunswick Police Department (2018), employs the community operational policing model. A review of the literature revealed these inconsistencies in the policing models used by New Jersey medium-size police departments. Consequently, the case study results cannot be generalized beyond the Mahwah Police Department.

**Significance of the Study**

Modern organizations embrace employee appraisals as a mechanism to develop, maintain, and promote employees (Carter, 2011). The criminal justice literature supports that organizations embrace employee appraisals as a method to encourage employee development (Rogers, 2003). Periodic performance evaluations are intended to measure the achievement of organizational goals and to ensure that employees’ skills evolve with organizational dynamics because “organizations learn only through individuals who learn. Individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning, but without it, no organizational learning occurs” (Senge, 1990, p. 139). Performance appraisals help organizational leaders guide personnel decisions and identify knowledge deficits, needed remedial actions, emerging core competencies, and training needs.

Job satisfaction, which is synonymous with morale in police organizations, may be affected by performance appraisals. Chawla and Renesch (1995) found that organizations that enhance learning opportunities are often the only places where self-actualizing individuals grow and are happy. In the present research, the literature review found no studies examining the relationship between police officers’ perceptions of performance appraisals and job satisfaction and performance. This case study, therefore, makes significant contributions to research on the perceived effects of performance appraisals on police officers’ job satisfaction and performance. From a public policy perspective, this case study is intended to provide law enforcement executives
with much-needed information for crafting and revising policy governing the design and implementation of performance appraisals.

**Research Questions**

How are performance appraisals perceived by law enforcement officers working in a New Jersey medium-size, suburban police department?

1. How do police officers describe the impacts of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?
2. How do police officers describe the impacts of performance appraisals on job performance?
3. To what extent do these two variables affect overall organizational operations?

Each research question was covered by five interview questions designed to group the respondents’ qualitative responses into themes. Vague or unresponsive statements prompted follow-up questions.

**Theoretical Framework**

This case study is undergirded by Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation, which has five levels:

1. Physiological needs, including food, water, warmth, and rest
2. Safety needs, including security and safety
3. Belongingness and love needs, including intimate relationships and friendships
4. Esteem needs, including prestige and the feeling of accomplishment
5. Self-actualization, or achieving one’s full potential, including through creative activities

Maslow’s theory of human motivation is as applicable today as it was in 1943. Police officers typically value honor and feel committed to the departments they serve. Such “organizational commitment was directly related to job satisfaction but only indirectly related to officers’ behaviors consistent with those expected of a community-policing orientation” (Ford, Weissbein, & Plamondon, 2003, p. 159). This case study is designed to examine officers’ perceptions of the effects of performance appraisals on job performance and job satisfaction. Maslow’s theory is examined in greater detail in Chapter II on the literature review.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are relevant to this case study.

**Chief of police**—the highest-ranking sworn member of a police department, appointed by the mayor and typically approved by the town council (N.J.S.A. 40A:14-118)

**Ferguson effect**—a phenomenon in which police, fearing backlash from their communities, media, politicians, and departments, are less proactive in enforcement when interacting with minorities in urban environments (MacDonald, 2016a)

**Interview questions**—questions designed to elicit qualitative responses germane to the case studied

**Job performance**—“the work-related activities expected of an employee and how well those activities were executed. Many business personnel directors assess the job performance of each employee on an annual or quarterly basis in order to help them identify suggested areas for improvement” (“Job performance,” n.d.).

**Job satisfaction**—“contentment (or lack of it) arising out of interplay of employee’s positive or negative feelings toward his or her work” (“Job satisfaction,” n.d.)

**Mahwah Police Department**—a medium-size police department in Bergen County, New Jersey, with 49 sworn officers of various ranks.

**N.J.S.A.**—New Jersey Statues Annotated

**Performance appraisal**—an instrument designed to appraise police officers’ knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) relative to their assignments (Oettmeier & Kenney, 2001)

**Performance evaluation**—see performance appraisal, referring to the same evaluative instrument and used interchangeably

**Police officer**—a sworn law-enforcement officer tasked with providing public safety and services to a community (N.J.S.A. 40A:14-152)

**Rater bias**—appraisal errors and biases in judgment observations (Javidmehr & Ebrahimpour, 2015)
**Rater training**—a process ensuring that raters are prepared to evaluate employees according to established standards

**Rater**—a supervisory officer completing a performance appraisal

**Research questions**—questions designed to explore a gap in knowledge addressed by a case study

**Supervisory officer**—a sworn law-enforcement officer tasked with supervising sworn officers of lower ranks (N.J.S.A. 40A:14-118)

**Limitations**

This case study relies on participant responses from twelve sworn police officers purposively selected from a population of 36 sworn police officers in the Mahwah Police Department. Regarding the generalizability and replicability of the findings in this case study, the results may not be generalized beyond the Mahwah Police Department. The study limitations are:

- Potential biases in the interview questions
- Actual or potential biases harbored by the researcher
- Actual or potential biases harbored by the interviewees
- Reliability of the evaluative instrument utilized by the Mahwah Police Department to appraise employees
- The researcher’s categorization of qualitative data into consistent themes
- The sample of participants from the Mahwah Police Department

**Delimitations**

The researcher set delimitations for this qualitative case study. It draws on homogenous data from one police department in Mahwah, New Jersey, and may not be representative of other police departments in New Jersey or elsewhere. The following are the case study delimitations:

- Purposive sampling method
- Interview questions
- Study design
Summary

This qualitative case study examines the perceived effects of performance appraisals on police officers’ job satisfaction and performance. Following Maslow’s theory of human motivation, the effects of performance appraisals on psychological and self-fulfillment needs may influence police officers’ job satisfaction and job performance. It is widely known that morale can affect job satisfaction and job performance in all forms of employment. When police officers’ actions are called into question, morale in law enforcement can be affected nationwide (MacDonald, 2016b). A recent event directly influencing police officers’ behavior in such a way was the police-involved shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri. The Ferguson effect consists of “a drop in proactive policing, leading to rising crime” (MacDonald, 2016a). In this case study, the relationships among officers’ perceptions of fair evaluations, job satisfaction, and job performance are examined.
Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to understand how police officers in a New Jersey medium-size police department perceive how their performance appraisals affect their job satisfaction and performance. A comprehensive, systematic physical and electronic search was performed for this literature review on the history of policing, policing professionalization, Maslow’s motivational model, performance appraisals, job satisfaction, and job performance. The first section of this chapter gives a historical overview of policing from the early British influences on United States policing through the present day. The second section is intended to explain efforts to professionalize policing over history. The third section on Maslow’s motivational model explores what drives the human psyche and how the human psyche influences policing. The fourth section describes the broad context of performance appraisals and many issues associated with them. The fifth section defines job satisfaction and identifies the many issues that can influence it. The sixth section explores job performance and its influences on individuals and organizations. Finally, the seventh section concludes the literature review and shows the gaps in the literature.

Literature Search Procedures

The researcher utilized the following resources: books, websites, journals, performance appraisals, Seton Hall University library databases, Google Scholar, interlibrary loans, and the Internet. The information obtained and incorporated into this study gives the reader a global perspective on the history and professionalization of policing, Maslow’s motivational model, performance appraisals, and job satisfaction and job performance in law enforcement.

There is a noticeable lack of research examining police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance in New Jersey medium-size police departments. A search of the Seton Hall University Libraries’ ProQuest multidisciplinary database using the search term
“Performance appraisal and Police Officer and Job Satisfaction and Performance” returned 82,989 results. Limiting the results to the years 2010–2018 yielded 25,091 results, while limiting the search to dissertations and theses yielded 19,823 results, and finally, limiting it to the United States yielded 28 results. A Google Scholar search for similar research completed over 2010–2018 returned 17,300 results, but again, there were few studies on this specific topic. This review of recent research thus revealed a significant gap in knowledge related to police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance.

This literature review served to focus the case study on performance appraisals and their perceived effects on job satisfaction and job performance after appraisals are given to police officers. Overall, this qualitative case study shows the perceptions of performance appraisals held by suburban police officers with a New Jersey medium-size police department. The formatting style follows the American Psychological Association’s (2017) sixth edition of guidelines.

**History of Policing**

**British Influence on American Law Enforcement**

In 1829, the British Parliament passed the Metropolitan Police Act, creating London’s first police force with full-time staffing. The Metropolitan Police Act called for the establishment of a professional police force based on the belief that the general public would support it. The act led to the creation of the London Metropolitan Police Force. In the first three years of its existence, more than 5,000 officers were terminated, and 6,000 more resigned due to changes instituted to create a professional police force (Swanson, Territo, & Taylor, 2012).

Many cities in the United States drew lessons from how the Metropolitan Police Act influenced British policing and led to the creation of a centralized, full-time police force under the strong leadership of Sir Robert Peel (Swanson et al., 2012). U.S. cities used the Metropolitan Police Act as a model for the establishment of modern policing and followed Peel’s nine principles of policing:
Principle 1—The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.

Principle 2—The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions, behavior, and the ability of the police to secure and maintain public respect.

Principle 3—Police must secure the willing cooperation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the public respect.

Principle 4—The degree of cooperation of the public that can be secured diminishes, proportionately the necessity for the use of physical force and compulsion in achieving police objectives.

Principle 5—Police seek and preserve public favor not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.

Principle 6—Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to achieve police objectives; and police should use the minimum degree of physical force that is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving a police objective.

Principle 7—Police at all times should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historical tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police are the only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare.

Principle 8—Police should always direct their actions strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary by avenging individuals or the state, or authority judging guilt or punishing the guilty.
Principle 9—The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them. (Shrestha, 2015, p. 23)

**Stages of American Policing**

Policing in the United States has gone through many stages. The patronage or spoils systems persisted until the Pendleton Act created the U.S. Civil Service Commission in 1883, which required testing of candidates before appointment to some federal positions (Swanson et al., 2012). The standards set by the U.S. Civil Service Commission have trickled down to the state and local levels in law enforcement. This method of merit-based testing of potential employees still exists today in many, though not all, police departments. The Mahwah Police Department (2018b), which was selected as the sample for this study, does use testing to select candidates.

Peel’s principles of policing were advanced between 1905 and 1932 by a U.S. police chief named August Vollmer, known as the father of U.S. modern policing. Vollmer’s professional model included the use of bicycles, cars, a dispatch system, intelligence collection, crime analysis, a scientific laboratory, training, recruitment of college-educated persons, and intelligence and psychological standards for officers (Swanson et al., 2012).

As policing entered the 20th century, it faced many pitfalls: political influence on how police operated, patronage, inefficiency, corruption, and riots. Corruption rose to the level of public intolerability, triggering a period of reform with two priorities: “1. arousing the public from its apathy; and 2. creating a conceptual cornerstone or model for improvement by separating politics and patronage in the worst sense from the administration of governmental agencies” (Swanson et al., 2012, p. 11). In 1929, President Herbert Hoover established the National Commission on Law Observance and Law Enforcement, which conducted the first known, documented comprehensive study on crime and policing in U.S. history. Commonly known as the Wickersham Commission, the 14-volume report published in 1931 with Vollmer as its principal author offered recommendations supporting modern policing. These recommendations included that police officers have civil service
protection, as well as enhanced training and education (Swanson et al., 2012). The standards set by
the Wickersham Commission are used by the Mahwah Police Department today (Coded Systems,
2018a, 2018b).

The World War II and Korean War era saw a shortage of able-bodied men to fill personnel
voids in law enforcement agencies, creating opportunities for women. Moreover, state and local
units of government came under the direction of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, followed
by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. This act amended Title VII, prohibiting
“discrimination in hiring, promotion, and firing based upon sex, race, color, religion and national
origin” (Swanson et al., 2012, p. 25). The act thus allowed women to serve in all functional areas of
policing, including patrols. The act also created more hiring opportunities for minorities based on
gender, race, and ethnicity (Swanson et al., 2012).

Schmallager (2012) identified four eras of policing. First, during the political era (1840s–
1930s), police and politicians had close relationships. Police departments were almost paramilitary
units serving the politically affluent, and politicians appointed members of police departments.
Second, during the reform era (1930s–1970s), police departments started to take pride in being
professional. Officers’ main concern was fighting crime, especially organized crime. This era arose
from popular calls to remove politicians from policing. Third, in the community era (1970s–2001),
police officers focused on working with the needs of the communities they served. Applying the
broken windows model of policing, officers created bonds with communities and targeted quality-
of-life offenses. Fourth, the new era (2001–present) has focused on homeland security, a priority
after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Intelligence-led policing is also a characteristic of
the new era, which relies on communities to provide information to assist homeland security.

Civil Unrest and Policing

During the 1960s, amid riots, protests, and assassinations, modern policing moved forward.
During this time, policing faced civil disorders that shaped the history of modern policing and
affected public perceptions of police agencies across the country. This section describes three historical incidents of civil disorder that had profound effects on perceptions of police departments nationally. The general public displayed a lack of trust in police as violent protests resulted from these actions. These protests shed light on the unknown level of professionalism in law enforcement, as discussed later in this literature review.

The 1965 Watts Riot started after an African American woman was stopped for driving while intoxicated. Her brother was accompanying her in the car when she was stopped, and her mother showed up on the scene. Persons congregated around the car stop and eventually started throwing rocks at the officers in protest. This incident led to six days of violence in Watts, a minority neighborhood in Los Angeles, California (Swanson et al., 2012).

The 1967 Detroit riot began when a police vice squad executed a raid on an after-hours drinking club in a predominantly Black neighborhood. The police expected to round up a few patrons but found 82 people holding a party for two returning Vietnam veterans. While the police waited for assistance to transport those arrested, a crowd gathered around the establishment to protest the police action. After the last police car left, a small group of men, confused and upset at being kicked out of the only place they had to go, ripped off the bars and broke the windows of an adjacent clothing store. From this starting point, vandalism, looting, and arson spread. The origins of urban unrest in Detroit were rooted in a multitude of political, economic, and social factors, including police abuse, an affordable housing shortage, urban renewal projects, economic inequality, Black militancy, and rapid demographic change. Local officers, state police, and the Michigan National Guard were needed to restore order (History.com, 2018).

The 1968 Washington, D.C., riot was triggered by the assassination of Baptist minister and civil rights activist Martin Luther King, Jr. After his death, many cities, including Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, Memphis, and Philadelphia, erupted into civil unrest as mourners vented their outrage. Many believed the U.S. government killed King to control African
Americans. Those involved in the civil unrest were also frustrated with what they believed to be racism that would not allow them to get a good education or jobs or live in good neighborhoods. Concerned about the civil unrest, President Lyndon Johnson placed the city of Washington under martial law. A 9 p.m. curfew was imposed, and violators were subject to arrest (Wright, 2007).

Policing Experiments

Public perceptions of police departments nationally affect the quality of life. To increase positive perceptions of police departments among the general public, different models of policing have been tested, and various studies have been conducted to see which model has the most positive effects on policing. In the 1970s, a policing experiment called the Kansas City experiment tested three policing models and measured their crime and public safety outcomes:

1. Reactive policing—no regular patrol, with officers only responding in and out of the district when given assignments and traveling the shortest route to and from assignments
2. Proactive policing—two to three times the amount of normal patrol coverage
3. Control policing—normal operations

The Kansas City experiment found no significant differences in reported crime or arrests across the three types of beats or reactive, proactive and control districts. This experiment is often cited when different policing styles are suggested (Swanson et al., 2012).

In 1973, the Rand Corporation initiated a study on what factors contribute to the success of detective work. The study focused on more serious crimes investigated by detectives and found most solved crimes were cleared by information patrol officers obtained during the initial response to the scene (Swanson et al., 2012).

The team policing concept was designed to reduce specialization within police departments. It placed approximately 20–30 officers under the direction of one person for a 24-hour period and was intended to make patrol officers more self-sufficient. This program became the gateway to community policing (Swanson et al., 2012).
Current Trends in Policing

From the 1980s through the World Trade Center attacks on September 11, 2001, policing operations changed. According to Swanson et al. (2012), policing has become more efficient at utilizing analytics and science to solve more crimes and identify potential threats. These analytical and science methods are:

1. Community-oriented policing—strategies and programs implemented in partnership with communities to customize police services and problem solutions, allowing for a focus on crime prevention instead of crime detection
2. Zero tolerance policing—the notion that ignoring small infractions creates a climate conducive to committing more serious crimes
3. CompStat—a management control system designed to analyze and distribute information about crime and possible offenders, which creates a significant level of managerial accountability for crime and public safety
4. Evidence-based policing—police strategies based on research to provide successful outcomes, prevention, detection, and eradication (Swanson et al., 2012).

The focus of policing has shifted to terrorism prevention and intelligence-based policing. Community relationships are being utilized to fight terrorism with the creation of counter-terrorism bureaus in police departments across the country. Law enforcement executives need to embrace their new role in countering terrorism by knowing the enemy, preparing for terrorist attacks, planning for more public transparency, and being aware of their vulnerabilities and limitations (Newman & Clark, 2008). With terrorism affecting the current policing climate, it is essential for police departments to provide an atmosphere of safety for the public they serve and the persons they employee. Safety is a part of Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs.
Professionalization

Classic examples of occupations considered to be professions are the practice of medicine and law, as well as law enforcement. The word *profession* is derived from the Latin words *pro* (meaning “forth”) and *fateri* (“confess”). The definition of *profession* in the workplace has undergone changes. At one time, it meant a learned occupation or how a person habitually earned a living (Swanson et al., 2012).

Whether law enforcement is considered to be a profession is determined by how professionalism is defined (Hess et al., 2014). Some characterize professions as important, paid jobs in contrast to unpaid amateurs. Sociologists have identified three elements that establish professionalism. First is specialized knowledge, which may be a required amount of college education or completed skills training, such as a police academy. Second is autonomy, which allows management to control employee selection and define the content given to employees. Autonomy also includes the capacity for self-monitoring and disciplining. Third is an ideal of service expressed through adherence to a code of ethics and commitment to the community one serves.

The Presidential Crime Commission’s report on the professionalization of law enforcement recommended that police officers throughout the country be required to have baccalaureate degrees by 1984 (Hess et al., 2014). Congress created the now-defunct fund called the Law Enforcement Education Program, which recognized more than 1,000 academic institutions of higher education offering policing-related courses. This program marked a federal effort to boost efforts to professionalize police officers across the country. The most significant advancement in law enforcement has been the professionalization of the police officer (Hess et al., 2014). Indeed, 80%–90% of police budgets are allocated to personnel, allowing departments to demand high-quality work from police officers (Hess et al., 2014).

In public-service professions, transparency is needed to change general public perceptions of police forces. Early policing was widely known for corruption, and many persons believed police
officers themselves were violent criminals (Swanson et al., 2012). The general public still believes law enforcement is only tasked with crime fighting, but in fact, law enforcement requires high levels of skill and intelligence (Williams, 1988). Leaders in police departments are reluctant to require a college degree but do prefer it (Bruns, 2010). Most police departments require a high school diploma or its equivalent (Bruns, 2010).

Efforts to professionalize policing have focused on education and educational requirements (McClellan & Gustafson, 2012). However, arguments for and against education have been proposed, and education itself has been criticized as insufficient for an organization to achieve professional status (McClellan & Gustafson, 2012). The professionalization of policing has seen a shift in police officers’ role from tough cop to problem solver, crime fighter, and rule applier (White, 1972).

The father of modern policing is Vollmer, chief of the Berkley Police Department (1905–1932), who developed the model for professional policing (Swanson et al., 2012). Vollmer was known for his efforts to continually improve personnel and provide them with equipment, so they could serve the community better. Vollmer’s changes included assigning fixed-post police officers to mobile patrols using bicycles and cars. He instituted a signal system, so officers could be dispatched to assignments. He created geographical beats and used crime analysis to address crime trends. He also employed the first scientific police laboratory in 1916 and a lie detection machine in investigations in 1921, both equipment still used by many police agencies today.

Costantino (2014) credited the professionalization of policing to Vollmer and the of the Wickersham Report recommendations, which pointed to a need for professional policing. Being recognized as professional further requires reviewing the structural attributes of organizations, including full-time employees, education, and ethical standards (Costantino, 2014). Law enforcement organizations, however, lack national, standardized entry requirements, hindering professionalization (Costantino, 2014).
Professionalization requires a personal call to duty that the candidate feels and a training process that meets professional standards (Hunsinger, 1994). Professionalization needs employee relationships with organizations that support occupations’ professional standards. It demands that persons maintain their credibility, which translates into self-pride and higher employment standards. However, policing, unlike medicine and law, existed as an occupation before training and educational requirements were associated with its practice (Rudoni, Baker, & Meyer, 1978).

**Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies**

With the goal of professionalizing police departments, many agency heads seek to obtain CALEA accreditation for their departments. This accreditation provides a measurable standard that assures the community that its police department maintains a professional level of service and operational standards. CALEA accreditation is best described as follows:

- CALEA’s accreditation programs is to improve the delivery of public safety services, primarily by: maintaining a body of standards, developed by public safety practitioners, covering a wide range of up-to-date public safety initiatives; establishing and administering an accreditation process; and recognizing professional excellence.
- Specifically, CALEA’s goals are to: Strengthen crime prevention and control capabilities; Formalize essential management procedures; Establish fair and nondiscriminatory personnel practices; Improve service delivery; Solidify interagency cooperation and coordination; and Increase community and staff confidence in the agency. (CALEA, n.d.a)

This accreditation has specific, required steps that must be met and sustained to maintain CALEA accreditation. The requirements start with enrollment, and the department reassesses its CALEA standards either every 24 or 36 months depending on the agreement. The department then has an on-site assessment for CALEA to decide whether it has met CALEA standards. Finally, the department must comply with CALEA (n.d.b) standards for three years leading to another on-site assessment.
To achieve accreditation, police departments must meet the most important six of 460 CALEA standards:

1. How responsibilities, roles, and relationships with other agencies are maintained
2. How the department manages itself, how its administrative section operates, and how the department is organized
3. How the agency administers its personnel
4. How the agency’s operational aspects, such as traffic and other support services, work
5. How the department works with detainees and court services
6. How the department’s technical and auxiliary services operate. (CALEA, n.d.c)

Setting and maintaining these standards facilitates crime control and prevention, supports fair management practices, improves delivery of police services to communities, solidifies inter-agency operations, and boosts the general public’s confidence in the accredited department (CALEA, n.d.a).

In 2003, the Mahwah Police Department (2018a) became the third municipality in New Jersey to earn CALEA accreditation, which it renewed in 2006, 2009, 2012, and 2015. Although there is no national-level mandate for professionalization, CALEA is a credentialing institution endorsed by the International Chiefs of Police, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, National Sheriffs’ Association, and Police Executive Research Forum (Costantino, 2014).

**Hiring Requirements and Practices among Various Police Departments**

An examination of employment requirements for officers in two New Jersey medium-size police departments revealed that the New Jersey State Police (2018) requires a candidate to be 21–35 years old and a citizen, possess a driver’s license, and have either 60 college credits with two years of work experience or a bachelor’s degree at time of appointment. The Paterson Police Department (2018) has the following employment requirements: citizenship; good health; the ability
to speak, read, and write English; good moral character; and no convictions related to moral turpitude. Police officers appointed to every municipal police agency in the state of New Jersey must attend and complete mandatory training consisting of more than 800 contact hours spread across 22 weeks prior to certification and deployment by the New Jersey Police Training Commission (Police Training Act, 1961; N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et. seq).

The Mahwah Police Department requires a candidate to be 18–35 years old and a citizen, be of sound mind and good health, have good moral character, hold a New Jersey driver’s license, and be able to speak, read, and write English. The candidate must also have a bachelor’s degree or an honorable discharge from the military with a high school diploma or equivalency certificate and meet the height and weight standards set by the U.S. Army (Mahwah Police Department, 2018b).

