

Running head: IMPROVING THE 360-DEGREE EVALUATION PROCESS

Executive Development

Improving the quality of the 360-degree evaluation process

used by Wilson Fire and Rescue Services

Ben Smith, Battalion Commander

Wilson Fire and Rescue Services

Wilson, North Carolina

July 2008

Certification Statement

I hereby certify that this paper constitutes my own product, that where the language of others is set forth, quotation marks so indicate, and that appropriate credit is given where I have used language, ideas, expressions, or writings of another.

Signed:_____

Abstract

This research project was conducted to identify areas of improvement for the performance evaluation process used by Wilson Fire and Rescue Services (WFRS). In 1998, WFRS began using a 360 degree evaluation process. The problem with the 360 degree evaluation process used by WFRS is that it consistently lacks valuable peer review feedback.

The purpose of this research is to identify reasons for the lack of valuable peer review feedback and to make recommendations for improving the evaluation process. Descriptive research method was used to seek answers for the following: (a) What influences may be causing limitation in the peer review feedback; (b) How has the workforce received training in the evaluation process; (c) What are the expectations of the line personnel in the 360 degree evaluation; (d) What are the expectations of WFRS Administration; and (e) How can WFRS meet these expectations?

Literature review was conducted to identify potential influences that caused limited feedback. A departmental survey and interviews were conducted to determine training histories, individual and departmental expectations, and suggestions for change.

Results indicated that procedures were not clearly identified. Policies need to be developed specific to the organization. Training should be conducted annually for all personnel. The organization should consider a department specific form and process that is electronic in format. This process should employ some sort of accountability system to ensure personnel complete all assigned processes.

Table of Contents

Certification Statement	2
Abstract	3
Table of Contents	5
Introduction	6
Background and Significance	8
Literature Review	15
Procedures	17
Results	21
Discussion	28
Recommendations	32
References	36
Appendix A (City of Wilson Policy D-3)	38
Appendix B (Performance Evaluation Form)	42
Appendix C (Departmental Survey Form)	49
Appendix D (Survey Form Cover Memo)	52
Appendix E (Departmental Survey Summary)	54
Appendix F (Interview Questions)	63

Introduction

Resources of the fire service have evolved from simple buckets of water to mechanized apparatus and tools costing thousands of dollars. Stations have evolved from modified horse stables to multi-million dollar, high-tech structures full of computers and electronics. Throughout this evolution one simple resource has remained constant; the individual firefighter. One may argue that the single most important resource an organization has is its personnel. Without the personnel, an organization will fail to function and all the high-tech toys will eventually fail to operate. We spend countless dollars keeping the tools and apparatus in top condition in order to maintain peak performance. Do we put forth the same effort to maintain peak performance from our personnel?

Once yearly we submit our pump apparatus to a performance evaluation called a pump test to ensure it is ready for service. Self-contained breathing apparatus are subjected to periodic flow test and aerial ladders are tested to ensure they are safe and ready to perform their duties. All of these are examples of periodic evaluations of our tools and equipment. Likewise we must put every effort in maintaining and developing our most valuable resource the firefighter.

Performance appraisals or evaluations are often used to monitor or measure an individual's work performance. The performance appraisal is described as a "formal, systematic assessment of how well employees are performing their jobs in relation to established standards and the communication of that assessment to the employee and the organization" (Edwards, 2005, p.146). Most employees want feedback on how well they are performing. Performance evaluations have the ability to deeply affect work performance and morale (Edwards, 2005). When properly executed, performance evaluations provide the employee feedback on his/her performance in a positive setting that supports growth and development. Evaluations done poorly can have an opposite effect such as damaging morale, causing less than desirable work performance, and limiting personal growth. Organizations must spend the needed time to develop personnel for optimum performance.

Wilson Fire and Rescue Services (WFRS) utilize a 360 degree evaluation process modeled after those used in general industry, including some Fortune 500 companies. The 360 degree evaluation (also called multi-rater) utilizes feedback from more than one's supervisor in the evaluation process. This process allows an employee to get feedback on how their subordinates, peers or co-workers,

and supervisor view their performance. While this type of evaluation has great value, it is dependant upon constructive feedback and the honesty of one's co-workers.