**Professionalization of Medical Practice**

Another profession that requires education and training is medicine. The requirements for a medical doctor are a doctorate degree in the field of medicine and a state license. Board certification by the American Board of Medical Specialties is optional (“Doctor of Medicine,” 2018). Candidates must complete a residency and possess accountability, empathy, attentiveness, critical thinking, physical stamina, communication and leadership skills, and familiarity with diagnostic equipment, Microsoft Excel, and medical software. Kirk (2007) qualified the practice of medicine as professional by stating that a profession requires the ability to apply learned knowledge and skills. Those who apply these skills and knowledge are bound by a sense of commitment, regulate themselves through government boards and hospital committees, and ethically practice medicine.

**Professionalization of Law Practice**

According to FindLaw (2018), the requirements to practice law are a baccalaureate degree and graduation from a three-year law school accredited by the American Bar Association. In addition, candidates must pass the bar exam for the state where they decide to practice law. They
have to pass a character and fitness review, swear an oath, and be licensed before being considered to be professional lawyers.

As described by Kirk (2007) and FindLaw (2018), the medicine and law professions both have centralized requirements. Although in the field of law, some states have their own bar exams granting the right to practice law within them, other states use a uniform bar exam. Law enforcement has not yet embraced uniform, national standards to qualify police officers. New Jersey statutes require officers to attend more than 800 contact hours over 22 weeks before certification and deployment by the New Jersey Police Training Commission (Police Training Act, 1961; N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et. seq).

**Maslow’s Theory of Human Motivation**

This study is undergirded by Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs, a psychological theory proposed in his paper entitled “A Theory of Human Motivation” published in *Psychological Review*. Maslow (1954) further detailed this theory in the book *Motivation and Personality*. This theory of psychological health is predicated on the fulfillment of innate human needs, which culminate when a person reaches a level of self-actualization. Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation describes how persons seek to satisfy various levels of needs that build upon each other:

1. **Physiological needs**: food, water, rest, and warmth
2. **Safety needs**: freedom from fear (self-security), protection from the environment, and some form of order and stability
3. **Belongingness and love needs**: emotional and intimate relationships with family and friends
4. **Esteem needs**: a sense of accomplishment, dignity, independence, reputation, and social status
5. **Self-actualization**: personal growth that allows persons to achieve their full potential
Figure 1. Maslow’s (1943) theory of human needs.

In Maslow’s hierarchy, lower-level needs must be satisfied before higher-level needs (Kuieck, 1980). If psychological needs, such as shelter, are not satisfied, an individual is not concerned with self-actualization (Kuieck, 1980). Maslow (1943) implied that persons move up through the hierarchy of needs as life progresses. Once security and psychological needs are satisfied, individuals can rise through the hierarchy of needs to belongingness and self-esteem (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow’s (1943, 1954) theory of basic human needs was revised twice by Maslow in 1970 in sources commonly referred to as 1970a and 1970b. The first revision (Maslow, 1970a) added cognitive and aesthetic needs, while the second revision added transcendence needs (Maslow, 1970b). These revisions were as follow:

1. Cognitive needs concern meaning and knowledge.
2. Aesthetic needs concern balance, form, beauty and appreciation.
3. Transcendence needs concern helping others reach self-actualization.
Figure 2. Maslow’s (1970a, 1970b) revised theory of human needs.

Police officers have the same human needs as those not sworn to serve the public. Officers need to meet Maslow’s basic human needs to achieve a rewarding level of job satisfaction. The first two levels of safety and physical needs in Maslow’s (1943) theory must be satisfied before the higher needs of belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization can be satisfied (Elliot & Williams, 1995). Meeting the basic human needs in Maslow’s theory of human motivation improves employee morale, leading to greater job satisfaction. In all facets of work, employee satisfaction can have positive or negative effects on job performance and work products. Employees who reach a threshold of job satisfaction improve organizational effectiveness. Indeed, “every organization must consider employee job satisfaction as a vital element to increase customer satisfaction and keep their business running. Dissatisfaction can affect the organizational productivity and progress” (Rukh, Choudhary, & Abbassi, 2015, p. 137). According to Boyad et al. (2012, p. 38), “employee satisfaction has always been an important issue for organizations.” Chia-Hao and Ting-Ya (2018)
found that job stress has direct impacts on job performance when only job stress is factored in, but when happiness is also factored in, the impacts on job performance are not as significant.

**Performance Appraisals**

**Definition of Performance Appraisals**

Performance appraisals are an instrument designed to assess police officers’ KSA relative to their assignments (Oettmeier & Kenney, 2001). Performance appraisals are defined as a process to evaluate organizational members (Erdogan, 2002). The process should include the standards used for appraisal, the appraisal-related behaviors of the person evaluated, a set period of time, and the methods used to determine and communicate the performance appraisal rating to the person evaluated (Erdogan, 2002). Performance appraisals allow for documentation of departmental expectations and values (Johnson, 2001). Shane (2008) described performance appraisals as the estimated or perceived value of the appraised individual. The rater is cognitively affected by the environment and by grasping the individual’s liability, whether positive or negative. Performance appraisals can further employee development in assigned tasks and allow employees to improve their job performance (Blue, 2011).

Letting employees give feedback improves their well-being and motivation (Daley, 2010). Performance appraisals should be designed to structure the assessment process in a positive manner (Daley, 2010). They should help supervisors focus on the objectives and the requirements to appropriately assess employees and should improve organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. Performance appraisals provide employees with feedback on how they can improve without discouraging their motivation and independence (Nimsombun, 2000).

**History of Performance Appraisals**

Patten (1977) traced the formal appraisal of personnel as far back as the third century A.D. in China. According to Compensation Café (2012), the known history of performance appraisals began as early as 222 AD. Looking at this history chronologically, between 221 AD and 265 AD,
members of the Wei Dynasty assessed the performance of official family members. Between 1540 and 1560, Ignatius Loyola created an appraisal system to evaluate members of the Jesuit Society. During Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century, employees were appraised based on the satisfactory output of the number of items they produced. Between 1800 and 1817, Robert Owens conducted performance appraisals to monitor the performance of his Scotland cotton mills, using colored cubes to indicate employees’ daily performance. In 1911, Frederick Taylor advocated paying employees higher wages for higher output, a philosophy aligned with the theory of scientific management. Performance appraisals were utilized on lower-level workers after the end of World War I in 1918 but not widely applied to managers and professionals until after 1955. In 1957, management by objective was initiated and led to the use of performance appraisals based on the achievement of goals set by both supervisors and employees. This process facilitated both employee development and employee feedback. During the 1960s, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1966 and 1970 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Guidelines led to the implementation of performance appraisals in most companies. In 1996, performance management and appraisals started to align with corporate goals to give employees clear expectations of performance and organizational goals.

**Commonly Utilized Performance Appraisal Types**

Trait-based performance appraisals require the rater to identify if a person has the personality characteristics to perform the task at hand. Behavior-based performance appraisals are intended to capture what employees do in performance of their job responsibilities. This appraisal system is considered to be more legally defensible. Civil rights legislation has led to development of tools focused on behavioral data: the critical incident technique and the behaviorally anchored rating system (Berman, Bowman, West, & Van Wart, 2006). In performance appraisals, the critical incident technique relies on the rater to identify inferior and superior behaviors. Supervisors can be trained to pay attention to more performance-based behaviors for appraisal. The behaviorally
anchored rating system uses dimensions to appraise behavior and critical incidents to underpin the appraisal instrument describing the ratee’s performance level (Halachmi, 1995).

The results-based performance appraisal system is also called the outcome-oriented approach. It is not based on behaviors or characteristics but precisely measures employees’ contributions to the organization’s success. The management-by-objective method of appraisal has the goal of achieving employee and organizational congruence (Berman et al., 2006). The self-appraisal method is based on the strong belief that ratees have important knowledge on how jobs should be performed and that organizational success results when employees and supervisors share the same goals (Berman et al., 2006). The 360° performance appraisal method, also known as the multi-rater appraisal, relies on input from supervisors, peers, and citizens. This appraisal method is considered to be time consuming due to the multiple sources of input. Peer reviews are more forthright if the reviewers are kept anonymous. Systems that maintain anonymity and encourage participation yield positive feedback for improving employee and management processes (Berman et al., 2006). Despite performance appraisals methods such as 360-degree and peer-prepared appraisals, immediate supervisors are the most common preparer of appraisals (Erdogan, 2002). With any appraisal preparation comes the possibility of appraisal errors, as discussed later.

**Performance Appraisal Preparation**

Persons tasked with preparation of performance appraisals should review employees’ goals and requirements for the rating period (DelPo, 2005). Before preparing appraisals, the rater should ask the following questions for each requirement or goal (DelPo, 2005): Has the employee performed to the level of the requirement or goal? Why or why not? How is the rater aware that the employee has or has not met the goal or requirement? What else can the rater review to confirm that the employee has met the requirement or goal? What is the impact on the organization, specifically on the employee’s division? How can the employee perform better in the next appraisal period?
What can the rater do to better support the employee in the next rating period? How can the organization better facilitate the employee’s performance to meet the required performance?

Evaluating and appraising employees allows supervisors to make recommendations about progress, promotions, and transfers. Managers can also identify employees’ deficiencies and create training programs to address them. Supervisors can reward employees, increasing employee loyalty and tenure in the organization (Javidmehr & Ebrahimpour, 2015).

By recognizing good and bad performance as it occurs, appraisers can avoid rater errors, such as central tendency, recency, and the halo effect. It is recommended that

When you see good performance, recognize it then and there. … Deal with poor performance when it occurs. Use the annual review as a quick summary of what you and the worker already know, then put the proper rating on his or her performance and go from there. (Albright & Clay, 1997, p. 67–68)

Albright and Clay (1997) further stated that there is an inverse correlation between how employees appraise themselves and their skill set. Top-performing employees are often demanding of themselves, see how they fall short of their own expectations, and accordingly appraise themselves lower. In contrast, lower-performing workers narrow their perceptions of what is expected of them and focus on how hard they work toward a narrower goal, leading them to believe they are top performers and to appraise themselves at a much higher level than they perform.

Performance appraisals are as important to an individual as annual physicals. They “help [us] make sure that our compass is still pointing in the right direction, and we are still meeting the needs of the organization and those we serve” (Haigh, 2016, p. 45). Daley (2010) concurred, stating that appraisals should improve organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. Aluri and Reichel (1994) stated that performance appraisals have a relationship to organizational effectiveness: “the basis of performance appraisals is that they should result in better organizational performance” (p.
Kramer (1998) found that police department employees viewed performance appraisals as useless, bureaucratic, and unconstructive. However, appraisals still provide a service for the public the employees serve, and organizations have to “continually evaluate and improve performance on both an organizational and an individual level” (Kramer 1998, p. 20). Kramer (1998) further found that no police department employees were trained in performance appraisals, and law enforcement agencies did not make the appraisal process meaningful. A lack of appraisal training makes preparation errors more likely to occur, undermining the intent of performance appraisals to aid employee improvement and organizational success.

**Performance Appraisal Preparation Errors and Bias**

Multiple studies have revealed bias and errors in performance appraisal preparation. Among the many types of errors, rater bias is defined as appraisal errors and biases in judgment observations (Javidmehr & Ebrahimpour, 2015). A common error is known as the leniency factor, also called the Santa Claus effect, in which the rater appraises the employee too highly. The supervisor wants to maintain a good relationship with the person appraised, perhaps to encourage a marginal employee to perform better, show empathy for an employee with a hardship, or avoid confrontation over a lower rating. Another performance appraisal error is known as the severity error. This occurs when the supervisor preparing an appraisal wants to highlight a deficiency in a high-performing employee or to shock a lower-performing employee into higher performance. Another rater error is the central tendency, when almost all employees are rated satisfactorily because rating personnel higher or lower requires more effort. As well, in the implicit personality theory, the rater passes judgement on the employee based on limited data often drawn from first impressions. The rating satisfies the rater’s opinion but does not accurately gauge performance (Berman et al., 2006).
In the recency error, “an individual’s total performance” is evaluated “based on the last or most recent behavior … observed” (Miami University, 2009). Berman et al. (2006) described recency error as when the rater is influenced by a recent, significant event that overshadows all other events during the rating period. The supervisor preparing a performance appraisal focuses on recent events, whether positive or negative (Javidmehr & Ebrahimpour, 2015). In contrast, in the primacy error, the rater only considers performance early in the rating period (Chambers, 2016).

Other errors in performance appraisal preparation include rating all employees as low, medium, or high due to the preparer’s convenience or lack of training. Such errors are known as the halo effect: when preparing a performance appraisal, the rater appraises the employee uniformly high or low based on a specific item. In the horn effect, the rater appraises the employee based on only one negative trait (Javidmehr & Ebrahimpour, 2015). In contrast, the central tendency effect occurs when the rater rates all employees as satisfactory, likely because the rater does not want to take too much time preparing performance appraisals and finds it expedient to rate everyone satisfactorily.

First-impression and attribution errors in preparation of performance appraisals have the same source: human interpretations of others. In the first-impression error, the rater bases all future appraisals on the first impression of the ratee (Chambers, 2016). In the attribution error, the rater appraises the employee based on behaviors, not performance (Chambers, 2016). First-impression and attribution errors create problems in employee development because the rater does not fairly assess employee performance, giving a false sense of the appraisal. Finally, the implicit personality theory is judgement of a person based on only limited information, which can also be described as stereotyping or the spillover effect (Berman et al., 2006). This stereotyping or spillover effect comes from the role of the rater, also known as the appraiser. These appraisal preparation errors (recency and primacy errors, halo effect, central tendency, implicit theory, stereotyping, first-impression error, attribution error, and spillover effects) can all influence employee productivity and morale.
Review of Performance Appraisals in Various Disciplines

This study explores performance appraisal in other professional fields, such as medicine and law, to provide a global overview of performance appraisals.

Medical practice performance appraisals. According to the American Association of Pediatrics (AAP, 2018), performance evaluations (Appendix A) serve the objectives to inform employees about their performance, identify gaps in the quality of work, and encourage professional growth. Appraisals have two components: development of a formal, written performance evaluation and a review-and-feedback session on the evaluation with the ratee. Performance evaluations should occur at least annually and at the 90-day mark for new employees to ensure they understand their roles in the organization (AAP, 2018). The AAP (2018) suggested reviewing performance evaluation templates to ensure they comply with legal mandates. The performance evaluation process goes through three steps: re-review, review, and post-review (AAP, 2018).

The AAP (2018) performance evaluations rate physicians on four levels (consistently, usually, needs to improve, and unable to rate/not observed) in the following areas.

Quality of service and patient and relationships: listening to and documenting patient histories, caring for and greeting patients, giving patients treatment plans and further instructions if the plans are ineffective, seeing urgent cases on the same day as requested, accommodating patients with pressing physical needs, seeing non-urgent patients within three months, and returning routine phone messages in a timely manner and urgent messages on the same day

Productivity and practice management: opening clinics on time, accepting overflow patients as required, and seeing urgent patients in a timely manner

Peer, coworker, and team relations: privately resolving conflicts, accepting and respecting input from non-physician coworkers, contributing to group meetings, keeping colleagues informed, following up with patients, and assisting in the performance evaluations of non-physician employees
Legal practice performance appraisals. The Altman Weil law firm’s associate attorney evaluation form was analyzed for this case study (Appendix B). Altman Weil’s (2018) associate attorney evaluation form has to be prepared by firm partners. Partners are strongly encouraged to write details in the evaluation and not only rely on the number scoring system, as explained later. The evaluation instructions state that no one can improve their performance unless they know in what areas they need to improve. For each category of the evaluation, the preparer gives a score ranging from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest):

1. Indicates significant concerns requiring immediate attention
2. Indicates some concerns requiring effort to improve over time
3. Indicates acceptable progress being made
4. Indicates good progress being made
5. Indicates exceptional performance

N/A indicates don’t know or too early to assess (Altman Weil, 2018).

Altman Weil (2018) evaluates associate attorneys in the following areas using this scoring system, with additional comments from the preparer for each area:

- Administration of practice, including accurate records
- Ability to draft legal documents that meet the firm’s expectations
- Thoroughness in preparation for court appearances
- Ability to analyze complex issues
- Ability to advocate for clients
- Efficient and independent work
- Professional development
- Good rapport with clients
- Business development
• Judgment and maturity
• Demonstration of initiative
• Responsiveness to coworkers and clients
• Commitment and dedication to the firm
• Good relationships with office coworkers

Law enforcement performance appraisals. The performance evaluation/appraisal used by the Greenville Police Department (GPD) in North Carolina was reviewed for this study (Appendix C). This department was first CALEA accredited in 1995 and was the 370th nationally accredited law enforcement organization. The GPD’s performance evaluation follows CALEA standards:

• GPD standard 35.1.1 (CALEA standard 35.1.1) Performance Evaluation System: The chief of the Greenville Police Department is the evaluation coordinator.
• GPD standard 35.1.2 (CALEA standard 35.1.2 and 35.1.3) Scheduled Performance Evaluations: Performance appraisals for full-time employees will be prepared annually. Newly appointed officers with probationary status will be evaluated quarterly.
• GPD standard 35.1.3 (CALEA standard 35.1.4 and 35.1.5) Criteria for Performance Evaluation: The evaluation will be relevant to the tasks performed during the evaluation period. Raters have to substantiate findings of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and outstanding. The evaluation needs to be prepared by the immediate supervisor. The evaluation will be reviewed by the rater’s supervisor. The employee will be given a copy of the evaluation and allowed to contest it.
• GPD standard 35.1.4 (CALEA 35.1.5, 35.1.6, 35.1.7, and 33.8.1) Employee Involvement in Performance Evaluations: An unsatisfactory rating will be given to the employee in writing. The employee will be allowed to review the evaluation with the rater before it is sent through the chain of command.
- GPD standard 35.1.5 (CALEA standard 35.1.8) Review of the Supervisor Rater: Supervisors who prepare evaluations will be assessed on how they prepare performance evaluations.

- GPD standard 35.1.6 (CALEA standard 35.1.9) Personnel Early Warning System: The Office of Internal Affairs will monitor the early warning system to protect the employee and organization from civil liability. The employee monitoring system will monitor complaints, including use-of-force incidents and motor vehicle accidents involving employees. (GPD, 2018)

**Overview of the Sample Population for Performance Appraisals**

The case study sample is the Mahwah Police Department, and its patrol officer performance appraisal form (Appendix D) is reviewed and summarized as follows. The appraisal uses the following scoring system: A = distinguished performance, B = exceeds expectations, C = meets expectations, D = below expectations, I = needs improvement, and N/A = not applicable. The evaluation gives instructions for the rater, who is responsible for maintaining the officers’ documents and records used in the evaluation process. The rater is not to treat performance appraisals lightly, and preparing them is an integral part of supervisory positions. The judgements placed in evaluations affect ratees’ eligibility for promotions and need for additional training. All supervisors should know officers’ behavior to effectively prepare performance evaluations. Additional indications reviewed include sick time, writing ability, measured activity, awards, and training. The rater is instructed to be fair and impartial. The evaluation spells out the following common errors in the preparation of performance evaluations: the halo effect and the central tendency, leniency, friendship, subjectivity, recency, and related human trait errors.

Supervisors are told that they must inform employees of subpar performance. The rater talks to the employee about documented strengths and weaknesses. The employee initials the performance appraisal to confirm the employee has been made aware of the concerns. The
employee’s signature acknowledging the performance appraisal does not equal agreement or disagreement with the evaluation. The employee has seven days to appeal or make written comments on the comment addendum. An officer who receives a D or I score in any area is placed on a performance improvement plan approved by the chain of command. The rater is tasked with monitoring the employee for the next three months to measure improvement. If the officer does not show improvement, the rater again discusses the plan with the officer. The results are forwarded to the chain of command, and the officer may be disciplined. Officers are rated in ten areas, which each have subsections:

1. Punctuality, attendance, and appearance
2. Operation and care of equipment
3. Patrol
4. Personal conduct
5. Work quality
6. Use of force
7. Safety
8. Relationships
9. Work knowledge
10. Problem solving

The form also has a comment section where supervisors can add comments for each performance area. Officers can also use a comment sheet to send feedback to the department. Finally, there is an area for feedback on the performance improvement plan.

**Performance Appraisal and Discipline**

In progressive discipline, employees are informed of serious deficiencies and given opportunities to improve. Progressive discipline has four steps: oral warning, written warning, suspension from employment, and finally termination. Positive discipline does not coerce
compliance with rules but instead assists responsible employees through corrective counseling. Rather than punishing employees, positive discipline treats them as adults, encouraging them to solve problems (Guffey & Helms, 2001).

When supervisors are uncomfortable disciplining employees, performance problems continue (Guffey & Helms, 2001). Employees must know what is expected of them, what the problems are, and what the two methods of discipline are. First, the progressive method, which is more common, uses coercion with varying levels of severity, such as counseling, verbal and written reprimands, suspension, and dismissal. The varying degrees of severity in the progressive discipline model call for written reprimands (Berman et al., 2006; Guffey & Helms, 2001). Second, the positive discipline method assumes that adults take responsibility for their questioned conduct or poor performance (Berman et al., 2006). Guffey and Helm (2001) suggested that supervisors document all employee interactions related to discipline and review documented discipline when preparing performance appraisals for specified time periods. Swanson et al. (2006) reviewed the uses of performance appraisals to determine and influence monetary compensation, assignments, promotions, career development, and even whether to lay off or reinstate officers.

**Employee Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is defined as “contentment (or lack of it) arising out of interplay of employee’s positive or negative feelings toward his or her work” (“Job satisfaction,” n.d.). It is a sign of good treatment, an indicator of emotional well-being and psychological health, and a reflection of organizational success (Nimsombun, 2000). Job satisfaction arises from what a person needs, wants, and is motivated to do succeed (Nimsombun, 2000). According to Maslow (1943), if human psychological needs are not met, the human body cannot function optimally, leading to burnout. Employees with low job satisfaction are more susceptible to burnout.

Burnout, as described by Avanzi, Zaniboni, Balducci, and Fraccaroli (2014), may expose employees to emotional exhaustion, which is a negative state of psychological well-being.
(Nimsombun, 2000)—a basic need in Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs. Employee burnout should be considered when preparing performance appraisals. Overcommitment, which is prevalent in law enforcement, can be a large contributor to employee burnout. Indeed, “job burnout may reinforce a maladaptive coping strategy with job demands increasing in the long run because employees dysfunctionally involved in their jobs may exaggerate their efforts, thus exposing themselves to more severe emotional exhaustion” (Avanzi et al., 2014, p. 463). When preparing performance appraisals, supervisors should recognize burnout and take measures to aid affected employees. Burnout does not mean that employees cannot be productive members of organizations, but it does significantly affect officers’ perceived job satisfaction due to unmet psychological needs (Maslow, 1943). As seen in many past situations, many people respond well to reasonable challenges at work, and “as employees perceive their job becoming more challenging, their corresponding level of job satisfaction will increase” (Yang, Brown, & Moon, 2011, p. 362). Morale and burnout can directly affect job satisfaction as well as performance (Meyer, 1973).

Job satisfaction can be influenced by employees’ experience, skill set, seniority, and work objectives. Maslow’s (1943) security and self-actualization needs are also related to job satisfaction and need to be met to avoid employee burnout. Buzawa (1979) described three ways to measure job satisfaction. The first approach is to measure the disparities in employees’ job experience and expectations. The second approach is to determine how employees’ most important objectives fit with the employees themselves. The third approach is to use factors such as employees’ security, self-actualization, and self-esteem needs. Both male and female police officers are highly concerned with occupational prestige (Krimmel & Tartaro, 1999). The perspectives of three different parties need to be evaluated when assessing job satisfaction: the employer, the employee, and society in general (Buzawa, 1979). The self-esteem need identified in Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation was confirmed by Buzawa (1979) and Krimmel and Tartaro (1999).
Police leaders must be concerned with employee job satisfaction for four reasons, as described by Hoath, Schneider, and Starr (1998):

One is that negative worker attitudes, including job dissatisfaction, may adversely affect job performance, that is, both the quantity and quality of the law enforcement service an organization provides. Second, negative police attitudes may adversely affect the attitudes and views the public develops about a law enforcement organization and its officers, thus undermining police-community relations. Third, a police organization has a moral obligation to demonstrate concern for its employees and promote positive work-related attitudes among them. Fourth, job satisfaction promotes lower stress levels and, accordingly, fewer symptoms of stress (e.g., absenteeism, burnout, and alcoholism). (Hoath et al., 1998, p. 338)

Supporting the fourth reason—that job satisfaction lowers stress levels (Hoath et al., 1998)—Hess et al. (2014) explained that policing is highly stressful and can affect officers by creating personal crises. Stress can also arise from changes, uncertainty, pressure, and a lack of self-control at work (Hess et al., 2014). Job satisfaction varies among police departments, but the one factor that has very little to do with police officers’ job satisfaction is demographic characteristics (Carlan, 2007).

Defining job satisfaction has gained much attention over time, although a clear definition has not emerged (Carruthers, 1988). Job satisfaction has been studied for more than fifty years and is the most commonly researched topic in studies on work (Hopkins, 1983), but it is difficult to develop an instrument that can measure job satisfaction with a high level of reliability (Carruthers, 1988). Hopkins (1983) found that measurements of job satisfaction are haphazard, serve manipulative goals, and give little attention to ethical concerns.

To measure the job satisfaction of arresting officers in the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), Seltzer, Alone, and Howard (1996) conducted a linear regression and Chi-square analysis. Those excluded from the sample (N = 322 of 377) were police officers who were not from the MPD, did not make arrests on a weekly basis, or were specialists, such as crime
scene technicians (Seltzer et al., 1996). The sample was representative of the make-up of the MPD (Seltzer et al., 1996). The sample was 80% male, 61% Black, and 71% patrol oriented, while the MPD was 76% male, 68% Black, and 71% patrol oriented. The researchers performed in-person interviews and administered a 20-item questionnaire. A series of exploratory questions placed these 20 questions into five dimensions: the “satisfaction index, confidence in supervisors, confidence in fellow officers, abuse index and discrimination” (Seltzer et al., 1996, pp. 28–29). In the first regression analysis, variables such as officers’ background and situation in the department were used as the independent variables:

- Race, sex, marital status, residence of police officer, rank, whether the officer worked undercover, whether the officer was located in a district, had the officer been shot at, had the officer fired his or her gun in the line of duty, education, number of arrest made in in average week, years on the force, age, and number of children. Dummy variables were created for the first nine of the variables listed above. For other variables, tests for linearity were conducted and, in some cases, additional dummy variables were created to capture non-linear effects. (Seltzer et al., 2006, p. 30)

Two other questions asked of the sample could not be added with the other variables to create interval-level indices. The responses to these questions were analyzed using Chi-square tests. The two variables that returned results for consistent job satisfaction were undercover (not in uniform) officers and officers without graduate degrees. This analysis also utilized the aforementioned independent variables (Seltzer et al., 1996).

According to Seltzer et al., (1996) the interviews were conducted, and the questionnaires were distributed over three days in the police liaison room, where on average, 200 arresting officers congregated daily to process the arrests they made. The sample, therefore, can be categorized as a convenience sample.
Two independent variables helped identify officers’ job satisfaction in this regression analysis: working in a capacity that the general public defined as undercover (not in uniform) and not obtaining graduate degrees. In the study results, 82% of the officers reported that they were very or somewhat satisfied with their jobs (Seltzer et al., 1996). The officers said if they had to do it all over again, they would choose the same career. The officers were also vocal about the problems they perceived in the agency. Although most officers seemed satisfied with their jobs, only 35% said their units had high morale.

Drug abuse within the MPD was not seen as pervasive. Only 11% of the sample felt that drug abuse was pervasive, while 33% felt that alcohol was a problem, and 36% felt that corruption was a problem. An identified variable was that the officers who believed these problems were less pervasive were assigned to the MPD’s second district, which covered a more affluent part of the community (Seltzer et al., 1996).

The sample also rated their levels of trust in their superiors. Only 8% had some amount of trust in the mayor, while 27% did in the courts, 51% in the police chief, and 63% in their section commanders. Two thirds of the sample, though, had trust in their union, and 87% had trust in their fellow officers (Seltzer et al., 1996).

The sample also reported their views on promotions and race relations in the MPD. Only 40% stated said promotions in the MPD were fair, and 24% that promotions were colorblind. Breaking down perceptions of the fairness of promotions by race, 66% of White officers felt that Black officers were favored for promotions, while 49% of Black officers felt that White officers were favored. Regarding whether promotions were made fairly, 21% of White officers and 30% of Black officers concurred. No demographic or situational attributes affected White officers, whereas it was found that Black officers with less than 10 years of service were more likely than senior officers to feel that White officers were favored in promotions (Seltzer et al., 1996).
Assessing race relations within the MPD, 31% of the sample felt that they were good, 51% fair, and 17% poor. Among White officers, 51% felt that race relations were good if they were sergeants or had higher rank, in undercover assignments, and satisfied with being police officers. No situational or demographic factors affected among Black officers on this question. Many respondents who perceived the promotion process as unfair believed it was based on race and affected intradepartmental race relations. Police officers were less likely to believe there was discrimination in the promotion process if they did not work in one of the MPD’s seven districts (e.g., headquarters) and had less than three years of service (Seltzer et al., 1996).

The study by Seltzer et al. (1996) covered many areas influencing job satisfaction, such as the satisfaction index, confidence in supervisors and fellow officers, the abuse index, and discrimination. All the independent variables affected officers’ job satisfaction as described by Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs (physiological, safety, belonging, esteem, and self-actualization needs). The following independent variables fell within Maslow’s theory of human needs:

- Race, sex, marital status, residence of the police officer, rank, whether the officer worked undercover, whether the officer was located in a district, had the officer been shot at, had the officer fired his or her gun in the line of duty, education, number of arrest made in in average week, years on the force, age, and number of children. (Seltzer et al., 2006, p. 30)

Maslow’s theory of human needs, which undergirded the present study, was correlated with officers’ perceptions of job satisfaction and performance after receiving performance appraisals. The present case study and the research by Seltzer et al. (1996) captured some of the same relevant variables (e.g., race, sex, and years on the force). Reviewing the results of the linear regression and Chi-square analysis of the job satisfaction of MPD officers (Seltzer et al., 2006) revealed some commonalities with this case study. Both case studies explored job satisfaction.
Job Performance

Job performance can be defined as “the work-related activities expected of an employee and how well those activities were executed. Many business personnel directors assess the job performance of each employee on an annual or quarterly basis in order to help them identify suggested areas for improvement” (“Job performance,” n.d.). Job performance is critical in assessing how effectively police departments perform (Champion, 1995). Poor job performance at all levels of an organization makes it exceptionally difficult to attain goals (West, 1990). If the thresholds set by an organization are not met, then employees likely are not attaining their personal goals. Job performance, moreover, is subjective depending on supervisors’ and employees’ interpretations, personal judgement, and organizational values, while employees’ performance directly reflects their abilities, traits, interests, and motivational level (West, 1990). West’s (1990) assessment of self-interest is related to Maslow’s (1943) theory that human needs culminate in self-actualization, including achieving one’s full potential, perhaps through creative activities. Maslow (1943) stated that to advance to the level of self-actualization, people must first meet their physiological, safety, love, and esteem needs.

A police department’s success depends on the performance of the officers it employs. Employee satisfaction, motivation, personal traits, and support underpin job performance, which has two metrics: quality and quantity. Job performance and appraisal criteria depend on job tasks and descriptions. Crime rates and police officers’ quantitative productivity cannot be used to effectively measure job performance (Nimsombun, 2000). Factors that can support job performance are employees’ “motivation, ability, skills, knowledge, needs, social conditions, experience, personality, job satisfaction, organizational structure, leadership, communication, supervision, feedback, and working conditions” (Nimsombun, 2000, p. 12). All the variables that affect job performance can be placed into four categories:
1. Job characteristics—are factors that influence employees’ efforts to accomplish their work responsibilities and tasks (motivation).

2. Personality traits—are employees’ perceptions that affect job performance.

3. Organizational facilitators—are factors that affect employee performance that are not controlled by employees themselves, such as the needed tools of the trade, policies, procedures and information.

4. Job satisfaction—are employees’ perceptions of their jobs (Nimsombun, 2000).


Organizational performance is a combination of goals, accountability, efficiency, economy, effectiveness, equity, satisfaction, responsiveness, and quality. Performance measurements should entail consciously collecting intelligence about employee performance in certain areas and their impacts on the larger organizational environment. Data gathered through performance measurements can be used to assess how well an organization is performing and to ensure accountability. Performance measurements allow organizations to better serve their clientele—the community for police (Sparks, 2003). Champion (1995) stated that officers’ job performance is essential to departmental effectiveness, supporting Sparks’ (2003) claim that employee effectiveness is a contributor to organizational performance. Organ (1997) stated that employees who help other employees contribute to organizational effectiveness. His research supported what occurs in policing every day as police constantly work together to solve community problems and protect officers’ safety by backing each other up. This atmosphere promotes morale. Police officers often have conscientious dispositions, which empirical evidence also ties to morale Organ (1997). All three...
authors (Champion, 1995; Organ, 1997; Sparks, 2003) agreed that job performance is an accurate
measure of how well an organization is run and a good indicator of when an organization needs
change.

Summary

This literature review covered numerous areas of study relevant to the present case study and
the research questions: How are performance appraisals perceived by law enforcement officers
working in a New Jersey medium-size, suburban police department? How do police officers
describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction? How do police officers describe
the impact of performance appraisals on job performance? To what extent do these two variables
affect overall organizational operations?

Research on the history of policing revealed that U.S. policing was heavily influenced by the
British policing model of the Metropolitan Police Act and Peel’s principles of policing. The first
stage of U.S. policing was characterized by the patronage and spoils system until the Pendleton Act
was issued (Swanson et al., 2012). U.S. policing has gone through four eras: the political, reform,
community, and new eras (Schmalleger, 2012). Swanson et al. (2012) described the patronage era,
which accords with Schmalleger’s (2012) identification of the political era of policing. At this time,
politics heavily affected policing. Both Swanson et al. (2012) and History.com (2018) recorded
historical incidents of civil unrest and public resistance to policing in history. Swanson discussed the
1965 Watts Riots, and History.com the 1967 Detroit Riot. Wright (2007) also concurred with
Swanson et al. (2012) and History.com (2018), pointing to King’s assassination as a significant
influence on the history of U.S. policing. Swanson et al. (2012) further identified variations in
policing experiments and current trends that affect present perceptions of policing.

Vollmer, chief of the Berkley Police Department, drove the move to professionalize policing
through his recommendations to educate, train, and better equip officers. In 1929, President Herbert
Hoover appointed the National Commission on Law Observance and Law Enforcement (also called
the Wickersham Commission). Its report, largely written by Vollmer, recommended giving officers civil service protection, training, and education (Swanson et al., 2012). Modern-day police departments are moving forward with professionalization by becoming accredited by the CALEA.

In the present case study, the researcher found that officers have a hierarchy of needs. Maslow (1943) referred to people in general, including police officers who experience the same range of emotions as non-police officers. Police officers’ personal hierarchy of needs directly affects their job satisfaction and performance. Performance appraisals are instruments to appraise officers’ performance and abilities (Oettmeier & Kenney, 2001). According to Sparks (2003), performance measurements (appraisal) consist of an organization’s collection of data on employee performance and their impacts on the larger organizational environment, which includes employees.

Job satisfaction can be defined as “contentment (or lack of it) arising out of interplay of employee’s positive or negative feelings toward his or her work” (“Job satisfaction,” n.d.). Job satisfaction and performance are relevant to performance appraisals, while employee burnout leads to job dysfunction (Avanzi et al., 2014). Factors that can support job performance are employee “motivation, ability, skills, knowledge, needs, social conditions, experience, personality, job satisfaction, organizational structure, leadership, communication, supervision, feedback, and working conditions” (Nimsombun, 2000, p. 12). When employees reach higher levels of job satisfaction, they might experience self-actualization, the top of Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs. When persons reach self-actualization, their job satisfaction and performance reflect it. When police officers reach self-actualization, they serve their communities better.
Chapter III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This case study has importance for the New Jersey law enforcement community. Data gathered during this research may reduce, if not eliminate, the gap in knowledge on police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore how police officers in a medium-size, suburban police department perceived performance evaluations. Specifically, the case study explored how police officers perceived the effect of performance evaluations on job satisfaction and job performance. The case study also identified to what extent these two variables affected overall organizational operations. Drawing from Maslow’s theory of human motivation, this study assessed the effect of performance appraisals on psychological and self-fulfillment needs and these needs’ effect on officers’ job satisfaction and job performance.

Design of the Study

The researcher choose a qualitative research methodology for this case study. According to Stakes (1994), “a case study is both the process of learning about the case and the product of our learning” (p. 237). “To emphasize variation in the concern for and methodological orientation to the case,” Stakes (1994) “named three types of study—intrinsc, instrumental, and collective” (p. 238). According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), “the general design of a case study is best represented by a funnel. The start of the study is wide end. … The data collection and research activities narrow to a particular sites, subjects, materials, topics, questions, and themes” (p. 59). This researcher reviewed potential sample populations and selected the Mahwah Police Department. The participants were narrowed to 12 Mahwah police officers to identify the themes related to job satisfaction and performance themes that emerged after performance appraisals.
According to Creswell (2003), “qualitative approaches allow room to be innovative and to work within researcher-designed frameworks” (p. 23).

This study was conducted on a topic germane to professional employment: performance appraisals. While qualitative studies on performance appraisals have been conducted, the literature review found none specifically on medium-size police departments in New Jersey. This topic also has not been addressed in a study on a New Jersey CALEA-accredited, medium-size police department, validating the researcher’s decision to explore this topic qualitatively. This single-case study focused on one CALEA-accredited, medium-size police department in New Jersey: the Mahwah Township Police Department. The researcher chose a case study approach based on the nature of the research problem to understand how the experiences of police officers were directly affected by their department’s performance evaluations. According to Sauro (2015), “a case study involves a deep understanding through multiple types of data sources. Case studies can be explanatory, exploratory, or descriptive.” To ensure academic integrity, the researcher reserved the right to alter the study design as needed.

Research Permission

Following the guidelines set forth by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB), a letter of solicitation for participation was sent via email to Chief James N. Batelli. He responded in kind, authorizing participation by his officers provided that it was voluntary and occurred during off-duty hours. He stated that the participants’ opinions did not necessarily represent the views of the Mahwah Police Department. Lastly, Chief Batelli assigned Lieutenant Jeff Dino to serve as liaison throughout the study.

Interview Site

The interviews were conducted in the judge’s room at the Mahwah Township Police Department, 221 Franklin Turnpike, Mahwah, New Jersey, 07430. The literature reviewed showed that previous studies had been conducted on various aspects of workplace performance, but none
examined police officers’ perceptions of performance appraisals and the effects of performance appraisals on job performance and job satisfaction. The researcher selected the Mahwah Township Police Department based on its size and CALEA accreditation. Mahwah, New Jersey, is a 26-square-mile suburban municipality in northern Bergen County. It follows the guardian service model and employs 49 sworn law-enforcement officers of various ranks, who responded to 22,048 calls for service in 2016. The department is representative of many CALEA-accredited, medium-size police departments in New Jersey.

Solicitation of Participants

The researcher obtained letters of informed consent from all the participants before beginning the interviews. The initial letter or email requesting permission to conduct research (Appendix E) and the letters of informed consent (Appendix F) are included in the appendices. The participants were advised on more than one occasion that their participation was voluntary.

Random Selection of Participants

The participants were selected through purposeful random sampling. Purposeful selection ensures the “representativeness, or typicality of the settings, individuals, or activities selected [through the] deliberate select[ion of] individuals or cases that are critical for testing the theories that you began the study with, or that you subsequently developed” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 98). The researcher should “select groups or participants with whom you can establish the most productive relationships, ones that will best enable you to answer your research questions” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 99).

Statistical software IBM SPSS Version 22 was used to randomly select officers via the “select cases” feature (Data\Select Cases) (IBM Knowledge Center, 2018). A new dataset was created by manually entering descriptive data on the total population sample of Mahwah police officers (N = 36). The data entered included the officers’ race, gender, age, badge numbers, and years of service. The complete dataset consisted of 36 cases, each representing one police officer.
Witte and Witte (2010) stated that “sampling is random if, at each stage of sampling, the selection process guarantees that all potential observations in the population have an equal chance of being included in the sample” (p. 176).

When performing random case selection in SPSS, the user has the option to specify the volume of cases processed as either a percentage of total cases or as “X of Y” cases. In this case study, the researcher utilized the second option and specified 16 of 36 cases. The resulting output contained 16 randomly ordered cases, labeled by badge number. The officers were solicited in the order they appeared. It was necessary to perform random case selection four times to reach the desired sample size. The badge numbers of those who volunteered to participate remained in the total population sample but were skipped if selected in subsequent rounds.

**Participant Profiles**

The oldest police officer in the total population sample (N = 36) was 57 years old, while the youngest was 23, and the average age was 39. The senior participant had been a police officer for 35 years, and the most junior participant for less than one year, while the departmental average was 12 years of experience. One police officer was female, and 35 were male, while 34 officers were White, and two were Hispanic.

Twelve police officers and four alternates were selected from the total population sample and assigned pseudonyms. The oldest police officer in the sample (n = 12) was 50, the youngest was 26, and the average age was 37. The most senior participant had been a police officer for 19 years, the most junior had three years’ experience, and the sample population’s average years of service were 9 years 8 months. All 12 officers were male, 11 were White, and one was Hispanic.

To protect the participants’ confidentiality, their pseudonyms are not included in the demographic summary in Table 1. For example, the total population sample had only one female officer and two Hispanic officers, so including their pseudonyms in the demographic summary would identify them. Table 1 provides a summary of the participants’ demographic information.
Table 1

*Summary of Officers’ Demographic Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badge #</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Seniority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Procedures**

Data were gathered via face-to-face interviews. The participants were given a letter explaining the study’s purpose, blank Mahwah Police Department patrol officer performance appraisal form, letter of solicitation, copy of the interview questions, demographic information form, and informed consent letter. The interviews were scheduled for approximately 30–45 minutes. Before the interviews, the police officers signed the informed consent form and were then given a copy of the 11 interview questions. They were allotted unlimited time to review the materials and were encouraged to take notes.

The participants were informed there would be no deviation from the interview questions provided unless follow-up questions were needed to clarify their responses. Once the participants were prepared to move forward, the researcher activated the digital voice recorder, introduced himself, and stated the purpose of the study. The participants were asked if they needed clarification on any of the interview questions or why the study was being conducted. They were
reminded that their participation was voluntary, and they could terminate the interviews at any time. Each respondent was offered a copy of the recording of their interview, but all declined.

As stipulated by Chief Batelli, the participants were off duty when interviewed. They were offered a bottle of water and instructed that they could take breaks at any time and as frequently as needed. All the interviews were digitally recorded with an Olympus digital voice recorder model WS-802 to ensure accuracy and provide a true account of what was said.

**Interview Format**

The interviews followed a semi-structured format to “offer the interviewer considerable latitude to pursue a range of topics and offer the subject a chance to shape the content of the interview” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 104). The researcher interviewed participants individually for as long needed to capture complete responses. The respondents were asked 11 open-ended interview questions and, if necessary, follow-up questions.

**Materials**

The researcher utilized various qualitative and quantitative research materials to conduct the case study. The qualitative materials consisted of a letter explaining the study purpose and intent, blank patrol officer performance appraisal form, letter of solicitation, letter of informed consent, and copy of the interview questions. An Olympus digital voice recorder was used to record the interviews, while the statistical software IBM SPSS v.22 was used for random case selection.

**Data Collection Process**

An IRB waiver of subject authorization form was filed in May 2018 and approved during the IRB’s June 2018 meeting. All the participants were interviewed on June 21, 2018, at the specified site. The researcher then began the process of transcribing, analyzing, and thematically coding the participants’ responses. All the responses were stored on an Apple File Vault encrypted thumb drive and stored in a secure location.
Patton (1990) stated that “for purposes of qualitative inquiry, good questions should, at a minimum, be open-ended, neutral, singular, and clear” (p. 295). The researcher developed interview questions aimed at understanding the officers’ perceptions, feelings, experiences, and opinions on the department’s performance appraisal instrument and process and their effects on job performance and job satisfaction. The in-depth interviews were designed to elicit data used to explore the participants’ behaviors and provide insights to answer the research questions. The researcher used the results of the literature review to develop the open-ended interview questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), “qualitative interviews offer the interviewer considerable latitude to pursue a range of topics and offer the subject a chance to shape the content of the interview” (p. 104). Moreover, “the individual interview is a valuable method of gaining insight into people’s perceptions, understandings and experiences of a given phenomenon and can contribute to in-depth data collection” (Ryan, Coughlan, & Cronin, 2013). One-on-one participant interviews were conducted to eliminate distractions and ensure that the researcher was afforded the opportunity to gain insights into the participants.

As stated, a qualitative case study design was implemented to identify the themes in the participants’ responses. In a qualitative approach, “the inquirer often makes knowledge claims based primarily on constructivist perspectives,” which consist of “multiple meanings of individual experiences, meanings socially and historically constructed, with an intent of developing a theory or pattern” (Cresswell, 2003, p. 18). The use of a semi-structured interview approach allowed for more fluid interviews based on the individuals’ experiences. According to Maxwell (2005), “a good [research] design, one in which the components work harmoniously together, promotes efficient functioning: a flawed design leads to poor operation or failure” (p. 2). As “design in qualitative research is an ongoing process, … it does not begin from a predetermined starting point or proceed through a fixed sequence of steps but involves interconnection and interaction among the different design components” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 3).
Jury of Experts

To ensure the interview questions were valid for their intended purpose and audience, the researcher consulted with a jury of two experts selected for their experience as command-level executives and overall knowledge of policing in New Jersey: a recently retired New Jersey State Police major and a retired New York and New Jersey Port Authority Police Department (PAPD) lieutenant. Retired Maj. Christopher O’Shea of the New Jersey State Police was the commanding officer of Troop B and supervised Operation Drug Interdiction & Gang Groups and the Troop “B” Technical Emergency and Missions Specialist Unit. Major O’Shea was also the incident commander of all security and safety for Super Bowl XLVIII awarded to New York and New Jersey. Retired PAPD Lt. Dominick Varricchio was the former commanding officer of Port Authority Operations of Staten Island, New York. After the 9/11 attacks, Varricchio left retirement to lead the PAPD Police Academy.

Varricchio suggested adding a third research question: “To what extent do these two variables affect overall organizational operations?” His suggestion was accepted. O’Shea (NJSP) suggested substituting the word revised for improved in interview question 2a: “Are there any revisions you could suggest to improve the instrument?” Shea’s concern was that the word improve implied there were deficiencies in the appraisal process and thus could skew the participants’ responses. His recommendation was accepted, and the word improved in interview question 2a was changed to revised.