The problem with the 360 degree evaluation process used by WFRS is that it consistently lacks valuable peer review feedback. This deficiency reduces the overall effectiveness of the 360-degree evaluation process, thereby negatively impacting personal development potential. The purpose of this research is to identify reasons for the lack of valuable peer review feedback and make recommendations for improving the evaluation process. Descriptive research method will be used seeking answers to the following: (a) What influences may be causing limitation in the peer review feedback; (b) How has the workforce received training in the evaluation process; (c) What are the expectations of the line personnel in the 360-degree evaluation; (d) What are the expectations of WFRS Administration; and (e) How can WFRS meet these expectations?

Background and Significance

The City of Wilson incorporated in 1849 with an estimated original population of 3,500 citizens. The City is located in eastern North Carolina approximately 35 miles east of the state capital of Raleigh, NC. In 1858 the

Wilson Fire Department, a volunteer organization, served as the jurisdiction's fire protection provider with a simple bucket brigade response. In 1887, the organization began responding with a horse drawn steamer from one centrally located station. The year 1938 brought about a significant organization change when the department went fully paid as a career department. In 1993, under the direction of a new fire chief, the organization embraced the reality of total risk reduction and adopted its current name Wilson Fire and Rescue Services.

Today the City of Wilson is home to a population of approximately 49,000 living inside territorial boundaries encompassing 29 (+/-) square miles. The city, once primarily an agricultural town, is now home to various industry and commercial facilities with residential housing in the mix. The citizens of Wilson are served by WFRS from 5 stations strategically located for quick response. An effective response force of 3 engines, 2 quints, 1 ladder, 2 light duty squads and 1 command officer respond to approximately 5,000 calls of service each year. Calls for medical assistance consistently attribute to 50% or more of the total calls for service.

In April 2008, WFRS celebrated its 150 year anniversary. This sesquicentennial celebration brought out

numerous active duty personnel as well as retired personnel. A look around the group reinforced the fact that the personnel of an organization are its greatest resource. Throughout the history of the department, many changes have taken place. Buckets were replaced with horse drawn steam delivery machines. Later, motorized fire apparatus of varying designs and configurations were introduced. The constant is the personnel in the organization that make it all work. The faces have changed overtime. Traditions and lessons have been passed from generation to generation. The need for continued development of the personnel will always be present no matter what type of apparatus we ride on, or what the uniform looks like.

The City of Wilson utilizes a traditional single point, supervisor driven performance evaluation. The City of Wilson personnel manual defines definitions, rules, and procedures employees are expected to follow to conduct performance evaluations (see Appendix A). In this process the supervisor summarizes and puts on one form the work performance and improvement plan of an employee. Each employee is evaluated in 8 different areas called factors of performance. These 8 factors used to categorize performance are identified as: (a) Administrative; (b)

Interpersonal; (c) Communications; (d) Teamwork; (e) Customer-Focused; (f) Time Management; (g) Job Safety; and (h) Occupational/Technical Knowledge. The employee is given one overall rating on his/her performance. This overall rating is a reflection of ratings in the 8 factors listed above. Performance ratings are broken down into 4 categories to include; (a) Exceeds expectations; (b) Meets expectations; (c) Needs improvement; and (d) Unsatisfactory. Definitions of these ratings are provided on each form (see Appendix B) to explain and give a common understanding of each.

Definition of Ratings (City of Wilson Performance Evaluation, 2008):

- **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** - Performance exceeds expectations in many areas. Accomplishes complex and difficult parts of the job on a thorough and timely basis. Decisions, recommendations and plans usually very sound. Initiates and accomplishes worthwhile objectives.
- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** - Performance meets the expectations in all areas. Performance is reliable, consistent and occurs with a minimum of supervision. Generally accomplishes objectives and operates on own

initiative at times. Decisions and recommendations usually sound.