O’Shea also commented on interview question 6: “What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall productivity?” He gave the following rationale:

The word productivity is most closely associated with statistics, quotas, and numerical values. Based on your language throughout this document, perhaps you should consider changing the language to “professional performance” or some similar term. The reason I say that is [that] policing is a social science which cannot always be measured numerically.
O’Shea’s second recommendation was also accepted. The word *productivity* was changed to *professional performance*.

**Interview Questions**

**Satisfaction**

1. Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department?
   a. Can you suggest improvements to the performance appraisal process?

2. What is your perception of the evaluation instrument?
   a. Could you suggest any revisions to the instrument?

3. To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization?

4. The employee comment sheet:
   a. Is this useful in providing feedback to the organization?
   b. Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback?

5. Is there anything else you would like to add?

**Performance**

6. What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance?

7. Can you provide specific examples?

8. When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale?

9. Of the ten appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which affects your job performance the most?
10. Of the ten appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which affects your job performance the least?

11. What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity?

To ensure consistency, all the interview questions were presented in the same order to each respondent. These interviews varied in length due to the nature of qualitative research but lasted 20–63 minutes each and were scheduled according to the participants’ availability.

**Data Analysis**

Patton (1990) stated that “the purpose of qualitative inquiry is to produce findings. The process of data collection is not an end in itself. The culminating activities of qualitative inquiry are analysis, interpretation, and presentation of findings” (p. 371). Furthermore, in action research, “the process is the product, so no report will be produced for outside consumption” (Patton, 1990, p. 374). Action research is applicable to this case study because the results are not generalizable outside the Mahwah Police Department. In addition, the “focus in analyzing qualitative data comes from the evaluation research questions generated at the very beginning of the inquiry process, during the conceptual, question focusing phase of the study” (Patton, 1990, p. 375). While formulating the research questions for this study, the researcher determined that a qualitative case study design with semi-structured interviews was optimal for identifying the themes in the participants’ responses.

Patton (1990) explained that “case analysis involves organizing the data by specific cases for in-depth study. Cases can be individuals, programs, institutions, or groups. The purpose is to gather comprehensive, systematic, and in-depth information about each case of interest” (p. 384). Patton (1990) advised that a case analysis requires “writ[ing] a case study for each person interviewed” (p. 376). Moreover, “content analysis is the process of identifying, coding, and categorizing the primary patterns in the data” (Patton, 1990, p. 381), and “the purpose of
classifying qualitative data for content analysis is to facilitate the search for patterns and themes within a particular setting or across cases” (p. 384). Accordingly, after concluding the interview process, the researcher wrote a case record for each participant and began transcribing the audio recordings. A case record “pulls together and organizes the voluminous case data into a comprehensive, primary resource package [and] is used to construct the case study” (Patton, 1990, pp. 386–387).

The audio recordings were transcribed using the commercially available automated transcription application TRINT. When automated transcription was completed, the researcher compared the audio recordings to the TRINT transcripts and made corrections as necessary. The finalized transcripts were reviewed for articulable information, which was categorized into themes and coded accordingly. The researcher developed categories based on inductive data analysis. In this analysis approach, “the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis” (Patton, 1990, p. 390). Inductive analysis ensures that the researcher develops categories based on articulable information provided by the participants.

**Validity and Reliability**

According to Patton (1990), the credibility and trustworthiness of the data in a case study rely on three distinct but related elements of inquiry:

1. Rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high quality data that is carefully analyzed, with attention to issues of validity, reliability, and triangulation;
2. The credibility of the researcher, which is dependent on training, experience, track record, status, and presentation of self; and
3. Philosophical belief in the phenomenological paradigm, that is, a fundamental appreciation of naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, and holistic thinking. (Patton, 1990, p. 461)
A credible qualitative study also needs to address the techniques employed to ensure the integrity, validity, and accuracy of the findings (Patton, 1990). This credibility, Patton (1990) noted, is the researcher’s responsibility. In this case study, the researcher employed various techniques to ensure credibility and trustworthiness, including assembling a jury of experts to evaluate the research and interview questions, using open-ended interview questions, randomly sampling the participants, assigning pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity, recording the interviews, manually confirming the automated transcription process, and coding the data collected. The study’s theoretical foundation was Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of human needs, further enhancing the study’s credibility.

This researcher followed Patton’s (1990, p. 464) “integrity in analysis” and “testing rival explanations” by identifying patterns and themes in the findings. Triangulation entails “checking out the consistency of different data sources within the same method, that is, triangulation of sources” (Patton, 1990, p. 464). However, “triangulation of data sources within qualitative methods will seldom lead to a single, totally consistent picture” (Patton, 1990, p. 467). The researcher triangulated the data by listening to the interview recordings, transcribing and coding the information obtained in the interviews, and reviewing the documents and research notes.

**Summary**

Chapter III has provided an explanation of the methodology used in this case study, including the qualitative study design, the purposeful random sampling selection of the participants, and the interview method used to collect data to answer the three research questions. Chapter III has also discussed the method of qualitative data analysis used to produce the findings. Finally, the chapter has described the methods used to ensure the study’s validity and reliability.
Chapter IV

STUDY RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this case study was to explore how police officers in a medium-size, suburban police department perceived the effects of performance evaluations on job satisfaction and job performance. The case study identified to what extent these two variables affected overall organizational operations. Drawing on Maslow’s theory of human motivation, the research also assessed the effects of performance appraisals on psychological and self-fulfillment needs and, in turn, these variables’ effects on officers’ job satisfaction and job performance.

To protect the participants’ confidentiality, it was necessary to omit their pseudonyms from the demographic summary table (Table 1 in Chapter III). For example, the total sample population had only one female officer and two Hispanic officers, so including pseudonyms in the table would identify them.

On June 21, 2018, the participants were interviewed in the judges’ room at the Mahwah Police Department headquarters, 221 Franklin Turnpike, Mahwah, New Jersey. Before each interview, the participant was provided with a letter of introduction, informed consent form, and blank Mahwah Police Department patrol officer performance appraisal form. Next, the researcher read the following research questions to facilitate responses reflecting the participant’s thoughts:

How are performance appraisals perceived by law enforcement officers in a New Jersey medium-size, suburban police department? How do police officers describe the effect of performance appraisals on job satisfaction? How do police officers describe the effect of performance appraisals on job performance? To what extent do these two variables affect overall organizational operations?

Interview Transcripts

R = researcher

P = participant
Participant A

1. Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department?

(P) I think the biggest thing is that there needs to be more consistency in how the performance evaluations are conducted. As per our guidelines, there [is a] standard operating procedure that we’re supposed to follow a certain timeline. I’ve been here for a handful of years and have seen only one of my performance appraisal forms. And I don’t think it’s an issue with my direct supervisor; it’s an issue somewhere else. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance appraisal process?

      (P) I think this should be done on a consistent basis, at the same time within a review period or a year’s time, so you are able to make adjustments if you feel necessary going into the new year. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument?

(P) This is the second time I’m seeing a performance or performance appraisal form. I think the way it’s set up is good. It explains everything for you. Then it breaks down each category. Definitely like the setup. Then looking at each thing, you didn’t even know some of this stuff was in here. Some stuff that definitely needs to be reviewed more. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Could you suggest any revisions to the instrument?

      (P) In my opinion, this covers everything now that a patrol officer is required to do or should do. I think that the evaluation is good and wouldn’t make any recommendations. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Yes, in the overall process, maybe an interview with the supervisor. But other than that, the actual instrument itself, I wouldn’t change, all right?
3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) Well, I think it’s subjective, so it’s based on the opinion of your supervisor. So certain supervisors hold things to certain standards, which can be good and bad. You know certain supervisors have more knowledge of the actual instrument. I look at patrol officers that check parks, schools, and county properties. Some supervisors see that as one of the more important things. When patrol officers work shifts opposite other officers and supervisors, things may be different. I don’t have an exact example. I’m trying to think right now, but you know, maybe they focus more on highway interdiction versus another supervisor. Like I said, more community policing or checking school parks or stuff. (R) Can clarify your response that the priority depends on the supervisor? (P) Exactly, some supervisors are more into interdiction, and some are more into community-based policing. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) Would you look at the employee comment sheet?

a. (R) Is this useful in providing feedback to the organization? (P) In my opinion, I don’t think anybody would comment. I mean, I wouldn’t put down something that I think. I don’t think I would put anything that the organization could change. I follow the old mindset of, you know, you take constructive criticism, and you move on. I’m a young officer—not to say that my ideas don’t mean anything. If it’s not broke, don’t fix it. So I don’t think it’s really necessary. I think that would be better used for an interview follow-up with the evaluation. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) I think it takes it into consideration, but taking into consideration and following up are two
different things. So they’ll listen to you, but they may not follow through with it or take it and run with it.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does and your performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) The differences in how supervisors view things are kind of subjective. I think when you sit down with your supervisor to go over the evaluation, each thing is obviously looked at, but it was done so quickly that we weren’t able to bounce ideas off each other. So, like I said, we had it done extremely quickly, so it was like, “Here, you did great this year. You know you’re staying on the right track.” I could do that throughout the year because we are in a smaller agency. I see my supervisor; I work with my supervisor directly on the same shift, versus a larger agency, where they may not see them unless there’s an issue or something like that. (R) Okay, so let me clarify for you. When we talk about the annual performance appraisal and how to fix it, that includes the process of listening to what you have to say back and forth. So you feel that the process can use improvement? (P) Yes, I mean, it’s just the process.

7. (R) Can you provide a specific example? (P) No. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Yes, some supervisors take into consideration community policing, checking on the schools, parks, and crossing guards, versus other supervisors who feel that those are important, but there are other things that are required of a police officer. (R) So we’ll go back to the difference in priorities, as you said earlier. I’ll clarify, if you don’t mind. So it sounds like once again, we fall right back into the different supervisors have different priorities, and that reflects on you and your performance? (P) Correct.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) Well, I’ve never had it happen to me, but I can only imagine how it would destroy your morale because no one likes to be told that
they’re a bad employee, or they’re performing substandard work. I would hope that prior to the evaluation, the supervisor could talk to the employee and let them know that they’ve got to pick it up a little bit. (R) You haven’t had a personal experience with it, but you project that if you did, it would hurt your morale. (P) Correct, absolutely.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) I would probably say the quality of work category, so you have your reports, your citations. Are you completing your reports on time? Like I said, I’ve never had an issue. I’ve always completed everything on time thoroughly, but there are some issues where people don’t do stuff that they’re supposed to in a timely matter. I’ve never obviously had an evaluation tell me that, so I don’t know how the supervisor uses it to judge that person who is not doing what they’re supposed to. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the ten appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your performance the least? (P) Maybe appearance, attendance, and punctuality because I’m always on time. I always make sure my uniforms are, you know, dry cleaned. I have my name tag and badge on. I always make sure my leather gear looks squared away. I think that, you know, that the first part of your use of force is your presence being there. If you don’t look the part, then you’re going to get walked all over. So I don’t think that part affects me at all. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) Having had one interview or one follow-up interview, it was a positive interview, so it definitely reignited the feeling to keep up the good work and stay motivated. Obviously, [you] take some things away from the evaluation that you can improve on. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant A’s total interview time was 22 minutes.
Participant B

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) We do them annually once a year. I understand the reason for them. I don’t agree with how we do them. We read them, and we sign. You know there’s a section in the back if you want to suggest anything, and then they get handed in. We don’t really get the supervisors to view them with us. I don’t know if that’s a supervisor-type basis, or it’s just certain people doing things one way or another. I understand why we need positive feedback or negative feedback. Knowing that we’re doing our job well or not well is something important for us to know. (R) So let me clarify this: it’s the whole process from the beginning to the end of the appraisal. The instrument just documents everything on it, but the supervisor is supposed to interact with you? (P) You know, I’ve never really had that. You know it’s kind of just at the end of year. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance appraisal process? (P) I want to experience with our supervisors what you are doing right, when you’re not doing right, where you can improve it. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I like it. It’s very straightforward with what we have to know, so on and so forth. You know, for me, there’s a couple of things that are identified, like, that are kind of repeated. So, you know, one of the big things is sick time. I feel like that’s brought up quite a bit in there. You know how many times people use it, so on and so forth. But for the most part, you know, it’s pretty understandable. You can read through it, you understand, and there are ample opportunities for you to put your own information in and see where your supervisor put stuff on. That’s pretty reasonable. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects the office’s contribution to the organization? (P) I’m not a huge fan. Sometimes you don’t have that personal, one-on-one talk, so it’s on paper. Yeah, and you may have only used one sick day the entire time the appraisal was for, and that might reflect really great, but you might be doing 10 other things you know that you’re doing really high, and that isn’t something that’s graded on this. (R) So if I can clarify, it sounds like you feel that your appraisal gets stuck on the negative and not the positive for a lot of stuff. (P) Yeah, like when you go through it, there are like a lot of sections for negative things. Like, I guess, it’s just on one because it’s on the page I see the most. But, for the most part yes, it’s okay. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. The employment comment sheet
   a. (R) Is this useful in providing feedback to the organization? (P) I didn’t have anything to put down, and I was told that I had to put something down. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) Depends on the person, depends on the person saying it or receiving it. Somebody with more seniority would know certain people that are involved in doing more things around the department and stuff like that. (R) So you would say if you stand higher on the social ladder of the police department, your work would be more versus somebody who didn’t stand as high because there’s obviously seniority? (P) Absolutely.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) For me, I can’t say it has a bearing on me because I do my job, and I know that I’m doing what I’m supposed to be doing, and I go and take initiative. Some people, they may need that pat on the back sometimes or need to be kind of reined in a little bit. You know, for me, no news is good news. (R) OK, so you don’t feel it affects you because you’re a good worker? (P) That’s how I feel. I know some people need that, you know, “Ok, yeah, I’m doing the right thing. I got to keep doing this.” Especially when you’re younger, like when you’re starting your career, and you know you could be doing this, you know, 10-15 years, and you’re still seeing stuff that you still have to learn.

7. (R) Can you provide specific example? (P) We had a situation where, you know, some of us had rescued some people out of the river. You know, they were stuck in the truck that was submerged in the river. I went and did what I needed to do. This is what we’re hired to do. That was in my performance review. My old sergeant really hit on that, but I know that’s what we’re supposed to be doing; it was written in a review. Yeah, I understand these need to be documented, but who cares? (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) I’ve never had one, so I can’t fully comment on what [effect] that would have on your psyche in the job. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) For me safety, you didn’t drive safely, take tactics seriously, or secure your weapon when you’re dealing with a prisoner. You know, that’s, to me, got to be the most important thing, something that has to be addressed immediately. (R) Clarifying, when it comes to safety, you say that should be documented in this appraisal. It should be
addressed immediately and not wait till the end of the year. (P) Yes. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) When it comes to actual job performance, appearance, and stuff like that—if you show up, and you look like a soup sandwich, but you’re doing the job, ok. Did you get your uniform dry cleaned, did you get your boots shined, stuff like that? You know, it’s all appearance. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) So, the thing, for me, it’s always been a positive thing, and it’s continue doing what you’re doing. I’ve been fortunate enough to work with supervisors that were very proactive in letting me go out and do my job. They’ve been very positive. They entice me to work harder and go for more training. When you get these performance appraisals, and you’re going through, and you can see even though you might be doing everything and meeting expectations, you can see where you’re really excelling and where you’re falling off, where else you can improve. When you have a supervisor that is honest with you and says, “Listen, you’re doing this great, but you know this over here needs a little bit of work.” (R) Ok, so the feedback could actually help your overall productivity? (P) Yes, ok, you know that no one is ever perfect. You know we’re all out there; you know just always finding ways to improve, going to classes and stuff. When they make you aware of an issue, you might not be seeing yourself doing certain things the way you learned from your teachers, and so on and so forth. One way to do something, but there’s another way you can be doing it a little bit better. From another point of view, these performance appraisals can show you those other points of view. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Like I said, we do like an annual appraisal. I know that the supervisors do reviews of the squad, and they get submitted to the higher-ups and the administration. Maybe we just have to sit down with
your supervisor and say, “Hey, you did this.” I’m not talking about numbers and tickets and arrests and stuff like that, just calls for service, the bread and butter, the most important thing that we’re here to do. Writing tickets is great, and making arrests is a lot of fun sometimes. You know doing stuff like investigations, motor vehicle accidents, domestics, stuff that you know you have to know how to do it. There are certain of certain circumstances [when] you’re like, “I’ve only been here for X amount of time. This guy’s been here for a while, and I think we all need to just refocus.” Some people need direction and meetings like once every three or four months, just to kind of rehash what you’ve done. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant B’s total interview time was 24 minutes.

**Participant C**

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) I feel that this performance evaluation that you’re asking right here is an evaluation of the police officer’s work duties. I guess that will include your day-to-day operations or your day-to-day performance on or off the road, report writing policies, and procedures. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) I guess what is in place is okay. I don’t have a suggestion for improvement. Maybe instead of annually, we do bi-yearly. I don’t see an issue of maybe doing it weekly or after a, I guess, maybe a serious incident. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I mean, I guess, looking at it, it’s self-explanatory. It breaks everything down where you can understand. I believe it’s fair, and the information in here relates to your day-to-day activities. I guess, overall, it’s put together well. Could there be improvement? There always could be improvement, but I think
you have a good basis to start from. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) I’d have to go through each one to see what’s maybe missing. To be honest with you, I think things do need to change, so maybe it should be updated yearly. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) Am I satisfied with it? I mean to be honest, are you asking me if I’m satisfied with it? Does it necessarily pertain to you as a police officer in your day-to-day function? I couldn’t tell you that. I don’t think it’s a fit. I will say it’s not fair. But if you’re asking a person or a police officer to answer some of these questions in here, that may not relate to your performance. (R) To clarify, so you’re not exactly sure if it does reflect you or doesn’t, correct? (P) Ok. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) The employee comment sheet.

a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) Me, personally, I don’t think so in this particular agency. I don’t really think that your comments or suggestions will go somewhere. I’ve seen it; officers have made suggestions or comments, and it has backfired on them. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) Absolutely not.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) Some say it could be that it affects me personally. My time in
service does not affect me whatsoever. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) Well, I mean, in my time in service, I have done some superior work and have been praised for it, whereas then I have been ridiculed for something that was pretty minor. So all the good work that I did was washed away by one minor incident. If that answers your question, niceties were overshadowed. (R) Anything else you like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) From my experience, it doesn’t affect me or my morale. Let me backtrack: it does not affect me because I won’t let it affect me, but when I leave work, it will affect me at home. I’ll think about it more at home than I do at work. (R) Anything else you like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) Operations and care of equipment. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Relationships, it’s an interesting question because of my job title. I haven’t really had a sit-down interview or a performance evaluation in quite some time. When I did have this, I basically took it with a grain of salt. I would listen to what he had to say. If there were some questionable issues in there, I looked. Constructive criticism is just fine, no issues with that. Overall, it really doesn’t make you who you are as a police officer in this department. I don’t think it makes a better police officer overall. I understand you have to have these things on record for policy and procedure, but there are other ways to go about motivating people. You know, I think overall, you have to look at morale issues here within this agency, and there are more important things to take care of than someone’s
performance if it’s not so substandard. You know, there are officers in this agency that are proactive, which is ok; you have other officers that are not proactive. So be it; you get a lot of different personalities here. I’ve had a hard time when you have someone who was proactive, and they’re getting ridiculed, or they’re getting sat down because of an IA complaint, and now that officer has a handful of complaints. Then officer B, who doesn’t do anything and has nothing, looks like a better officer. That’s just my personal preference on that. That’s all I have to say. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) None. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant C’s total interview time was 25 minutes.

**Participant D**

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) My opinion of the process is it’s something that I feel is necessary to critique an employee’s performance over the years. I think it’s something to make sure they’re meeting the standard requirements for their job performance. We have an evaluation that we fill out ourselves that gets forwarded to our supervisors, who then forward [it] up the chain. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) The only improvement that I would personally suggest is when there are areas that we may need improvement with, maybe we could get re-evaluated within the next time frame just to ensure that we are improving where we re-evaluated. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I feel it’s pretty thorough. It covers the areas that would need to be evaluated. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) I’m satisfied with it. I think it
does cover everything, and it appears that the supervisors recognize areas of where
officers excel and areas that they don’t want. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to
that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the
Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization?
(P) I am satisfied. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) The employee comment sheet.
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) I think it’s
      something that is a good way to forward information back up the chain. (R) Anything
      else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) Yes.

5. (R) Anything else you like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall
    professional performance? (P) I personally like being evaluated and critiqued because it’s
    someone else’s eyes on my work, and I know there’s always room for improvement. That
gives an opportunity for someone to express to me when and where I need to improve. (R)
So you think it works, it helps your professional performance? (P) Yes. (R) Anything else
you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) Early in my career, I performed a lot better.
Then family life happened where things kind of slowed down, so I just acknowledged that
there were areas to maybe refocus on because I slowed down. (R) Anything else you’d like
to add to that response? (P) Not right now.
8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) I guess, fortunately, I have not had that. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) Quality of work. It’s just something that I always want to make sure that I’m doing as much as I should be doing and meeting the standard that’s expected of me. (R) Sounds like you hold very high bar for yourself? (P) Absolutely, without a doubt. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Relationships, I guess. My explanation of that relationships means [that] when I come here to do my job, I’m doing what’s expected of me not based on the influence of friends’ thoughts or opinions of it. I’m just doing what is expected of me. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) Well, that’s the opportunity where our direct direction supervisor speaks with us, who also sees our work on a daily basis. It definitely has affected me because [I] know that I’m meeting the standards of what they expect. (R) So you think it improves your productivity? (P) Yes, absolutely. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No, I think it was very thorough.

Participant D’s total interview time was 27 minutes.