- **NEEDS IMPROVEMENT** - Expectations are met in some areas, however objectives are either not met at the minimum acceptable level on a frequent basis or decisions and recommendations are usually not sound. A concentrated effort to improve performance against established deadlines is a must if the individual is to remain in the job.
- **UNSATISFACTORY** - Expectations not met. Immediate improvement is required. Employee will be reevaluated in three months. If overall improvement does not meet expectations, the employee may be dismissed.

Wilson Fire and Rescue Services is the only department within the City of Wilson taking exception to this process by utilizing the 360-degree evaluation. In 1998, WFRS began using the 360-degree evaluation to generate feedback from multiple viewpoints rather than only one. While WFRS takes this exception to the process, the form itself remains the same as used by all other city departments. The organization, in addition to using the same form, has continued to operate within the guidelines set forth in the City of Wilson Personnel Policy Manual (see Appendix A).

In our process each position within the organization has a predetermined number of evaluations that are distributed and filled out anonymously. A deadline is posted for the completion of the forms that are then returned to a locked drop box in a central collection point. In an effort to maintain anonymity, a check off sheet is posted for employees to initial when they have completed their assigned work. This check off sheet is based on an honor system where employees are trusted to complete the work assignment. Once the deadline has passed the forms are collected, grouped together, and forwarded to the appropriate supervisor. The supervisor will then compile the comments from the collective group into one document for rating and review. The supervisor then works with the employee to develop work goals and personal improvement plans. The goal of this system is to give an employee a document that is indicative of his/her work performance as seen by both the supervisor and his/her co-workers. In addition this system allows the supervisor to get a view of the employee from the eyes of his/her co-workers.

Prior to being promoted to my current rank of Battalion Commander, I processed and reviewed many evaluations of subordinates as a Captain. Time after time

I have received anonymous peer review forms that lacked quality feedback. Many times these forms were distributed for peer review but not returned. Since the peer review process is anonymous tracking the missing forms is difficult.

Since my promotion to Battalion Commander, I have been able to attend staff meetings with the administrative chiefs of the organization. The 360 degree evaluation process and the lack of valuable feedback continue to be a topic of discussion in these meetings. The staff officers are constantly looking ways to improve the quality of the peer review process while maintaining anonymity.

This research project has been chosen to help identify areas of improvement in the process used by WFRS. While attending the National Fire Academy's (NFA) Executive Development course, we studied teams and teamwork. The class took part in a shocking experiment called the Electric Maze (National Fire Academy [NFA], 2006, p. SM 2-5). One of the rules was strictly adhered to in this game was silence. We were given an objective and restricted from talking to our teammates. The lack of communication from one's teammates made the game more difficult. In essence, we lacked feedback from our peers to improve our performance. This research project supports the lessons

learned in Executive Development by encouraging personal growth through team feedback.

The United States Fire Administration (USFA) has established 5 operational objectives. These objectives are: (a) to reduce loss of life from fire for those 14 years old and younger; (b) to reduce loss of life from fire of those 65 and older; (c) to reduce the loss of life from fire of firefighters; (d) to promote within communities a comprehensive, multi-hazard risk-reduction plan led by the fire service organization; and (e) to respond appropriately in a timely manner to emerging issues (NFA, 2005, p. II-2). This research project supports all 5 of the operational objectives. Improved individual performance leads to improved organizational performance. Improved performance enables an organization to meet all of the operational objectives outlined by the USFA.

Literature Review

Literature review was made to give insight into pitfalls or influences that could cause poor peer review feedback. In an article titled *360 Degree Feedback: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly*, Susan Heathfield suggests that 360 degree feedback provides a much greater view of an employee. This allows "well-rounded feedback" from ones co-workers. The employee is able to understand how he or

she is perceived by co-workers (Heathfield, 2008). In this same article, the author suggests that there is a reduced discrimination risk associated with the 360 degree process. Influences such as the "horns and halo effect" are reduced due to the multiple viewpoints (Heathfield, 2008). This same author, in an article titled *Outcomes from Your 360 Degree Feedback Process*, also suggests that people may be unwilling to provide accurate feedback if the process has the potential to impact compensation (Heathfield, 2008).

Ilana DeBare (1997) reported that "personnel experts" have questioned if the 360 degree process should be used for consideration of pay raises and promotions. Debare also reported that when used for determining pay raises and promotions, forms of cheating the system are more likely. Employees view the system as a game and learn how to band together to help each other out (Debare, 1997).