Participant E

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) They have these forms like this in front of me, filled out by your supervisor. You get to review it. You can rebut anything that you think is off key or maybe you disagree with, but ultimately, it’s how you know they view your performance
as their underlings, so to speak. (R) Okay, [are you] positive or negative on it? Or are you not sure? (P) To be honest, I don’t think there is either, positive or negative. I really think nobody looks at them. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Not now.

a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) Maybe, they just take a little more time going over them. That’s probably about it, with a little more detail. I feel like when they do them, there is a rush to get them done. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) In a department this size, it’s semi-useless. It’s small enough where you know who’s doing what, who performs and who doesn’t perform, who’s a slacker, who’s picking up the slack on calls when the other person doesn’t. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) I mean, it pretty much covers most of the stuff that you do. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I think it’s kind of like a 50/50 situation where they’ll put things in there that they think need to [be] correct[ed]. But at the same time, you know, this is like a small agency, so they’re not going to completely slam somebody because we’re all still here, and then that may create an even worse environment. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) The employee comment sheet.

a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) You’re not getting switched around from bosses, you know; maybe, like in a city, you’re going to a different precinct. Like, if you get promoted, you’re still all working together. So you
have that, unfortunately, but you need to at least keep it on like a workable level. You
know, maybe the person knows that didn’t go so well, but, yeah, [at] the same time,
you didn’t beat them over the head with a roll of quarters and a gym sock on the
employee comment sheet. (R) Is it useful for providing feedback to your
organization? (P) No. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) No.
5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Not particularly, I just think the
time thing is an issue for me. I just think that they seem rushed when they have to get them
done. Where if this was an agency I think that took more consideration, they would have a
little more time. But unfortunately, the way that we’re structured, the supervisors have a lot
on their plate, so this is just one more thing.
6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall
professional performance? (P) Your performance personally is zero. I give it 110 percent
whether they slammed me on this thing or not. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that
response? (P) No.
7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) No, I explained before that I give it 110 percent
all the time. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan,
what effect does this have on your morale? (P) I’ve only heard of them being issued to, you
know, person A or person B. On a personal level, I never had one. So I think on a personal
level, it’s like getting taken down a couple pegs on a ladder. But then I think at that point,
it’s really based on the person. (R) Is that a motivating factor to get them to listen? (P)
Maybe just a little, you know, to get a reasonable level of performance. Some people think
it’s based on personality; some people at that point completely shut down, and some people
pick it up. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) To be honest, I wouldn’t say any one of the 10 in particular. I think they’re kind of all-encompassing of how you as a police officer should be doing this job. Granted, everybody does things at different levels, and you may have one person might have a B in one thing, but in another, somebody else might have an A. As a police officer in this agency, it should all even out because you can’t have an entire agency that we only have a certain number of guys who work. If everybody in the agency is like, “I’m going to be a community policing guy,” and no one is getting arrested. Or if you have an entire department of people like, “I’m making arrests,” none of the other stuff is getting done. You need guys to make everything come together in the middle. With that being said, you shouldn’t punish a guy because he’s not good at what the other guys are doing and vice versa. So everybody should also have equal opportunity when it comes to assignments, promotions, things of that nature. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) I mean, I put it is pretty awful as far as what am I doing as patrol for the patrol section. You know, the relationships section is just as important to me; at least, you’ve seen them as an equal playing field across the board. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No, if there’s anything particularly offhand, I apologize for going off on a tangent. In my opinion, they’re rushing when they have to do these. It would seem that our supervisors—and I know for a fact that compared to other agencies, they have more tasks than just supervising the people under them. This is because we don’t have an administrative sergeant, and we don’t have an administrative lieutenant, so a lot of the stuff that those positions would be dealing with is pushed onto the squad supervisors. So in addition to their daily stuff and keeping an eye on guys when they’re doing the reports, they have a lot of all the stuff thrown on top of it. I think kind of last minute sometimes, they have
to get them done. And you know, when you rush through something, I’m sure it’s never as thorough as you’d like it to be. But I think everybody, even the people being evaluated, kind of know that that’s the case. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) None. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant E’s total interview time was 25 minutes.

Participant F

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) I’ve been here a short time, and I can only remember two reviews. I think I was told that these procedures are going to be mid-year now, so I should be having them soon. One day, I came into that room, and it was pretty good. He sat me down, went over how I do things. He told me to continue to do, you know, what I was doing and asked me if I wanted more training and to put in for it. Then there was one scene that was kind of quick: “If you want to read over, it go ahead.” There wasn’t much interaction. (R) So, your opinion is, how would you say, positive, negative so far? (P) I guess it would be middle of the road since I’ve had two different takes on it. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) I liked when both supervisors were there, so I got input from both of them. That it’s not just laid out to me and then go over any questions I have. I don’t like that. I like to discuss it specifically with both of them. I mean, as opposed to putting the appraisal in front of me or the evaluation: “I did your evaluation. Look at it.” (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) Good enough. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) Yes, there is a section that goes over report writing. That is the thing for me: to see an aspect of reports written. I think it covers everything. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I feel like that’s hard for me to answer since I’m not sitting in on other people’s evaluations, and I’m not hearing what they hear about themselves, so I don’t know how they’re taking it and are being told if they’re adding to the department or not. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) I find it useful. If enough of the same comments are said by multiple employees, redundant [repeated] comments get addressed. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) Yes.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) I treat it as a barometer to see where I stand in the department. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) Arrest activity. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) Hasn’t happened to me yet. Just the thought of it affects me, so I don’t want to have subpar performance. (R) Anything else you’d like to
add to that response? (P) I don’t want to be known by my supervisors if they would have to put me into some poor performance retraining or evaluation.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) I would say knowledge of work. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Well, realistically, use of force because it happens so infrequently. We rarely use it. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) Depends on the evaluation that’s already been done. I mean, if it’s a back-and-forth interaction, I would say highly, so it depends on the interaction and input from my supervisor. If it’s negative, it’s going to affect your policy. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant F’s total interview time was 20 minutes.

Participant G

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) I know that there is an evaluation done, but I don’t know what its name is or if it’s a certain type. I know there are different kinds of evaluations, like a face to face or one that’s done without knowing and then you review it. I don’t know what type we do. But I know that there is one that is done, and it’s done pretty quickly, and I don’t think it’s accurate. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) Yeah, I think it should be done with the officer present, or at least it should be gone over a little bit more thoroughly. I think it’s important that certain things are addressed. You know, if a guy is doing good, just have him come in and be like, “You know you do a
great job all the time. You don’t even really need to look at this. I gave you all fours or fives or whatever.” It’s like, some things you do just because you like to work. Other times, it is nice for someone to point out what you do that they think is [done] well or what you do to a level above some of the other guys, you know, just because it’s your drive to do it. I don’t arrest people for them to give me a high-five and say, “Hey, thanks for doing that.” But at the same time, it is nice to see you know that someone is recognizing that you’re going above and beyond, especially because in this field, there are no bonuses like [in the] private sector. You can arrest a million people, and your paycheck’s the same. So, like I said, a compliment or something, you know, an official review does go a long way. Were there, just say, “You did good job.” In small departments, they do see our day-to-day work, but they just like, “Oh, yeah, he does a good job.” But if they [were] like, “Holy crap, he does a lot of good things,” that might be better to see it right now. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I don’t really like it. This is something I don’t ever even see. I take it back, now that I’m thumbing through it. I have seen it, but it’s usually, like, given to you. Like I said, and they say, “You did a good job. You know, if you want to thumb through it really quick and look it over to make sure that there’s nothing negative, and then just sign it at the bottom.” That’s how it’s usually presented. It would be nice to actually go over what you said. It would be nice to actually see what some of the stuff is or what they use as examples of what I’ve done. I feel like a lot of times, the supervisors don’t have enough time to really do them thoroughly, and they just kind of whiz through them to say that they’re done, and that’s it. Yeah, I don’t think that the supervisors are given enough time to complete them. They’re overrun with all sorts of other stuff, and then it’s like, “By the way, these are due next week.” I know there’s eight
patrolmen in a squad, so they have to prepare them, and they’re lengthy. You’re supposed to come up with examples, and they are just like, “I don’t have time for that,” and they got to run out on a call. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) The instrument itself, I mean, I understand certain words have to be in here for us, but the patrolmen don’t take the time to really think. If they streamlined it more or made it more user friendly or reader friendly. I’m not sitting here going through number 5 all the way. I mean, we’re all bright individuals, but it doesn’t need to be so wordy. Like, I’m not taking the time to read my own evaluation if I see that I got all good. So I don’t take the time to review it because it is so long. I think if it was condensed and a little bit maybe more verbal and less written or something like that, and then you might actually feel better about it, when you’re just going to see all these words. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) That’s not hard to answer. It’s not, really. I don’t feel it accurately reflects with all the, you know, the numbered points that are in there. I guess I can’t really answer it because I don’t sit and review the whole package, and it’s not gone over thoroughly with me either. I think, you know, guys that usually are on the lower side of performance end up with much more strict reviews of their performance. You don’t worry if you’re on the good to better side, or you don’t constantly ring the bell in the corner office where you’re in there getting your head chewed off. It’s kind of like, “You did a good job this year.” No one’s looking for you. So I think that’s kind of the way it just gets completed. They might pick one or two standout arrests, but they don’t go into your movement. I think a lot of it’s just lost in how you do a good job. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.
   
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) They are not going to listen to you anyway because they don’t listen to a lot of the things. If you write something down, that’s really suggestive. You open your mouth once or twice, and then it’s like the next thing you know, you are in there, and you’re like, “Why did you say that?” “Because I believe in it.” (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) No.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) I come to work and do what I like to do, regardless of the department’s contract issues. We’ve had issues with a litany of different things where, you know, numbers have declined. But that doesn’t affect how I come to work and still try to make arrests and just do the right thing. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) I already have in my last answer. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Personally, I still work; I do, no matter what the evaluation. If they say, “You’re the greatest cop ever,” I’m not going to stop. It’s not going make me work harder, and it’s not going to make me slow down. I’m already doing a good job. I should probably do less. It’s not going to change how I drive through hotels or try to make arrests or stuff like that.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) Fortunately, I’ve never had that issued to me. I’m not the type of guy that would take it the wrong way. I would still work. You know, I have not had performance-based, like, suggestions on tactics or shooting or something where
you kind of come up with a plan to better yourself. I’d rather be better than take that negatively. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) I really care about knowledge of work because I want to know. I’d like to get promoted to a sergeant and run a squad. I think that you, if you train the guys the way you want them to work or, you know, you run a squad the way you want it to work. I want to have a good knowledge of things, so if I show up to a job, I don’t do something wrong. You [don’t] want to feel stupid, or you’re like, “Ooh, I didn’t exactly know what to do there.” So that’s important for me, to be on top of everything that I should know as a patrolman. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Probably number one, appearance, attendance, and punctuality. I mean, we don’t really get graded as long as we’re here on time. No one does uniform inspections or anything, so I would say that’s the least. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) I’m fortunate enough to work with a good supervisor who is aggressive and active and, you know, is one of the guys. My sergeant is motivating, unlike my lieutenant who I don’t see eye to eye with. But I like going every day, running, tactics, and training. I don’t think I would take it well from him [my lieutenant] because I don’t feel like he’s really part of the team. He’s kind of like an outlier. You don’t really know what you’re doing right. You’re [my lieutenant is] blowing smoke to keep me heading in the right direction. It doesn’t affect my productivity. If the supervisor is in line with the guys, and he gives you positive feedback, that can be motivating if the guy that is one of the guys, like he’s a bro, like someone that understands what we’re out there doing. If you’re out there at 3 in the morning,
and you have something that’s decent, and you want to follow up, and you have a guy saying, “No, we’re not doing that now because we have to call somebody in and overtime.” Then he’s blowing smoke because he’s like, oh, “You’re doing a great job. Get out there, and just keep it up.” Then he’s the one that’s not letting me do it. So I guess that helps answer the question a little bit more. I just feel the performance evaluations can be done much better. I feel like they are rushed. We do them to say that if anybody ever asked, and there’s one with everybody’s name. I think there’s a lot of room for change in the performance appraisal, but as of where, I stand there’s not much I can do. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant G’s total interview time was 25 minutes.

**Participant H**

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) The performance evaluations don’t necessarily happen every year. However, I have been a part of a couple of them. My opinion on it is basically, it’s a useful tool [for] knowing what aspects of the job that you need to either pick up on or, in ways, what [are] your pluses and minuses. Yeah, pluses and minuses in your profession. Ways that you need to improve on your profession. This job kind of has many different aspects to it, and some people might gravitate towards one versus another. I think as a whole, we cover the bases of policing in a local township like this. There’s good crime prevention; there’s good community outreach and good youth programs. We have a lot of different aspects in the township that are very successful. I think for being a town like this, we make a lot of arrests, so I think we do a very good job here. So the performance appraisal is necessary, I guess, for improving on the performance of the agency. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) I think there should be an appraisal form on the overall performance of the agency. That would be an anonymous way to voice your opinion. Because I might be satisfied with my own performance, because I might hold myself to a higher standard. There should be a way for me to be able to raise concerns without feeling the threat of retribution or some type of punishment for bringing up an issue that is in the township and the way that things operate around here. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I don’t feel threatened by it, if that’s part of the question or if that’s kind of what you’re leaning towards. When I go over this, and I do it on my own, I think I can answer it honestly. I perform my job honestly, and I feel I perform my job with a great amount of integrity, so I don’t have any problem answering these types of questions. Appearance—let me go over the appearance, attendance, punctuality, and I exceed in all of those aspects. I think it’s a good way to go over the different aspects of the agency and the way you should operate. We’re police officers; we should be operating at a higher standard. And there’s got to be some types of checks and balances to be able to say this is a position where you need to improve on doing a great job here. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) I think my previous answer does kind of touch on this because I think there’s an amount of fear in the agency where if you raise concerns, you’re afraid of retaliation or some type of punishment against you for bringing a problem. So, like I said, if there was an anonymous way to bring up an issue with your discontent with the operation of the agency, that would be a great way to voice your opinion without having to deal with it later on. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I mean, look, you know, it’s nine pages. It’s tough to accurately describe someone’s performance in nine pages with the number of questions here. Your day-to-day behavior, your day-to-day interactions with people, whether it’s on the call or just dealing with people in the public—it is hard to capture that in an evaluation. I think it’s not crime or use of force. I mean, I guess they take into consideration my complaints or job performance or commendation letters written to the chief, whether positive or negative. I guess that all goes into this, right. I know everything really is on the plate when it comes evaluations. So, I mean, it is really probably the only way to accurately describe somebody’s performance around here, looking at everything they do from the beginning of the year to the end of the year and comparing it to the past. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) Yeah, I mean, the ones that I’ve been a part of, they’ve always been positive in nature because I’m involved in the youth programs in town, and I’m nice. I tend to talk to people when I’m out on the street, and I’m friendly with people, you know. I high-five little kids, and I’m respectful to people because there’s a terrible perception of police officers in the country right now, and I want to be able to look at somebody, say, “Good morning,” and they might be a little more open to talk to you. So, yeah, I mean, I guess it’s a good way to judge your performance. I think it’s acceptable. How else are you going to judge someone’s performance other than looking at the complaints or the way they’ve performed throughout the year? That’s good checks and balances, I guess.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) Guys might be reluctant to raise an issue that they might have, and it might be a legitimate issue because someone was promoted not for their accomplishments or performance but
for other reasons. Maybe they’re not performing their job adequately—that’s something that someone would like to raise. But [with] their name attached—that’s a tough thing to raise. You know, when someone’s not performing the job adequately in the patrol business, it can be a problem. You worry; retribution seems to be on your mind. It’s really not me personally, but because I’ve been here a lot of years, I’ve had a good career so far, and I’ve never had any issues. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) I answered that before.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) Little to none. I can tell you why: because I operate the way I do for specific reasons. One is public perception, my prior experiences in my life observing police officers’ conduct in public and either disagreeing with it or agreeing with their conduct. Before I was law enforcement, either I was a kid dealing with police in my young adult years or in my adult years being a police officer. This is kind of a gray; everything is not black and white in law enforcement. There are a lot of gray areas and a lot of different decisions you can make in certain situations. The way I operate is based on the individual situation. So if ticket production is down, well, that means I didn’t deal with so many people that needed tickets. I might have pulled them over for something, and they were respectful about it, and I didn’t feel they deserved the ticket. But if my performance is low, it’s not because I didn’t perform. I wouldn’t measure things like performance overall when it comes to just talking [to] somebody. It’s not measured by numbers. Are you actively engaged? How you carry yourself and deal with the public. It has nothing to do with a performance appraisal. You know, we’re sworn law enforcement. We’re held to a higher standard, and
that needs to be reminded on a daily or weekly basis. But I don’t think a performance evaluation is going to make me do my job better. A couple of pieces of paper saying this and that, it doesn’t have an effect on my overall perception of myself. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) You know, a lot of times in performance evaluations, numbers are looked at, so it’s kind of hard to shy away from numbers when specific numbers are looked at, your arrests, your summonses. You know, there are a couple of things that you can look at on a graph in an aspect like that, ok. Maybe they’re saying you’re not doing your job because you’re not issuing enough tickets, or you haven’t made enough arrests. I have the ability to give verbal warnings, and I have the ability to cut someone a break and make an arrest. So I don’t think of specific examples, because if I stopped 15 cars, and everybody is respectful and courteous—motor vehicle summonses are expensive. Somebody might be working two jobs, they might be supporting a family, and they might be coming from work and were going too fast. Maybe they were on a cell phone or something silly like that, and it’s a relatively minor offense. You have to look at the totality of the circumstances because this guy or woman is supporting their family. They have kids, they have a house, they have a mortgage, they have to feed their family, and a ticket is not cheap. You give someone a speeding ticket, and they want to get the points away, so they know it’s going cost in insurance. It’s going to cost him four hundred dollars. Four hundred dollars is clothes and food and stuff like that. That stuff there is more important. I think verbal warnings can go a longer way sometimes than giving a ticket. So that’s my specific example: You might be criticized for your performance because you haven’t written so many summonses. What’s not looked at is your demeanor when you’re pulling people over and giving them the verbal warnings. You can get further by speaking
with someone, not just handing them a ticket as a money maker. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) I have been criticized for lacking production at some points in my career. You know, we do have a patrol supervisor here who is very good, so my lieutenant tells me, “You need to pick it up a little bit.” It makes me not want to disappoint them, almost like you’re disappointing a parent. You feel obligated to pick it up because some things are expected of you. So I can understand that side of it, but at the same time, I do have a difficult time writing tickets just for the purpose of writing [them]. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) So—and correct me if I’m wrong or tell me that I’m nuts—but patrol, personal conduct, quality of work, relationships, knowledge of work are all the same. They all blend into each other. You need to know your job knowledge, and safety is important. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Attendance, punctuality, and operation care of equipment. Use of force because use of force is used the least amount of times. As compared with everything else I’ve filled out, maybe a dozen use-of-force reports in my life. The majority of people are cooperative with us. Any use of force is important because you have to know because you can hurt somebody, you can take someone’s life, and you can end up going to jail. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) Depends on the boss, but I have to say that the majority of supervisors here are well respected. They know the jobs [and] were good at it. I take their criticisms and their
recommendations well. If they tell me I need to pick up on some aspect of my policing, I’ll try to do more. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant H’s total interview time was 47 minutes.

**Participant I**

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) It was completed by your squad supervisor, and it’s supposed to be annually. It’s supposed to be, you know, within a reasonable time before squad changes to movement within agencies, so they want your direction. The previous year detailing your progress or your growth or any issues or concerns they may have. It’s a pretty standard form, and some of it is open ended. I think it really depends on who your supervisor is as to how effective or how seriously it’s taken. You know, I feel some take it more seriously than others, and I use it as a learning tool or as a standard. I mean, in the grand scheme of things, we’re pretty small, we’re pretty tight-knit—you know, you know how guys work. We’re all kind of friendly, you know, and I feel like it’s not necessarily a true gauge of work performance. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) How they’re administered, when they’re administered, mainly on how they’re administered. Know, it’s kind of like when you’re in college, and everybody knows the easy grader—it’s the same type of thing. You know you’re going to get some guys who just go through the motions, and everybody is a rock star. You may get another guy who takes it a little more seriously. You know that [he] shows deficiencies. You know, if I go for a promotion, one guy’s going to show he was a rock star. Another guy may show deficiencies when these things may just not be administered in the same manner. It could affect your output opportunity to be promoted. Meanwhile, the work performance is the same perhaps because one has a
preference. I mean, it’s all arbitrary. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I don’t really have an opinion. I’m a proactive guy, and I do my job. I try to do well every day. I love what I do. I think it shows in my work. I’m not afraid of these things now. You know, I get it. That’s why I work so hard. (R) Is there anything else you like to add? (P) No.

   a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) Maybe from like just a supervisory standpoint, they cannot assume you perform consistently outstanding.

   (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I don’t necessarily believe it’s accurate, but again, it’s very—you know—based on you know who your supervisor is. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.

   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) I’ve made comments, and I’ve never gotten a response to a comment. I don’t know where it goes after that. I mean, I’ve never heard of it working negatively toward anybody, like that guys are afraid to say something. (R) It does provide feedback to the organization because you said you had made comments. (P) I’ve never received any negative feedback, although it depends on who found out. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) Depends on what the individual says. Understand that everyone falls in a social structure.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) I don’t pay any mind to it. You know, I work to my standard. I don’t work for a piece of paper. I don’t work to please the next guy. I work to please myself to a standard that I’m happy with. I’m not worried about ever being, you know, put on a piece of paper or graded. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) I don’t let them praise or affect my performance. I hold myself to high standards. I mean it’s like they’re not asking anything like out of the realm that you shouldn’t be doing anyways. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) Not at all. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) Knowledge of work seems pretty common. You know, you have to know how to do your job, you know. Although, yes, you have supervisors, you shouldn’t rely on them. You should know your job. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Care of equipment. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) It depends on the boss. If, you know, a boss that’s providing constructive criticism or, you know, that’s going to do things to make you better, you know it’s well received, and it’s very much appreciated. Then there could be other bosses that, you know, don’t take it seriously, and you’re not getting anything out of the interview. It’s kind of just
like going through the motions just to satisfy that. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant I’s total interview time was 27 minutes.

Participant J

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) It’s a questionnaire that you are supposed to get at the end of every year. The questions that are in there are pretty good. I would say that it’s a great evaluation if it was actually used for what it was intended to be used for. You don’t believe its intention is being used right. I think that it was created this way. You can have a factual, relevant evaluation of the employee. However, in this agency, they just do it as a matter of fact. The results of your evaluation are never used at any point in the future. Throughout your career either, you know, to advance your career or any type of detrimental way. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) I mean, like I said, the actual questions, I think they’re good. I think they’re relevant. If they actually followed through and actually used it to—let’s say, if there was a problem area where an officer needs some type of improvement, [and] they actually use[d] the evaluation to actually improve that particular section of his career. Then it would be beneficial. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) I think it’s good. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) Not now. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization?
(P) I feel like I’m reiterating myself about the document itself. You know what, let me take that back. It depends who’s doing the evaluation. So I’ve been in several squads and have had several supervisors. Some of them take this very seriously; others don’t. Depending on who is actually doing your evaluation, you know as soon as they get it, they’ll go ahead and give it to you and sit down with you and review it. Then there’s a wait until the very end and they say, “Here, you go. This is what I think of you, and would you just sign the bottom because the captain’s down my throat, and they were due yesterday?” (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.
   
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) Yeah, I think this is an important part because there may be things or events that you may want to remember. You want to reflect on this part of your evaluations and maybe some type of positive call that you were on. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) I don’t think they look at them. I think they take them, and they put them in a filing cabinet, and that’s it.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) It doesn’t really mean anything. I mean, it’s almost like a standing joke around here: “It’s time for your evaluation. Come on. Let’s get through it.” (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) I think I answered that in the earlier question. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) Me, personally, I strive to try to give the best possible product that I possibly can. So if there is anything negative that is shown on there, I will make an effort to improve that, whatever negative comment or negative critique. (R) Does it affect your morale? It just makes you work harder? (P) It makes me want to work harder. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) I guess what would affect me the most is probably safety, if I was unsafe in a particular situation where I could either compromise my safety or the safety of another. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) I would say that the use of force doesn’t affect me. It is one of the sections which doesn’t affect me. I don’t really see myself as a very short fuse. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) If there’s a certain area where, you know, my work performance needs some type of improvement—you know, even though these aren’t really used. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant J’s total interview time was 23 minutes.