James Fox and Charles Klein (1996) reported an increase of companies using the 360 degree process for pay determination. This report indicated that these processes have marked notable success in local governments.

In an article written for the Missouri Small Business Development Center by Rick Sparks, reference is given to 360-degree evaluation through a comparison to the wise old owl. In this article, Sparks describes the owl's ability

to see views from all sides. The owl, physically able to turn its head farther than many other creatures, can get a 270 degree view and gather information from all directions. By being able to get view points from all sides, the owl is able to recognize opportunities and identify threats. The correlation to personnel development is the idea that we are much wiser if we get a full, well-rounded view of ourselves. Being able to see ourselves as others see us, gives us an opportunity to know our strengths and weaknesses (Sparks, 2002). The success of this concept is dependant upon others providing well-rounded, honest feedback.

Dennis E. Coates (2008) referenced the 360 degree feedback process as a developmental feedback process rather than a performance appraisal. Coates recognized that multi-source feedback can be superior to single source reviews; however, the linkage to compensation and personnel decisions can introduce bias and render the system invalid (Coates, 2008).

Procedures

This descriptive research paper, focused on a departmental identified deficiency in performance evaluations, was developed in a two-step process. The research questions identified in the proposal were broken

down into two categories. Information that was specific to our organization and information that could be considered generic in nature where outside resources can be studied and referenced.

Questions pertaining to the internal training of employees and the expectations of both the line personnel and the administration are specific to the department. Information on these questions was gathered using a combination of interviews and departmental surveys.

A departmental survey (see Appendix C) was developed and distributed to all personnel within the organization below the rank of Deputy Chief. In total, 87 surveys were distributed. In an effort to generate information that was free from any bias the survey was introduced with a cover memo (see Appendix D) stating its purpose and commitment to maintain anonymity. Members of the organization were encouraged to be open and honest in their feedback with no threat of recourse action that could reflect on any one person.

The target population for this survey were 4 Battalion Commanders (3 serving as Shift Commanders, 1 serving as Fire Marshall), 16 Captains (15 Company Officers, 1 Deputy Fire Marshall), 3 Lieutenants, 57 Firefighters and Firefighter-Engineers, 3 Fire Inspectors (2 full-time, 1

part-time employed), 2 administrative personnel, 1 Life Safety Educator, and 1 Maintenance Technician. Years of tenure for this target population ranged from over 30 years down to just a few months on the job. This survey had a return rate of 42 total, or 48%. The results of this survey and any associate percentage calculations are based on the returned survey numbers not the total number distributed. The results of this survey instrument have been captured on one document (see Appendix E). The document is identical to the survey and contains numerical values for each yes or no type questions. The open ended questions that generated comments have been captured and placed in aggregate form under the appropriate question number. The answers lend no ownership or indication to any one person.

The senior leadership team of the organization, Fire Chief and Deputy Chiefs, has an opportunity to review all performance evaluations in the organization. Personal interviews were chosen for the senior leadership team because their view of the performance evaluation process is much more global within the organization. A request was made to each of the senior leadership members for this interview. An opportunity to interview both the Deputy Chiefs was made available. These interviews were scheduled

and conducted in a one-on-one setting. Pre-scripted questions (see Appendix F) were used to structure the interview in similar fashions and to help identify the perspective of the senior leadership team. The interview with our Support Services Deputy Chief, Randy Godwin, was conducted on June 17, 2008 at 1:45 pm. The interview was conducted in Chief Godwin's office. An interview was conducted with the Deputy Chief of Operations, Tracy Mosley, on June 16, 2008 at 1:40 pm. This interview was conducted in Chief Mosley's office. Each of these interviews lasted about 20 minutes. The interviews were recorded by pen and paper.