Participant K

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) Well, I guess the problem I’m having is that the process is kind of inconsistent. We don’t do them regularly, and the process seems to change as far as what type of evaluations we’re using, the timing of them, and when they’re done. You know, how fast they have to be done, which I think ultimately affects the quality of the
review. Because when the supervisors are under the gun to get them in, and they’re trying to meet a timeframe, they don’t have as much time to dedicate to going over each one individually. It’s almost like they’re just kind of going through the motions just to satisfy the requirement. While I think they do give thought to them because they know the guys, because of the size of the department, I don’t think it always allows them the opportunity to really analyze the people that are working for them and what they’re doing right and what they’re doing wrong and how to properly critique it. So, infrequency, inconsistency, and the rush. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

   a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) I would say just say having a timeframe. We do squad changes in the first month of the year, so if anything’s going to change, that’s going to happen right there. So it’s either, you know, doing it maybe towards the end of the year and saying, whatever, you have from the beginning of the year to the end of December. In December, I’m going to officially get it, and I have four weeks to get it done. They can start to formulate the things they want to bring up, whether it’s positive or negative, and how they’re going to approach the subject. I think it’s tough when you obviously have to critique somebody who works for you. They want to be tactful on how they do it because they want you to take what they’re saying seriously. If they’re giving you a negative or something that’s less than positive review on an area for improvement, you want to say it in such a way that it doesn’t necessarily sound like it’s negative. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) The administration maybe will use your own words against you or somebody else in retaliation. In this day and age, we have to be worried about, you know, the public and people coming after us and how our words [can] be used against us. So if I say, “Last year, I didn’t do this well or a particular
thing,” and then something happens later in your career where it’s germane to what you just said, you know, it can be used against you. Well, there are guys who think, “Well, if I shoot a 100 on my qualification, I’m going to be held to a standard of 100 going forward.” So if I get into a shooting, and you hit the bad guy, that’s one thing; you’re still going to be called into question. But if you hit somebody who is innocent, and now they question that you shot a hundred: “So you’re obviously very good. How come he didn’t shoot so good here?” So I think it’s the problem guys are leery of retaliation but also from the outside world. So, on the civil liability that, you know, you don’t want your words to be used against you. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) No, I cannot. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I’d have to say I’m not completely satisfied. I mean, first of all, the workload isn’t exactly evenly distributed, so some of us have more opportunities to do more things. Some of it’s by choice, and sometimes it’s not by choice. You know, I volunteer to do certain things, whereas other people, because of their work ethic or just the type of people they are, they don’t get as much to be responsible for. They’re basically the guys that show up and go out on the road and take their calls, and they write their reports, and that’s about it. Competence gets rewarded with more work. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.

a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) I don’t, and you know, again, I think that there’s always an apprehension that if you point out something that needs to be corrected, you might be questioned about it later. So
again, you know, that sort of retaliation can put you on the spot, so I think guys hold back. My experience is that we just don’t seem to see recommendations happen. You put them out there, and sometimes they’ll say, “Yes, there’s a better way of doing this, and maybe we should look at it,” but they don’t. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) The answer is no. I’m one of the more senior guys here, and I’m involved in a lot of different things from patrol services unit to the firearms and everything down to car seats. Mostly it’s because I wanted to be, and I put myself out there, and it is as a show of my competency. I got to work, and some of the supervisors have said at times they value my opinion, but at other times, I’ve also had it used against me, so I’ve seen it work both ways. I think they have to be, and you should be receptive to it. And it’s like anything else; it’s all really in the presentation of it. If you can phrase it in a way that it doesn’t sound like you know everything, and you’ve done it. In my experience, if you can cite certain examples where you say, “Well, today, I had to do this, and this is the way we’ve been doing it. But what if we tried this way, just like an alternative?” But unfortunately, I just haven’t seen a lot of you guys talking about it, or it doesn’t get passed up because guys are hesitant to pass it up.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) I have a very high standard for myself, so that’s what drives me. I want to be a positive reflection of myself, and I want to be a positive reflection of my agency. That’s what that drives me on a daily basis. I mean, obviously, I want my supervisors to see me in the same way, but if I keep my standards high, then I don’t really need to. I don’t need to be so concerned about what other people are thinking and how I’m doing things
because I do good day to day. If you need day-to-day corrections or advice, you didn’t make the corrections. So for me, it doesn’t come down to a once-a-year evaluation. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) It really doesn’t apply because my standard is high. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) It is something I have not experienced. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) Quality of work means the most to me. In the event that something is brought to my attention, I tend to internalize it more than deflect it. “You know we noticed a couple of times you showed a little bit late,” and I’m like, “Ok, you know I’m an adult.” Then I say, “You know they’re right.” I look at these guys as not just my bosses but my friends. For me, I hate to put them in the position where they have to even say something about it, that I have to be an adult enough to say, “All right.” But, you know, from very early on, like quality of work, because it talks about you know doing things completely and accurately. On our job, everything has to be done that way because you know if you didn’t write it down, it didn’t happen. If I don’t write it down, I don’t remember it because it’s just, you know, a lot of things come up way down the road, you know, whether it’s a simple ticket or, you know, a report. So details matter. I mean, like, relationships are obviously important; that would be probably almost a tie. But, you know, I think if you know your quality of work, you keep that bar high. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Use of force only. In my career, there has not been a lot of a lot of
opportunities or incidents where things came down to that or enough infrequency. (R)
Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) I mean, for me, it has it has very little. I don’t necessarily want to be the leader on arrests or summonses. I always try and keep myself somewhere near the top, but I don’t have to be the rabbit that everybody else is chasing. It’s never really been my goal because I don’t need to be the standout. I’m not getting any awards for it. I want to be in that top group somewhere. It also keeps me moving forward. It makes the days go better. (R) You just pushing yourself? (P) I’m kind of aware of where I stand with these things, but that’s just my internal drive. You know, some guys just want to come in here and do the bare minimum and keep everybody off their back. I like to be out there and interacting with people, and you know, I like to make good use of my time. So I feel like if I’m doing that on a daily basis, then I don’t really need to be concerned about what somebody is going to write up. You know, I, unfortunately, I see the value of these if they can be done honestly and not just to fulfill the requirement, whether it’s for you or CALEA. I mean, it seems like every year, we have more and more things that we have to do as far as mandatory training. It’s just to another go through the motions. It’s not so frustrating for me personally because I don’t have to do this. But for somebody, a supervisor that has that sit down and do this once a year, you don’t just want to haphazardly put things down. You’ve got to sit down and give it to the guy and say, “Well, these are what I like about you and what I don’t like.” It’s got to be reflective of what’s really going on. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant K’s total interview time was 30 minutes.

**Participant L**

1. (R) Can you identify and describe your opinion of the annual performance appraisal process of the Mahwah Police Department? (P) I know typically any time we get evaluated or any
type of appraisal, it goes through our direct supervisor, which is a sergeant or lieutenant, and then a captain, then to the chief. The good thing I like about it is that there is a section of, you know, if you agree or disagree with something, or you want to add to it, you can. If you think they omitted something, then you put it in there, and maybe they get over it or whatever, maybe positive or negative. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Can you suggest improvements to the performance evaluation process? (P) The consistency of when it’s done. At times, it’s intermittent. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

2. (R) What is your perception of the evaluation instrument? (P) As long as I’ve been here, it’s probably like the second or third time I actually got my hands on a blank one. But as far as the process itself, I think it covers most bases of what we’re expected to do. Now I don’t know if it actually has any value. I haven’t been at a position like sergeant. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

a. (R) Could you suggest revisions to the instrument? (P) No, I think I think it’s pretty self-explanatory. I think it covers most bases. I had not personally run into any issue with them or with the evaluation process, so I don’t really know. I really can’t comment on any type of revisions. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

3. (R) To what extent are you satisfied that the annual performance appraisal used by the Mahwah Police Department accurately reflects an officer’s contribution to the organization? (P) I would have to say that most of the time, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal. I think that the supervisors that do the appraisal do a good and thorough job of making sure your performance is accurate. What I can’t speak for is the hierarchy of the department, what
they take in consideration, or how accurate their perception is of what they see. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

4. (R) For the employee comment sheet.
   a. (R) Is this useful for providing feedback to the organization? (P) I’m probably going to say no. I think it’s just more you can get things off your chest, if that’s really the case. I also feel you got to be careful what you say because of retaliation. You don’t want that retaliation. You don’t want them holding anything over your head because you may disagree with something that a supervisor may have written in your evaluation. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.
   b. (R) Do you believe the department values individual employee feedback? (P) They ask you for your feedback on things, but I don’t think it’s really ever taken into consideration.

5. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

6. (R) What effect, if any, does the annual performance appraisal have on your overall professional performance? (P) I haven’t been in a position where my appraisals affected my performance. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

7. (R) Can you provide specific examples? (P) No. (R) Is there anything else you would like to add? (P) No.

8. (R) When substandard performance results in issuance of a performance improvement plan, what effect does this have on your morale? (P) I haven’t had experience with that. It depends on the person you talk to. It’s about the personalities and, you know, what is it that I could be doing differently. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

9. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the most? (P) Relationships because I am a firm believer in the community aspect and any communication with the department itself. So I feel, like, building your
relationship with your lieutenant; obviously, there’s the chain of command. There’s the respect, but I feel like if you build a relationship, you’re going to have a successful career, and hopefully, you’re going to make your supervisor’s career easier as well. (R)

Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

10. (R) Of the 10 appraisal areas of the appraisal instrument, which one affects your job performance the least? (P) Appearance, attendance, and punctuality. I’m pretty punctual. I’m usually always on time. I’m rarely sick. I may not be the biggest ticket writer or the biggest sick guy, the biggest community-policing guy or the schools, or anything like that. I think there needs to be that direct, balanced mix of everybody. They may say, “You know, you’re good here, but you know, you need to do a little better this way.” I think it goes back to the communication aspect. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

11. (R) What effect, if any, does the culminating supervisory interview have on your overall productivity? (P) I’m multitasking, whether it’s patrol, administrative, or anything else that they may have me do. So one month, I made my productivity level, and when it comes to tickets, I may be sky high. Whereas another month where I’m doing office work Monday through Friday, it may be lower. So I don’t really take too much offense to the evaluation. I do like that line of communication; this is where you’re seeing what you’re evaluated. (R) Anything else you’d like to add to that response? (P) No.

Participant L’s total interview time was 63 minutes.

**Interview Time by Participants**

A. 22 minutes  
B. 24 minutes  
C. 25 minutes  
D. 27 minutes  
E. 25 minutes
F. 20 minutes
G. 25 minutes
H. 47 minutes
I. 27 minutes
J. 23 minutes
K. 30 minutes
L. 63 minutes

The shortest interview lasted 20 minutes, and the longest 63 minutes. The average interview was 29.83 minutes. The total time spent in the interviews was 358 minutes (5 hours and 58 minutes).

Coding

The researcher utilized thematic coding to capture the perceived impacts of performance evaluations on Mahwah police officers’ job satisfaction and job performance. The researcher also investigated to what extent these two variables affected overall organizational operations. Per Gibbs (2007), thematic coding enables the “retrieval and comparison of all the data marked with the same code that are examples of some action, setting, strategy, meaning, emotion, and so on that you are interested in” (p. 144). IBM SPSS v22 was used to categorize all the police officers involved in this qualitative study as cases. Gibbs (2007) instructed researchers to “look for differences and similarities across different cases, settings, actors, situations, motives and so on” (p. 145). Gibbs (2007) further defined a case as the various things, including persons, making up the sample (n) of the study. The results of this study are analyzed in Chapter V.

Themes Corresponding to Research Question 1

During the participants’ interviews, the researcher identified the following themes related to research question 1 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?). Participant A felt that supervisors prepared performance appraisals inconsistently. The participant was satisfied with the performance appraisal instrument but felt that supervisors
were rushed to prepare performance appraisals, which were subjective to preparers. The participant also felt that employee comments on performance appraisals could trigger retaliation against employees. The participant further stated that the department did not value employee feedback.

Participant B felt the performance appraisal instrument was satisfactory, and employee comments on performance appraisals only had effects depending on the person supplying the comments. The participant did not think the department valued employee feedback. The participant noted that the process of interactions between supervisors and employees in the performance appraisal process needed improvement. The participant also felt that performance appraisals focused on the negative and did not give enough positive feedback.

Participant C felt that the performance appraisal instrument was satisfactory but did not fairly represent employee contributions to the agency. The participant also felt that employee comments on performance appraisals could trigger retaliation against employees. The participant further stated that the department did not value employee feedback.

Participant D discussed only one theme related to research question 1 and felt that the performance appraisal instrument was satisfactory. Participant E was satisfied with the performance appraisal instrument but felt that supervisors were rushed to prepare performance appraisals, which were subjective to preparers. The participant further stated that supervisors did not value employee feedback. The participant felt that the process of interactions between supervisors and employees in the performance appraisal process needed improvement.

Participant F felt the performance appraisal instrument needed improvement. The participant believed that repeated employee comments on performance appraisals would be addressed. The participant suggested that the process of interactions between supervisors and employees in the performance appraisal process needed improvement.

Participant G felt that the performance appraisal instrument needed improvement, and supervisors were rushed to prepare performance appraisals, which were subjective to preparers. The
Participant further felt that the instrument did not fairly represent employee contributions to the agency, while employee comments on performance appraisals might trigger retaliation against employees. The participant stated that supervisors did not value employee feedback. The participant felt that the process of interactions between supervisors and employees in the performance appraisal process needed improvement.

Participant H felt that performance appraisals in the Mahwah Police Department were not prepared consistently, and the appraisal instrument needed improvement. The participant also felt that employee comments on performance appraisals could trigger retaliation against participants. The participant stated that the department did not value employee feedback.

Participant I felt that performance appraisals in the Mahwah Police Department were not prepared consistently, and the appraisal instrument needed improvement. The participant thought that supervisors were rushed to prepare performance appraisals, which were subjective to preparers. The participant felt that employee comments on performance appraisals only had effects depending on the person supplying the comments, and the department did not value employee feedback.

Participant J was satisfied with the performance appraisal instrument itself but felt that supervisors were rushed to prepare performance appraisals, which were subjective to preparers. The participant also felt that supervisors did not value employee feedback.

Participant K thought that performance appraisals were not prepared consistently, and supervisors rushed to prepare them. The participant also felt that employee comments on performance appraisals could trigger retaliation against employees, and the department did not value employee feedback.

Participant L suggested that performance appraisals were not prepared consistently, but the participant was satisfied with the performance appraisal instrument itself. The participant felt that employee comments on performance appraisals could trigger retaliation against employees, and supervisors did not value employee feedback.
Themes Corresponding to Research Question 2

During the interviews, the researcher identified the following themes related to research question 2 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job performance?). Participant A felt that performance improvement plans negatively affected morale. The participant identified quality of work and safety as the most important category and appearance and attendance as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant B stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride. The participant identified safety as the most important category and appearance and attendance as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant C stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride. The participant identified operation and care of equipment as the most important category and relationships as the least important category in performance appraisals.

Participant D identified quality of work as the most important category and relationships as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant E stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride, and performance improvement plans negatively affected morale. The participant identified quality of work and relationships as the most important categories and patrol as the least important category in performance appraisals.

Participant F felt that performance improvement plans negatively affected morale. The participant identified knowledge as the most important category and force as the least important category in performance appraisals.
Participant G stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride. The participant identified knowledge as the most important category and appearance and attendance as the least important category in performance appraisals.

Participant H stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride, and performance improvement plans negatively affected morale. The participant identified safety and knowledge as the most important category and appearance and attendance, along with force, as the least important categories in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant I stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride. The participant identified knowledge as the most important category and operation and care of equipment as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant J stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride, and performance improvement plans negatively affected morale. The participant identified safety as the most important category and force as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.

Participant K stated that performance appraisals did not have any effect on work performance due to self-pride. The participant identified quality of work and relationships as the most important category and force as the least important category in performance appraisals.

Participant L identified relationships as the most important category and appearance and attendance as the least important category in performance appraisals. The participant also stated that the culminating supervisory interview was motivating.
The researcher collected all the themes associated with the research questions. The percentages of the participants who expressed the themes were calculated to create Table 2, in which:

- RQ1 themes are associated with research question 1 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?).
- RQ2 themes are associated with research question 2 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job performance?).

The researcher also identified other areas not relevant to the study as outliers:

- Participant E stated that bosses were overtasked because there was no administrative sergeant or lieutenant. This implied that squad sergeants were overtasked and consequently rushed the performance appraisal process.
- Participant K recommended that performance appraisals be prepared at the end of the year. The participant justified this suggestion by stating that it would ensure that the preparer and the officer appraised had worked together for the entire calendar year, making the appraisal fairer.

See Table 2 for a breakdown of the themes, codes, and corresponding research questions.
Table 2

Thematic Coding: Identified Themes and Corresponding Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic coding</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Pct.%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent Preparation of Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal instrument satisfactory</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal Instrument needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor rushes preparation of Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal is subjective by the opinion of the supervisor preparing it (central tendency)</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal reflecting a P.O. contributions to agency is not fair</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee comments on the Performance Appraisal and retaliation</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee comments on Performance Appraisal only have effect depending on who is giving feedback</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee comments on Performance Appraisal Redundant comments get addressed</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department doesn’t value employee feedback</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Performance Appraisal process via interaction between supervisor and employee</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal focuses on the negative items, not enough positive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal doesn’t affect professional performance due to self pride</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance improvement plan affects morale negatively</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the most-Quality of work</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the most-Safety</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the most-Operation and care of equipment</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the most-Knowledge</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the most-Relationships</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the least-appearance and attendance</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the least-Relationships</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the least-Patrol section</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the least-Force</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Performance Appraisal that affects performance the least-Operation and care of equipment</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating supervisory interview was motivating</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

While conducting the study, the researcher identified 12 themes related to research question 1 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?) and 13 themes related to research question 2 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job performance?). Research question 3 (To what extent do these two variables affect overall organizational operations?) is addressed in the analysis of the results in Chapter V. The themes are reviewed, and the results are analyzed thoroughly to answer research question 3. A total of 25 themes emerged during the study.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of this qualitative case study, starting with a restatement of the study purpose and the research questions. Next are a summary and discussion of the study and the implications of the findings in relation to the literature review and the study’s theoretical framework. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future policy, practice, and research.

The purpose of this case study was to explore how police officers in a medium-size, suburban police department perceived performance evaluations. Within the framework of Maslow’s theory of human motivation, the research explored how Mahwah police officers perceived the effects of performance evaluations on job satisfaction and job performance. The study also investigated what effects, if any, these two variables had on the Mahwah Police Department’s overall operations. Performance appraisals may affect job satisfaction, which is synonymous with morale in police organizations. Organizations that enhance learning opportunities are often the only places where self-actualizing individuals can grow and be happy (Chawla & Renesch, 1995). Examining officers’ perceptions of the performance evaluation process, therefore, can inform law enforcement agencies’ efforts to design and implement more effective performance evaluation practices.

The sample for this qualitative case study was 12 police officers from the Mahwah Township Police Department in New Jersey. Data from one-on-one interviews were collected and analyzed. All the participants were male and ranged in age from 26 to 50 years. Their years of experience ranged from 3 to 19. Eleven participants were White, while one was Hispanic.
Research Questions

The following three questions guided this study:

1. How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?
2. How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job performance?
3. To what extent do these two variables affect overall organizational operations?

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

As stated in the literature review, performance appraisals provide a process to evaluate organization members (Erdogan, 2002). This process should include the standards used for appraisal, appraisal-related behaviors of the person appraised, set appraisal period, and methods to determine and communicate the performance appraisal rating to the person appraised. The performance appraisal process involves interactions between employers and subordinates. Supervisors appraise employees for set time periods, usually annually, biannually, or quarterly. During the appraisal period, supervisors are tasked with giving employees performance expectations to meet, and employees are assessed based on their performance at the end of the period.

Job satisfaction is defined as “contentment (or lack of it) arising out of interplay of employee’s positive or negative feelings toward his or her work” (“Job satisfaction,” n.d.). Nimsombun (2000) expanded the definition of job satisfaction to be a sign of good treatment and an indicator of emotional well-being and psychological health, which contribute to self-actualization (Malsow, 1943). Nimsombun (2000) found that job satisfaction also reflects organizational success. Job performance, in turn, is defined as “the work-related activities expected of an employee and how well those activities were executed. Many business personnel directors assess the job performance of each employee on an annual or quarterly basis in order to help them identify suggested areas for improvement” (“Job performance,” n.d.). This case study explored how job
satisfaction and performance affect organizational operations. Nimsombun (2000) stated that job satisfaction reflects organizational success, while Hoath et al. (1998) suggested that workers’ attitudes affect job satisfaction so that if job satisfaction is high, worker stress levels are low.

Twenty-five themes emerged from the interview data. Six themes were pertinent to research questions 1 and 2, while research question 3 was addressed through analysis of all the participants’ responses. This case study was framed by Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation, and the participants made statements related to the five levels of his hierarchy of human needs:

1. Physiological needs: food, water, warmth, and rest
2. Safety needs: security and safety
3. Belongingness and love needs: intimate relationships and friendships
4. Esteem needs: prestige and feeling of accomplishment
5. Self-actualization: the achievement of one’s full potential, including creative activities.

Throughout the study, the researcher repeatedly noticed that the participants shared high levels of pride, identified as a dominant theme in this study. The participants readily discussed the importance of safety, another theme identified in this study. Some participants even stressed their relationships with their supervisors as highly important to them. This finding can be associated with the dominant theme that the officers attached great importance and attributed a motivating effect to the culminating interviews with their supervisors at the end of the appraisal process.

The dominant themes were determined by a ≥50% response rate. If a specific theme was identified in at least half of the total responses, it was considered to be dominant. The dominant themes pertinent to research question 1 were:

1. The performance appraisal instrument is satisfactory.
2. Supervisors rush to prepare performance appraisals.
3. Employee comments on performance appraisals raise fear of retaliation.
4. The department does not value employee feedback.
The dominant themes pertinent to research question 2 were:

1. Performance appraisals do not affect professional performance due to self-pride.
2. The culminating supervisory interview is motivating.

**Dominant Themes for Research Question 1**

These findings emerged from the comprehensive literature review, problem statement, and responses from the participants’ interviews related to research question 1 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job satisfaction?). The first dominant theme, identified among 58.33% of the participants’ responses, was that “the participants are satisfied with the current appraisal instrument used to evaluate them.” According to Blue (2011), performance appraisals can aid employee development, which, in turn, contributes to employee satisfaction. Performance appraisals give employees insight into how their supervisors rate their job performance, which can have substantial effects on job satisfaction.

The second dominant theme was that “supervisors rush to prepare performance appraisals,” noted by 50% percent of the participants. When supervisors rushed, it diminished the value of performance appraisals because supervisors projected an appearance of non-importance. This can be called the human factor in performance appraisals based on the individuals involved and not policy or instruments. Only officers’ sense of self-worth was affected, supporting Kramer’s (1998) finding that employees viewed performance appraisals as a useless part of the bureaucracy. Kramer (1998) observed a lack of training in performance appraisals and noted that law enforcement agencies did not make performance appraisal process meaningful.

The third dominant theme, identified by 50% of the participants, centered on retaliation for negative comments about the performance appraisal instrument. Retaliation had a substantial effect on job satisfaction: when the employees worked in fear, they did not reach Maslow’s (1943) level of self-actualization, and retaliation created significant civil liability for the Mahwah Police Department and Mahwah Township. Retaliation thus affected employee morale, contributions, and
job satisfaction. When job satisfaction was affected, it affected performance. When performance suffered in policing, the community the officers served became the inadvertent victim of their lack of motivation. Aluri and Reichel (1994) described the relationship of performance appraisals and organizational effectiveness: “the basis of performance appraisals is that they should result in better organizational performance” (p. 151).

Finally, the fourth theme relevant to research question 1 was “the department does not value employee feedback,” identified by 83.33% of the participants. When the officers felt that their feedback had no value to their employer, they stopped giving feedback, preventing the department from making changes to continue successful policing. It also kept the officers from feeling satisfied at work because they did not reach Maslow’s (1943) level of self-actualization.

**Dominant Themes for Research Question 2**

These findings emerged from the comprehensive literature review, problem statement, and responses from the participants’ interviews related to research question 2 (How do police officers describe the impact of performance appraisals on job performance?). The first dominant theme was “performance appraisals do not affect professional performance due to self-pride,” identified by 66.66% of the interviewed Mahwah police officers. All these officers stated that they had high levels of integrity and refused to let performance appraisals affect their work performance. They seemed to hold themselves accountable. This theme directly correlates with Maslow’s (1943, n.p.) “esteem needs, which includes prestige and feeling of accomplishment” and “self-actualization, which includes achieving one’s full potential, inclusive of creative activities.”

The second dominant theme was “the culminating supervisory interview is motivating,” as stated by 58.33% of the participants. The generalization was that the participants wanted feedback from their supervisors, which set expectations and identified weaknesses. The participants who reported this theme stated that the culminating interview reinvigorated their belief in what they did and left them wanting to work harder. All these participants identified this as a motivating factor in
their job performance. The participants stressed the importance of their relationships with their supervisors.

**Research Question 3 Findings**

Regarding research question 3 (To what extent do these two variables—job satisfaction and job performance—affect overall organizational operations?), the researcher did not identify any theme or effect from officers’ post-appraisal job satisfaction or performance on organizational operations. In fact, most participants expressed high levels of pride, job satisfaction, and job performance. Almost all the participants reached self-actualization, as defined in Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation. None ever stated that they allowed performance appraisals to affect their satisfaction and performance. Reviewing these themes and literature showed that performance appraisals did not seem to affect job satisfaction and performance. The majority of the participants stated they held themselves to high standards, no matter how they were appraised. Their body language and responses to the researcher’s inquiries displayed significant levels of self-confidence.

It is important is to ensure that officers maintain these high levels of pride. In today’s anti-police climate, departments and supervisors should be hypersensitive to employee job satisfaction and performance. Mental health is a key concern for all, and police officers are no exception. Mental health has direct effects of job satisfaction and performance.

**Recommendations for Policy and Practice**

In the law enforcement profession, every major police action is governed by a policy document (e.g., standard operating procedures, operations instructions, departmental policies, attorney general’s directives, and executive orders). The recommendations for policy enumerated in this section, therefore, are, in effect, also recommendations for practice. I recommend that supervisors in the Mahwah Police Department conduct performance appraisals in December. This would allow supervisors to thoroughly evaluate officers for the entire year and to inform officers what is expected in the upcoming year. In the Mahwah Police Department, squad changes in
January can change who prepares performance appraisals, but this practice would ensure continuity in preparers. Supervisors in the Mahwah Police Department should solicit their subordinates’ suggestions on the performance appraisal instrument. During this exchange between supervisors and subordinates, officers’ contributions to the department should be discussed. This may refresh supervisors’ knowledge, allowing them to properly document officers’ accomplishments.

The participants stated that supervisors rushed preparation of performance appraisals. One participant even stated the department did not have an administrative sergeant or lieutenant, creating additional work for squad supervisors, who hurried to complete appraisals. It, therefore, is recommended that supervisors in the Mahwah Police Department receive training in preparing performance appraisals. This training should address rater error and biases because the participants identified central tendency among supervisors. The literature review showed that supervisors can avoid central tendency by documenting good performance and dealing with bad performance as it occurs (Albright & Clay, 1997). Supervisors should also have sufficient time set aside to thoroughly prepare appraisals to overcome the tendency to rush completing them. This measure could also allow supervisors to value the performance appraisal process itself and address another theme the participants expressed: insufficient interactions between supervisors and subordinates.

Training supervisors in the performance appraisal process could also address the following themes:

- Employee fears of retaliation for making comments on performance appraisals
- Employees adjusting comments on performance appraisals based on who gives feedback
- Addressing only repeated employee comments on performance appraisals
- Perceptions the department does not value employee feedback

The recommended supervisory training in performance appraisals could set policy to address and correct these themes. Such policy should value employee feedback and ensure that all employees
feel free to engage in discussions without fear of retaliation. A method to report retaliation to the Mahwah Police Department chief should be created, so the chief can actively take steps to stop retaliatory behavior. If employees are properly engaged with their supervisors, it can allow supervisors to identify what matters most to employees, affecting both job satisfaction and performance. During this study, this researcher did identify the areas of the performance appraisal the participants liked the most and least.

The Mahwah Police Department should create a performance evaluation preparation guide. The guide should be both prescriptive and suggestive, containing examples of officers’ behavior for each evaluation category. This guide could serve to enhance transparency and manage expectations, strengthening relationships between supervisors and officers.

If the culminating supervisory interview became a required step in the performance appraisal process, supervisors could appropriately gauge subordinates’ satisfaction and performance and solicit their input on departmental operations. In the findings, it became apparent that the majority of the employees did not feel that their opinions mattered. However, the majority of the officers still conducted themselves professionally and worked at a consistently high level.

I strongly believe that the Mahwah Police Department is run very efficiently. If, however, management’s actions demonstrated respect for employee input and feedback, it could serve to enhance employee morale, most likely, in turn, improving officers’ performance across the board. These developments could ultimately bolster the Mahwah Police Department’s image and reputation.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

A review of the study findings has emphasized the need to further explore the relationships between performance appraisals and the law enforcement profession. It is important to determine whether such variables play roles in the overall determinants of employee job satisfaction and performance. The following suggestions for further research are proposed.
1. A parallel study of duplicate subjects could be conducted using only quantitative research methodologies. Such a study could give researchers the opportunity to investigate the interview data from a different perspective. Statistical analysis could convert the already-acquired numerical data presented on the themes into tables, descriptive and otherwise, to be used for hypothesis testing. This analysis could provide greater insights into the suggested links among performance appraisals and job satisfaction and performance.

2. A study could be conducted on the effects of performance appraisals in a sample with greater racial and gender diversity. Investigating the role of appraisals in the policing world and the related gender and race factors could be essential to give incentive for more candidates from diverse gender and racial backgrounds to pursue the police profession.

3. A study could be conducted on the effects of performance appraisals among minority men in law enforcement. This dissertation was conducted within a department employing mostly White male employees.

4. A study could be conducted on the effect of appraisals on the future success of active and retired law-enforcement personnel. This study could track the current and second careers of officers who achieve success before and after retirement.

5. The results of this study should be disseminated to nearby police agencies in the county and eventually throughout the state. Doing so would share information among police agencies that hire from similar candidate pools and serve neighboring communities.

6. This study should be revised into a manuscript suitable for publication as an article in major law-enforcement publications.

Summary

Employee job satisfaction and job performance are essential for any police force to function at an optimal level, and the Mahwah Police Department is no exception. It is responsible for public
safety in the community it serves, and improving officers’ job satisfaction and performance can only compound the good job it is already doing.

This five-chapter dissertation starts with an introduction to the study, including the problem statement. The purpose of the case study identified in Chapter I is to explore how police officers from a medium-size, suburban police department perceive the effects of performance evaluations on job satisfaction and job performance and to what extent these two variables effect overall organizational operations. There is a noticeable lack of research examining police officers’ post-appraisal perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance in New Jersey medium-size police departments, showing the need for this case study. Police officers serve the community, so two groups can benefit from this study: police officers and community members.

The literature review in Chapter II focuses on performance appraisals, job performance, and job satisfaction. Performance appraisals are an instrument designed to assess police officers’ KSA relative to their assignments (Oettmeier & Kenney, 2001). Job performance is critical to assessing how effectively police departments perform (Champion, 1995). The present research identified a common, dominant theme: the officers did not allow their performance to suffer regardless of their performance appraisals. The participants in the case study did not lack job satisfaction, defined as “contentment (or lack of it) arising out of interplay of employee’s positive or negative feelings toward his or her work” (“Job satisfaction,” n.d.). Job satisfaction is a sign of good treatment, an indicator of emotional well-being and psychological health, and a reflection of organizational success (Nimsombun, 2000).

Chapter III describes the research method used in this qualitative case study. In Bogdan and Biklen’s (2007) words, “the general design of a case study is best represented by a funnel. The start of the study is [the] wide end. … The data collection and research activities narrow to a particular sites, subjects, materials, topics, questions, and themes” (p. 59). The researcher reviewed potential sample populations for the case study, selected the Mahwah Police Department personnel, and
narrowed the sample to 12 Mahwah police officers to identify emerging themes. The participants were selected through purposeful random sampling. Data was gathered via face-to-face, semi-structured interviews to “offer the interviewer considerable latitude to pursue a range of topics and offer the subject a chance to shape the content of the interview” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 104).

The study results and dominant themes identified are reported in Chapter IV. The researcher found 12 themes related to research question 1 and 13 themes related research question 2. Of these themes, six were identified as dominant. The first four themes identified as dominant were related to research question 1:

1. The performance appraisal instrument is satisfactory.
2. Supervisors rush to prepare performance appraisals.
3. Employee comments on performance appraisals raise fear of retaliation.
4. The department does not value employee feedback.

The two other themes identified as dominant were related to research question 2:

5. Performance appraisals do not affect professional performance due to self-pride.
6. The culminating supervisory interview is motivating.

As the themes were investigated, aspects of Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation, which undergirded this study, were observed among participants.

After conducting the interviews with the participants, I feel the Mahwah community is fortunate to have good officers serving its public-safety needs. Many officers had high levels of self-initiated discipline, cared about their performance, and managed to keep focused on the department’s mission regardless of their personal opinions on the agency and supervisors. In concluding this work, it is worth noting how professionally the participants conducted themselves not only while participating in this study but also while representing the Mahwah Police Department. The researcher benefitted from such a professional sample of participants, and the Mahwah community is fortunate to have such selfless individuals serving it.
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APPENDIX A

American Academy of Pediatrics Performance Evaluation

NAME OF ORGANIZATION

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION OF PHYSICIAN PERFORMANCE

PHYSICIAN: ________________________________
(Please print.)

FREQUENCY REVIEWER INTERACTS WITH PHYSICIAN
(Filling out this item is optional.)
Daily _______ Occasionally _______ Rarely _______

Quality of Service and Patient Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Needs to Improve</th>
<th>Unable to Rate/Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician listens and takes careful histories, as evidenced by chart documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician greets patients with a caring demeanor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients are given treatment plans with clear instructions and told what to do if treatments don’t work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients calling for urgent sick visits are seen that day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with pressing physical examination needs (e.g., sports physicals and child care physicals) are accommodated to meet reasonable needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patients for nonurgent visits are seen within three months.

Phone calls are returned in a timely manner. Urgent phone calls are returned the same day.

Notes in the chart are legible.

Notes are made in charts within 24 hours of office visits.

### Productivity and Practice Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Needs to Improve</th>
<th>Unable to Rate/Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician starts clinics at the scheduled time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician is willing to accept overflow patients as circumstances require.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician cooperates to see urgent patients in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer/Coworker/Team Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Needs to Improve</th>
<th>Unable to Rate/Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician resolves conflicts in private settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician seeks, accepts, and respects input from nonphysician coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician makes constructive contributions in group meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician arranges appropriate follow-up for all patients and keeps on-call colleagues informed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician attends and contributes to practice-site meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician assists in performance evaluations of nonphysician employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sample document was created by the Children’s Medical Group. It is provided only as a reference for practices developing their own materials and may be adapted to local needs. This document does not represent official American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) policy or guidelines, and the AAP is not responsible for its use. Consult an attorney knowledgeable about the laws of the jurisdiction where you practice before creating or using any legal documents.
APPENDIX B

Altman Weil Associate Attorney Evaluation

Sample Associate Evaluation Form

This form is intended to assist partners in the process of evaluating the performance of the firm's associates. Partners will be asked to complete the evaluation form for each associate attorney.

The criteria contained in the form are not intended to be exhaustive. Views should be expressed on any aspect of associates' performance and development that are considered important. Your assessment should be based on your own recent experience during the past year.

Bear in mind that associates need and deserve to know in what areas partners consider or perceive there to be room for improvement in performance or progress. It is unfair to attorneys to not candidly evaluate their performance. No one can improve their performance unless they know in what areas they are expected to improve.

The form asks you to rate attorneys in a number of different areas and to supply comments that back up your ratings. Please take the time to give meaningful written comments. Numerical ratings are of little assistance or credibility to attorneys without details backing them up.

For each category of the evaluation, there is an assessment scale ranging from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). The assessment key is as follows:

1. Indicates significant concerns requiring immediate attention
2. Indicates some concerns requiring effort to improve over time
3. Indicates acceptable progress being made
4. Indicates good progress being made
5. Indicates exceptional performance
N/A Indicates don't know or too early to assess
ASSOCIATE EVALUATION FORM

NAME OF ATTORNEY: __________________________

YEARS OF PRACTICE: _______________ YEARS WITH THE FIRM: ____________

NAME OF EVALUATOR: __________________________

1. PRACTICE ADMINISTRATION: Does the person keep current and accurate time records? Are time entries for services accurate, sufficiently descriptive, and otherwise satisfactory? Are billing responsibilities discharged properly?

Lo Hi N/A

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2. DRAFTING ABILITY: Are this person’s letters, briefs, briefs, contracts, pleadings, and memoranda consistently well written and well thought out? Is this individual careful to avoid errors (typographical, factual, and legal) in the documents he or she produces? Does the quality of this person’s work products consistently meet standards appropriate for the firm?

Lo Hi N/A

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:
3. **THOROUGHNESS:** Does this individual use appropriate care to ensure that legal and factual issues relevant to the matter handled are properly explored? Is this person consistently well prepared for hearings, trials, depositions, etc.? Does he or she diligently document significant communications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

4. **ANALYTIC ABILITY:** Has this person demonstrated the ability to identify and properly analyze complex issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

5. **ADVOCACY SKILLS:** Is the person an effective advocate for clients' positions in negotiations, trials, or hearings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
6. **EFFICIENCY:** Does this person generally work efficiently? In most cases, are the number of hours entered on file within the range of what you would expect? Do clients get “good value” for the services of this person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

7. **ABILITY TO WORK INDEPENDENTLY:** Does this person regularly handle complex and/or significant matters (considering his or her years of practice)? Has he or she demonstrated the ability to handle complicated matters competently with minimal supervision? Do you have confidence delegating responsibility for complex matters to this person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

8. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:** Is this person developing a degree of specialization or expertise in an important area of practice? Is this person gaining or has already gained a high level of respect from clients, other lawyers, or the bench? Is this person knowledgeable about the law in his or her preferred areas of practice? Does the person make an effort to stay abreast of developments in the law (for instance, by attending or participating in seminars)? Is this person’s area of practice too broadly or narrowly defined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
9. **CLIENT RELATIONS:** Does this individual maintain good rapport with clients? Is he or she responsive to clients' needs? Do clients speak highly of this person? Do clients seek out this individual for new assignments? Does this person project effort and commitment when working on client affairs? 

Lo Hi N/A

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

10. **BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT:** Does this individual demonstrate commitment to marketing and business development? Does this person make acceptable efforts to generate new business?

Lo Hi N/A

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

11. **JUDGMENT/MATURITY:** Do you consider this individual to be making acceptable progress in developing judgment and maturity as a practitioner in both legal and ethical matters?

Lo Hi N/A

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:
12. **INITIATIVE:** Does this person show initiative in seeking out challenging and demanding assignments? Does this person routinely do more than is asked for? Does he or she put in “extra” effort? Do you get the sense this person has a strong desire to learn, develop, and refine his or her skills as a practitioner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

13. **RESPONSIVENESS:** Does this person consistently turn over work in a timely manner? Does the person keep the client and supervising lawyer adequately apprised of the progress of files?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

14. **COMMITMENT:** Do you think this individual is dedicated to working hard? Does he or she have a strong work ethic? Does this person demonstrate willingness to do what is necessary to ensure that jobs are done properly and in a timely fashion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
15. **DEDICATION TO FIRM**: Has the person demonstrated strong dedication to the firm's well-being? Does he or she willingly participate in the firm's affairs (practice meetings, marketing, management, socials, etc.)? Is the person a team player? Does he or she maintain good relations with other attorneys? Does this person demonstrate a commitment to promoting the firm by participating in professional associations, seminars, and community activities?

Comments:

16. **OFFICE RELATIONS**: Does this individual have good rapport with partners and other personnel?

Comments:
To achieve its goals and objectives, the Greenville Police Department depends on the satisfactory job performance of all personnel. The Greenville Police Department shall apply fair and reliable principles of performance evaluation to all personnel to ensure the best use of human resources, ensure that personnel problems can be identified and resolved promptly and fairly, and ensure optimum job satisfaction for personnel.

### 35.1.1 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

**CALEA Standard: 35.1.1**

The Greenville Police Department’s performance evaluation system is coordinated by the chief of police. Performance evaluations shall be documented using the Greenville Police Department’s performance appraisal report. The *Performance Appraisal and Evaluation Procedures Manual* contains the following:

- Procedures for the use and completion of performance appraisal reports
- Performance standards for the different job tasks listed on the performance appraisal report
- Measurement ratings for each performance level as defined in the “definitions” section of the manual
- Responsibilities of the supervisor (rater) conducting performance evaluations

Upon promotion or transfer to positions requiring evaluation of subordinates’ performance, personnel shall, as soon as availability and scheduling permit, receive training in conducting performance evaluations and completing performance appraisal reports.

### 35.1.2 SCHEDULED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

**CALEA Standard: 35.1.2, 35.1.3**

**Annual Evaluations**

Performance evaluations for regular full-time employees of the Greenville Police Department shall be conducted annually. Completed performance appraisal reports shall be submitted to the bureau commander by the tenth day of the month in which the evaluations are due. Performance evaluations shall be documented using the Greenville Police Department’s performance appraisal report.
Probationary Employee Evaluations—Sworn Employees
Newly appointed, entry-level sworn employees shall be evaluated at least quarterly. Daily observation reports (DORs) are scheduled evaluations conducted as part of the field training program. DORs serve as the first quarterly evaluation for a new police officer or until a sworn employee is released from training. Once released from training, the employee’s second quarterly evaluation will be completed by the training coordinator. The second quarterly evaluation shall be completed on the training unit’s six-month preliminary evaluation memorandum. The third quarterly evaluation shall be completed by the employee’s supervisor on the Greenville Police Department’s standard evaluation form. The fourth quarterly, twelve (12) month evaluation shall be completed by the employee’s supervisor on the Greenville Police Department’s standard evaluation form.

Probationary Employee Evaluations—Non-Sworn Employees
All non-sworn employees will receive a probationary evaluation at three months and six months from their date of hire. DORs are scheduled evaluations conducted as part of the field training program for Animal Control officers and Communication Center personnel. DORs serve as the first quarterly evaluation for Animal Control officers and Communication Center personnel or until employees are released from training.

The second quarterly evaluation shall be completed on the Greenville Police Department’s standard evaluation form by the employee’s supervisors. If there are no significant performance issues necessitating extension of the probationary period, then the employee will be released from probationary status pursuant to City of Greenville Personnel Policies, Article IV, and Section 6.0. If probation is extended, evaluations will continue to be conducted quarterly during the probationary period.

35.1.3 CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Employee Assignment
Performance evaluation criteria are specific to the position occupied by the employee during the rating period. Performance evaluations shall be based only on performance of the employee’s assignment during the rating period. The performance evaluation shall be based on the job tasks established for each position.

Performance evaluations shall be documented on the performance appraisal report appropriate to the position, including:
- Administrative personnel
- Supervisory personnel
- Investigative personnel
- Forensic Services personnel
- Patrol officers
- Telecommunicators
- Civilian personnel

Rating Period
Performance evaluations shall be conducted quarterly for entry-level employees and semi-annually from the date of hire for non-entry-level personnel for the first year of employment and then annually thereafter. The dates of the evaluation period shall be reflected on the front page of the performance appraisal report.
Performance evaluations shall be based only on the employee’s performance during the specific rating period shown on the face of the report.

**Explanations for Performance Ratings**

Raters shall substantiate ratings of below standard (unsatisfactory), standard (satisfactory), and above standard (outstanding) by providing comments in the appropriate spaces of the performance appraisal report.

**Evaluation by the Immediate Supervisor**

Performance evaluations shall be conducted, and performance appraisal reports completed by the employee’s immediate supervisor. Performance evaluations of employees transferred or reassigned shall be conducted as follows:

- If the new position has similar job tasks as the previous position, the evaluation shall be based on performance in both positions.
- If an employee is transferred or reassigned to a position with a different set of job tasks and has been in the position less than ninety (90) days, the employee shall be evaluated under the job task for the former position by the previous supervisor with input from the current supervisor. If an employee is transferred or reassigned to a position with a different set of job tasks and has been in the position for 90 or more days, the employee shall be evaluated under the job task for the new position by the current supervisor with input from the previous supervisor.

**Review by the Supervisor of the Rater (Chain of Command)**

Each performance evaluation documented on a performance appraisal report shall be reviewed and signed (with comments if necessary) through the appropriate chain of command to the chief of police.

**Employee Provided a Copy of the Performance Appraisal Report**

A copy of the completed performance appraisal report shall be provided to the employee after it has been reviewed and signed by all the appropriate command personnel. Nothing in this section shall prevent an employee from being provided, upon request, a copy of the performance appraisal report at any time during the review process.

**Process for Contesting Performance Appraisals**

Performance appraisals are not grievable under Article X, Grievance Procedures, of the City of Greenville Personnel Policies. However, if an employee believes that the rating or comments in the performance appraisal report are inaccurate or otherwise not indicative of the employee’s overall performance, the employee may contest the rater’s decision.

The process for contesting the performance appraisal shall be in the form of an addendum by the employee evaluated. The addendum must be completed and forwarded to the chief of police through the chain of command within seventy-two (72) hours of the employee’s performance review.

The chief of police shall review the performance appraisal and addendum and may direct further action or revision. The decision of the chief of police in contested performance evaluations shall be final.

**Retention of Performance Appraisal Reports**

All performance appraisal reports shall become part of the permanent record in the employee’s personnel file. The originals shall be forwarded to the City of Greenville Human Resources Department. Copies shall be filed in the employee’s personnel file.
**35.1.4 EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

**CALEA Standard: 35.1.5, 35.1.6, 35.1.7, 33.8.1**

**Below Standard (Unsatisfactory) Performance Notification for Non-Probationary Employees**
The employee’s immediate supervisor shall notify the employee in writing if the employee’s work performance is below standard (unsatisfactory) at any time during the employee’s rating period. The written notification shall be provided to the employee in a timely manner and identify measures the employee shall take to improve performance.

The employee’s immediate supervisor is expected to counsel the employee about work performance at any time deemed necessary during the employee’s rating period. If below-standard (unsatisfactory) work performance continues after the employee has received written notification, this information should be included in the employee’s performance appraisal report.

**Review of Performance Evaluations by Employees after the Rating Period**
The employee shall be given the opportunity to review the performance appraisal report with the rater before the report is forwarded through the chain of command. The review shall include a discussion about the areas evaluated by the rater and the employee.

After reviewing the performance appraisal report, the employee shall be requested to sign the performance appraisal report indicating that the employee has read and understood the report. The employee may indicate agreement or disagreement with the evaluation by marking the appropriate box on the performance appraisal report. The employee may make written comments concerning the evaluation on a supplemental sheet and attach the comments to the performance appraisal report.

**Employee Performance Goals for the Beginning of the New Rating Period**
To ensure that employees fully understand specific duties and responsibilities, supervisors shall be responsible for counseling the employees under their immediate supervision at the beginning of each employee’s rating period about the:
- Tasks of the positions occupied
- Level of performance expected
- Evaluation rating criteria

**Employees’ Career Development Goals**
During the performance evaluation interview, the employee’s immediate supervisor shall discuss the employee’s career goals within the agency. The evaluation interview is an appropriate time and means to ensure the employee has opportunities to discuss topics such as:
- Advancement
- Specialization
- Training appropriate to the employee’s position

The employee is asked to complete a career development annual review form as part of the performance evaluation. A copy of the form shall be forwarded to the training coordinator to assist in coordinating the employee’s training interests with training availability and funding.
Employees are also encouraged to discuss any training and career development issues with their immediate supervisors and/or the training coordinator during the time between performance appraisals.

35.1.5 REVIEW OF THE SUPERVISING RATER

CALEA Standard: 35.1.8

As part of the annual performance evaluation, supervisors shall be evaluated on their ability to conduct performance evaluations and complete performance appraisal reports. Supervisors shall be assessed on the quality of evaluations regarding:

- Fairness and impartiality of ratings
- Participation in counseling rated employees
- Ability to carry out the rater’s role in the performance evaluation system

35.1.6 PERSONNEL EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

CALEA Standard 35.1.9

The Office of Internal Affairs is responsible for administering a personnel early warning system (EWS) and initiating follow-up review procedures to identify employees who may be experiencing difficulties in job performance. The purpose of such a program is to reduce personal civil and criminal liability to the employee and the department and to assist the employee in improving job performance.

**Early Warning System Application**

Application of the EWS is limited to monitoring:

- Complaints on non-sworn employees
- Complaints, use-of-force incidents, and departmental motor vehicle accidents involving sworn employees

The EWS does not change supervisors’ responsibility as the primary source for monitoring personnel performance and behavior on a daily basis. Supervisors shall continue to be alert to and monitor the strengths and weaknesses of the employees assigned to their unit or shift. Examples of behaviors and actions symptomatic of personnel difficulties include:

- Uncharacteristic or repeated citizens’ complaints
- Increase in use-of-force incidents
- Abrupt changes in tardiness and absenteeism, erratic mood swings, unreasonable irritability, aggressiveness, and repeated instances of failure to act or overreaction in the line of duty
- Indications of alcohol and/or substances abuse
- Accumulation of employee conference reports within the same annual performance evaluation period
- Significant negative changes in an employee’s annual performance review

All employees who become aware of a fellow employee exhibiting any of the described symptoms shall bring their concerns to their supervisors’ attention.

**Early Warning System Reporting**

The Office of Internal Affairs or its designee will be responsible for administering the EWS and generating the report specified by this policy. Supervisors who detect the need for an EWS review based on criteria set forth in this policy will notify the Office of Internal Affairs.
The Office of Internal Affairs or its designee will maintain a file separate from other personnel files to be used as a tracking system for reported complaints, use-of-force incidents, and departmental motor vehicle accidents. Records will be maintained on individual employees. In an effort to keep all records centralized, prior supervisors will be required to forward copies of all motor vehicle accident reports involving employees and departmental vehicles to the Office of Internal Affairs. Internal Affairs will provide copies of any documentation needed for compliance with this policy.

When any employee has been the subject of the following listed criteria within twelve (12) months, the Office of Internal Affairs or its designee will prepare a personnel EWS report:

- 4 departmental motor vehicle accidents or
- 4 documented complaints (citizen and/or internal) or
- 4 use-of-force incidents or
- 8 combinations of the above incidents (any combination totaling 8 of these incidents)

The report will consist of a brief summary of the complaints and/or uses of force, including dispositions when available. The personnel EWS report will not include any conclusions or determinations about the involved employee. The report is designed to assist in an early intervention review that will evaluate and guide the employee. Personnel EWS reports alone do not form the basis for disciplinary action.

**Early Warning System Review Process**

The Office of Internal Affairs will forward completed personnel EWS reports to the appropriate bureau commander according to the employee’s assignment. The bureau commander will then direct the employee’s zone commander or unit supervisor to discuss the personnel EWS report with the affected employee and seek the employee’s comments. The supervisor will meet with the employee and prepare a written statement on the findings. The interview must be conducted, and the completed report returned to the bureau commander within five (5) working days.

The appropriate bureau commander will arrange a meeting with the employee’s supervisor within five (5) days of receiving the completed personnel EWS report. The bureau commander and the employee’s supervisor will review and discuss each reported incident, including all comments, to determine if problems exist and to identify possible solutions. If the bureau commander determines that additional action is warranted, the report will be returned to the Office of Internal Affairs with the appropriate bureau commander’s written statement requesting that an early intervention review be conducted.

The Office of Internal Affairs or its designee will be responsible for arranging a meeting with the chief of police, the involved bureau commander, the affected employee, and the employee’s supervisor. The Office of Internal Affairs will organize a profile of the affected employee’s development, including use-of-force reports, documented complaints, accident reports, and other details, such as sick leave, commendations, performance reviews, and any other pertinent information.

The early intervention review will include an informal discussion to encourage effective communication. The employee will be informed why he or she was selected for an early intervention review and what the procedure is. Listed complaints, observations, and/or patterns of behavior will be discussed, as well as awareness of the potential consequences of civil liability. The review is primarily aimed at correcting deficiencies through proper training, direct supervision, guidance, and/or counseling through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).
Following the early intervention review, the involved supervisors and the chief of police will meet outside the presence of the affected employee. A decision will be made to refer the employee to one or a combination of the following six options:

- Additional training in the area of identified deficiencies, such as interpersonal skills, firearms, use of force, and defensive tactics
- Closer supervision and tracking by immediate supervisors
- Referral to a psychologist for evaluation
- Reassignment
- Referral to the EAP
- No action to be taken

All documentation concerning the personnel EWS and intervention review reports will be kept separate from the employee’s personnel file and maintained by the Office of Internal Affairs or its designee. The Office of Internal Affairs will be responsible for attaching a memorandum providing a short synopsis of the early intervention review, future actions to be taken, and identification of the supervisors involved.

To aid in assessing the benefits of the EWS, the Office of Internal Affairs will keep a file of the reviews initiated by the EWS and submit an annual evaluation to the chief of police, who will use the report to determine if any changes need to be made to the program.
APPENDIX D

Mahwah Police Department Patrol Officer Performance Appraisal

Mahwah Police Department
Patrol Officer Performance Appraisal Form

Employee: ___________________________ Date of Hire: ___________________________

Supervisor: ___________________________

Job Title: Patrol Officer Review Period: From: ___________ To: ___________

Type of Performance Appraisal: Probatory ☐ Annual ☑ Special ☐

Rated by: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Probationary Personnel Recommendation: ☐ Regular Status ☐ Extend Probation

Procedure: When making an evaluation the rater will mark the appropriate box for each element of performance observed. Each value will correspond to the statements below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinguished Performance</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectation</th>
<th>Meets Expectation</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your performance is</td>
<td>You are</td>
<td>You consistently</td>
<td>Your performance</td>
<td>You are not</td>
<td>You are not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistently outstanding</td>
<td>performing in</td>
<td>meet the</td>
<td>fully meets some</td>
<td>meeting the</td>
<td>responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and you add unique</td>
<td>excess of the</td>
<td>requirements of</td>
<td>the requirements</td>
<td>minimum job</td>
<td>for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value to the</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>your position</td>
<td>of your position</td>
<td>requirements.</td>
<td>particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization. You</td>
<td>requirements. You</td>
<td>and are doing a</td>
<td>However a key</td>
<td>You must</td>
<td>task and will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td>continually</td>
<td>fully competent</td>
<td>area of your job</td>
<td>improve your</td>
<td>not be graded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellence and</td>
<td>produce results</td>
<td>job. Your</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>performance.</td>
<td>on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptional ability.</td>
<td>which are better</td>
<td>performance is</td>
<td>improvement.</td>
<td>You will be</td>
<td>element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than required</td>
<td>what is expected</td>
<td></td>
<td>reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>even on the most</td>
<td>of a well</td>
<td></td>
<td>again according</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult and</td>
<td>qualified,</td>
<td></td>
<td>to your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex jobs</td>
<td>experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>person in your</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Use of Force: A: B; C: D: I:

a. Uses proper verbal techniques to diffuse possible hostile situations, B
b. Uses proper verbal commands to control hostile situations, C
c. Does not shy away from physical confrontations D
d. Refrains from physical force when subject is under control, D
e. Shows proper technique with less and less than lethal weapons, C
Performance Evaluation Form

Employee’s Name: ___________________ Date: ___________ Rater’s Initials: ___

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES

It will be the responsibility of each rater to obtain and maintain documents and records of an employee’s performance whether good or bad to be used in the evaluation process. The records developed during the specific rating period will be used to help create an accurate evaluation of each employee. The rater/s will then use the documents to help prepare the evaluation. The rater/s will retain the documents until all appeals for the rating period have been reviewed and answered.

In conducting a performance appraisal, it is important to remember that the appraisal will have a great impact on the employee being evaluated. Therefore, performance appraisals will not be treated lightly. Also, the performance appraisal is not an occasional or chance occurrence; it is an integral part of the job of being a supervisor. These judgments may determine who gets a promotion, who is given opportunity for additional training, who gets a different assignment or who gets disciplined.

Each supervisor must thoroughly know and observe the employee’s behavior before an effective performance evaluation can be conducted. Additional indications of performance shall be gathered from review of:

* Sick time
* Reports written
* Summons issued
* Commendations
* Training records (What schools has the employee attended and has that affected performance)

The rater will be fair and impartial and will not let biases or favoritism affect the rating. The supervisor will accurately reflect the employee’s performance throughout the rating period, not just the recent performance, whether good or bad.

The rater should be aware of the following common rating errors.

* Halo Effect is the tendency to rate an individual high or low in all categories because of a particularly high or low rating in one significant category. Determine ratings in other categories based on information specifically related to each category.

* Central Tendency is the rating of all employees in the middle of the range. In some cases this may be correct, but you should be sure before using it in other ratings.

* Leniency is made by the supervisor who wants to be the "nice guy" to everybody regardless of their performance. The contrary is a supervisor who is too strict and rates everyone toward the low end of the rating scale.

* Friendships is putting personal relationships and likes and dislikes before objective information, and causes resentment. Otherwise known as favoritism

* Subjectivity occurs when the rater is unduly influenced by one or two characteristics that are of special concern to him. A rater who values pleasant demeanor, for example, may rate an officer with these characteristics higher than overall performance justifies.
Performance Evaluation Form

Employee’s Name: __________________________ Date: __________ Rater’s Initials: _______

* Overweighing is the result of being overly influenced by good or bad performance that occurs near the end of the rating period.

* Error of Related Traits is the result of assuming that there is a relation between one trait and another, for example, high dependability relating to high initiative. Evaluate each characteristic individually.

Supervisors who are aware that an employee’s performance is unsatisfactory have an obligation to notify the employee. It is also incumbent upon the supervisor to use good supervisory skills in correcting perceived unsatisfactory behavior and encouraging good behavior at the time it occurs, not just waiting until the annual evaluation.

The Interview

A rater (Interviewing supervisor) and the employee should discuss the observed level of performance for the employee by going over each area of the evaluation along with their results, comments and ratings. The interviewing supervisor should also point out to the employee, their strong points and weak points that were observed during the evaluation period. They should then discuss ways for the employee to strengthen the weak points for the next evaluation. The employee will be allowed the opportunity to read the completed evaluation. The employee will initial directly under any comments made in the comment sections or if none at the top of the comment section. The employee will then sign the overall-scoring sheet in the space provided. The signature does not imply agreement or disagreement with the contents of the evaluation, only that the evaluation was presented to the employee.

The employee will then have the opportunity, within seven calendar days to make any comments they wish on the employee comment addendum or appeal the evaluation. The employee should be given the comment sheet to make any comments or appeal at their leisure but return it within the specified time. In the case of an appeal the supervisor should review the comment sheet before it is passed up the chain of command. This will allow the rating supervisors the opportunity to clarify any issues with the employee and may alleviate the necessity for appeal.

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

The employee who scores a D or I in any element will be placed under a performance improvement plan. The object of this plan is to raise the level of the performance of the employee to the minimum level of department standards. During the interview process, the interviewing supervisor and the employee will determine what the PIP consists of in a cooperative effort. The PIP will then be forwarded through the chain of command for approval before the plan is put into affect. The rater/s are then tasked to monitor the employee for the next three months, to determine if the employee has improved the level of performance to a meets expectation (C) level. The rater/s will then document the level of performance on a department communication and once again review the performance with the employee. This will then be forwarded through the chain of command for the appropriate action and placed with the proper evaluation. Not meeting the minimum standard after a PIP could result in disciplinary action.
### Performance Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee’s Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Rater’s Initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1. Appearance, Attendance, Punctuality
- a. Personal appearance and uniform in compliance to Policy 095:15-20
- b. Amount and pattern of sick time complies with MPD Rule & Regs Number 13
- c. Adjustments of shifts and work hours are appropriate and approved
- d. Arrives on time for work and leave at the appropriate time
- e. Responds to subpoenas

Total Number of Sick days used during the Evaluation Period: __________

#### 2. Operation and Care of Equipment
- a. Inspects the patrol car / work area at the beginning and end of the shift
- b. Operates equipment in a safe and reasonable manner
- c. Properly reports problems with equipment in a timely manner
- d. Takes care of all personal issued equipment.
- e. Keeps patrol car clean and fueled

#### 3. Patrol
- a. Response to radio calls are made promptly, safely, and appropriately
- b. Proper radio procedures are followed
- c. Maintains an awareness of assigned sector
- d. Patrols aide streets along with highways
- e. Checks on Township parks, schools, County properties
- f. Makes proper use of unassigned time.
- g. Shows initiative.

#### 4. Personal Conduct
- a. Accepts feedback/directions
- b. Respectful to supervisors and peers
- c. Conduct with victims/professional/courteous/willingness to help
- d. Conduct with suspects/arrestee/s/professional/courteous/willingness to help

#### 5. Quality of Work
- a. Reports, citations, and other written information are completed correctly
- b. Reports, citations, and other written information are legible
- c. Reports and other written information are reported accurately
- d. Submits reports in a timely manner, meets deadlines
- e. Proper recognition, collection, preservation and submission of evidence
- f. Accepts direction from supervisor and carries it out to the best of officer’s ability.
- g. Able to adapt to changing situations, accepts changes in assignments

#### 6. Use of Force
- a. Uses proper verbal techniques to diffuse possible hostile situations.
- b. Uses proper verbal commands to control hostile situations.
- c. Does not shy away from physical confrontations
- d. Refrains from physical force when subject is under control
- e. Shows proper technique with less than lethal weapons.

---
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Performance Evaluation Form

Employee’s Name: __________________ Date: _____________ Rater’s Initials: __

7. Safety
   a. Recognizes and reacts to potential dangers
      Proper positioning of patrol car on traffic stops
   c. Does not put other officers or citizens at risk
   d. Takes reasonable risk in performing job duties
   e. Takes precautions concerning infectious diseases and hazardous materials
   f. Request backup when appropriate
   g. Able to work well under stressful situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Relationships
   a. Effectively conducts field interviews
   b. Treats citizens in a fair and courteous manner
   c. Anger and verbal abuse from citizens do not adversely affect performance
   d. Problems in personal relationships with other personnel does not impair work relationships
   e. Readily assists and backs other officers
   f. Trains and guides less experienced officers
   g. Seeks positive change for the good of the department
   h. Maintains a supportive and productive relationship with supervisors, adheres to the chain of command
   i. Accepts constructive criticism in a positive manner, strives to correct behavior.
   j. Has a positive approach when participating in routine activities, assignments, and problem solving
   k. Displays behavior which builds trust and mutual respect and cooperation among fellow workers
   l. Makes comments and takes action to constructively enhance a team environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Knowledge of work
   a. Demonstrates knowledge of New Jersey Statutes and Township Ordinances
   b. Demonstrates knowledge of laws of arrest, search and seizure
   c. Can distinguish between criminal and civil issues.
   d. Has the ability to apply knowledge of laws to field situations.
   e. Uses proper reports
   f. Demonstrates knowledge of Police Departments Policies & Procedures
   g. Properly deals with citizen complaints
   h. Knowledge of referral agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Evaluation Form

Employee's Name: ___________________________  Date: ___________  Rater's Initials: ___________

### 10. Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Demonstrates logical reasoning patterns and good judgment in the decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identifies and resolves problems effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Suggests new ideas and methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Offers alternative ways of dealing with problem situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Anticipates problems and prepares resolutions in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Remains calm and controlled under varying situations and is able to adapt to new or changing circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Follows up on complaints to appropriate resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahwah Police Department Performance Evaluation Comment Sheet

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:
Performance Evaluation Form

Employee’s Name: ___________________ Date: __________ Rater’s Initials: ___

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:

Category #: ___ Comments:
Mahwah Police Department Performance Evaluation
Employee Comment Sheet

Employee’s Acknowledgement:

My supervisor reviewed and discussed the contents of the performance evaluation with me. My signature below does not indicate whether I agree or disagree with this evaluation just that it was presented to me, I am aware of the contents, and that I have received a copy.

I understand my right to submit written comments regarding this evaluation within seven (7) calendar days after discussion with my immediate supervisor. I have read this evaluation of my work performance and I have discussed it with my supervisor.

I wish to make a comment ☐ I was given the opportunity to make ☐
a comment but declined

Employee’s Comments:

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Employee’s Signature ___________________________ Date / Time ___________________________

Interviewing Supervisor’s Signature ___________________________ Date / Time ___________________________
Performance Evaluation Form

Employee’s Name: ___________________ Date: ____________ Rater’s Initials: ___

Performance Improvement Plan

List the category and element below by number, letter, and name. Forward the evaluation and any documentation necessary with your plan to improve the rate’s performance, through the chain of command for the approval of the Chief of Police.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Employee signature ___________________ Date ____________

Supervisor signature ___________________ Approved □

Captain’s signature ___________________ Approved □

Chief of Police’s signature _______________ Approved □
APPENDIX E

Request for Permission to Recruit a Sample of Mahwah Police Officers and the Response

Christopher C. Zimmerman

May 19, 2018

Chief James N. Batelli
Mahwah Police Department
221 Franklin Turnpike
Mahwah NJ, 07430

Dear Chief James N. Batelli:

I am a doctorate student at Seton Hall University and partial requirement to complete the Educational Doctorate Degree Program K-12 requires me to complete research for my dissertation. To complete this research, I am requesting your permission to interview police officers who work at the Mahwah Police Department (MPD).

The purpose of this case study is to explore how police officers from a medium size suburban police department perceive performance evaluations. Specifically, this case study will explore how police officers perceive the effect performance evaluations have on job satisfaction? This case study will also explore subject’s perceptions of the effect performance evaluations have on job performance? Lastly, to what extent do these two variables affect the overall organizational operation?

Data will be gathered via face-to-face interviews, collection of demographic information, and a blank MPD Patrol Officer Performance Appraisal. These interviews are scheduled for approximately 30-45 minutes. The police officers will be asked to sign an informed consent form and will be shown a blank MPD Patrol Officer Performance Appraisal form at the beginning of each interview. There are approximately 13 open-ended interview questions. The participant sample will be 12 random purposively chosen police officers. In addition, 4 police officers will be chosen as alternates due to potential unavailability of some of the 12 participant sample. This is a total of 16 police officers. Their anonymity will be ensured via random case selection using IBM SPSS v.22. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Data collected will be stored on a password protected USB drive and stored in a locked location to ensure security and anonymity.

If you grant me permission to utilize police officers at the MPD for this case study, I respectfully request that you reply to my request either in a written response, or from an official MPD email account to my SHU email (Christopher.Zimmerman@student.shu.edu). I look forward to your anticipated cooperation in this case study.

Sincerely,

Christopher C. Zimmerman
Thank you Chief!

Sent from my iPhone

On May 21, 2018, at 09:04, Chief James N. Batelli <JBatelli@mahwahpd.org> wrote:

Chris,

Thank you for your e-mail. You are welcome to interview Mahwah Police Officers for the purpose of research for your continuing education. The interviews should be voluntary and conducted while the officers are off duty and not expected to receive any compensation whether in the form of overtime or compensation time. The views are their own and not representative of any official position of the agency.

Please coordinate the interviews through Lieutenant Jeffrey Dino at dino@mahwahpd.org.

Regards,

Jim Batelli

James N. Batelli
Chief of Police
Mahwah Police Department
Administrative Assistant Kathleen Kelly 201-831-2002
APPENDIX F

Informed Consent

Student’s Affiliation
I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University, and one requirement to complete the K-12 education doctoral degree program is to conduct research for my dissertation.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this case study is to explore how police officers from a medium-size, suburban police department perceive performance appraisals. Specifically, this case study will explore how police officers perceive the effect performance evaluations have on job satisfaction. This case study will also explore police officers’ perceptions of the effect performance appraisals have on job performance and, lastly, to what extent these two variables affect overall organizational operations. Each participant should expect to participate for approximately 30–45 minutes.

Procedures To Be Used in the Study
Data will be gathered through face-to-face interviews, and each participant will be given a letter explaining the purpose and intent of this case study, along with a blank Mahwah Police Department (MPD) patrol officer performance appraisal form, a letter of solicitation, copies of the interview questions, and an informed consent letter. The interviews will be scheduled for approximately 30–45 minutes. At the beginning of the interviews, the police officers will be asked to sign an informed consent form. The participants will be shown a blank MPD patrol officer performance appraisal form and a copy of the 11 interview questions and will be allotted unlimited time to review them before the interview starts. The participants will be asked to review the documents handed to them and be instructed that they may take notes. The participants will be given unlimited breaks as needed and will be offered water to refresh themselves during the interview process. The interviews will take place at a discreet location in the MPD, which will be free from distractions and will ensure anonymity. All the interviews will be audio recorded.

Participation—Voluntary
Participation by the Mahwah police officers randomly selected for this study is strictly voluntary. The officers may stop participating in it at any time.
Anonymity of the Participants
In order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants and the integrity of this case study, pseudonyms will be assigned to all the participants. Only the researcher will know the identities of the participants from their responses to the questions. The researcher will not disclose the identities of the participants in the study.

Storage of Confidential Data
The participants’ responses to the questions will be audio recorded. These recordings will be stored on a USB drive, which will be locked in a safe accessible only to the researcher. The data will be kept for three years and then destroyed.

Confidentiality of Records
The researcher and the dissertation committee members will have access to the participants’ responses to the questions. Only the researcher will know the identities of the participants.

Discomfort or Risk
No risk is expected during this study. If the participants become uncomfortable during the interview process, they may refuse to answer the questions. The participants also have the option to end the interview whenever they want.

Questionnaires and Survey Instruments
There are no questionnaires or survey instruments used for this study.

Remuneration
There is no direct benefit for participation in this study.

Alternative Procedures
There are no alternative procedures for this study.

Contact Information
Please contact the student researcher for this study at Christopher.Zimmerman@SHU.Edu or (516)-790-5453. If you have any questions regarding your participation or any other concerns regarding this study, please contact dissertation advisor Dr. Anthony Colella at Anthony.Colella@SHU.Edu or 973-761-9389 or Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board representative Dr. Mary Ruzicka at Mary.Ruzicka@SHU.Edu or 973-313-6314.
Audio Recordings
All the interviews will be audio recorded to ensure accuracy and provide a true account of what is said during each interview. All the participants will be referred to by pseudonyms during the recorded interviews. These recordings will be stored on a USB drive, which will be locked in a safe accessible only to the researcher. The data will be kept for three years and then destroyed. To record these interviews, the researcher will use an Olympus digital voice recorder model WS-802.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
All the participants will be referred to by pseudonyms during the recorded interviews. These recordings will be stored on a USB drive, which will be locked in a safe accessible only to the researcher. The data will be kept for three years and then destroyed. Only the researcher will know the identities of the participants from their responses to the questions. The researcher will not disclose the identities of the participants in the study.

As a participant in this study, I have been given enough time to thoroughly review this informed consent document. My participation in this study is voluntary. I also consent to audio recording of this interview.

My consent to participate is indicated by my signature on this informed consent form. The researcher will maintain possession of the original document and provide a copy of the signed and dated document to the participant.

Participant ___________________________ Date ___________________________

By signing this document, I agree to participate in this study.