Identifying influences that may cause limitation in the peer review feedback required external research. Literature review for this topic was conducted through information offered in both published text and Internet sources. Electronic searches were conducted using a common search engine, www.google.com, with great results. The search criteria or definitions were varied using different terms commonly used to represent the 360 evaluation. Searches included but were not limited to; "360-Degree Evaluation" (generated 25,100 hits), "360 performance appraisals" (generated 1,150 hits), "multi-rater evaluation" (generated 270 hits), "multi-rater performance

appraisal" (generated 57 hits). These same searches were conducted without the quotations used to narrow the criteria and resulted in a much broader return.

The final piece of this paper, developing recommendations for improvement, is a culmination of the external and internal research. This piece of the research was developed using departmental surveys and practices in comparison with influencing factors identified in external literature review. Capturing the expectations of both the line personnel and the organization was made from a summary of the surveys and interviews conducted.

Some components of this paper are dependant upon an uncontrolled source of information. In the spirit of maintaining anonymity the surveys were not tracked, thereby reducing accountability on each individual. This reduced accountability and the subjectivity of the individuals completing the survey must be considered as limitations when recreating the research. Like many studies this survey is a picture of that particular moment in time with the population studied.

Results

A review of literature was conducted to help identify what influences may be causing the poor peer review feedback the organization has experienced. This

information helped shed light into areas that could cause limitations of feedback. Constant returns in the literature review revealed a direct correlation to compensation or decisions that may affect promotions or demotions. Ilana DeBare (1997) even suggested that some employees may view the system as a game and develop methods to band together to help each other out. The article, *Outcomes From Your 360 Degree Feedback Process*, indicated that people may be unwilling to provide accurate feedback if the process has the potential to impact to compensation (Heathfield, 2008). In direct contrast to this article, James Fox and Charles Klien (1996) reported that some companies are using the 360-degree feedback in decisions that influence or decide compensation with notable success. Susan Heathfield (2008) recognized and reported the importance of “well-rounded” feedback. This author suggested that influences such as the “horns and halo effect” can be reduced by utilizing 360-degree feedback (Heathfield, 2008).

Dennis E. Coates (2008) suggested that the process of the 360-degree feedback is a developmental tool rather than a performance appraisal tool. The concept of multi-source feedback can be superior to single source when used for the development of an employee. The linkage of compensation

has a tendency to introduce bias and render the system invalid (Coates, 2008).

A departmental survey instrument was used to gather information regarding training individuals have attended. For this research 87 surveys were distributed to the target group. A total of 42 were returned giving a 48% return rate for analysis. The results of this survey and any associate percentage calculations are based on the returned survey numbers.

The members of the organization were first asked if they had participated in a 360-degree evaluation. Results indicated that 38 of those participating in the survey had taken part in the evaluation process. It is possible for this surveyed population to include personnel new to the organization having never participated in our 360-degree evaluation. The results of this question indicate a 90% participation rate. This percentage indicates the surveyed audience has some degree of background knowledge of the process and is able to provide experienced feedback.

The survey document was then used to seek insight into the training made available to the members of the organization. Members were asked had they ever received training on conducting 360-degree evaluations. Immediately following was a question inquiring how recent the training

was offered. Thirty-two of the participants indicated they had received some type of training. This indicates a 76% rate of contact for delivering the training. Two of these indicated the training was within the last 12 months. Fifteen indicated it was between 12-24 months and 15 indicated the training occurred more than 36 months ago. The participants were then given an opportunity to share their opinion on whether the training had prepared them to complete the performance evaluation. Twenty-five of the participants indicated they thought the training prepared them to complete the evaluation. This combined total of 42 survey participants indicates that only 59% feel they are well-trained enough to effectively participate in the evaluation process.

The survey gave the participants an opportunity to list what they felt were quality comments that help foster the personal development of a co-worker. These comments have been captured and placed in aggregate format in the summary document of the survey (see Appendix E). A review indicated repeating comments of needing honest, accurate, unbiased and constructive feedback. The survey indicated that employees wanted feedback in some descriptive format that allows for an opportunity to learn and grow.

The participants were then asked to describe their expectations of the evaluation process. While the expectations varied, a common expectation was the desire for constructive feedback. Employees indicated they want to be evaluated by those with whom they directly work. Repeated comments indicated the desire for feedback that promoted an opportunity to grow and develop. Employees want to be respected while being honest. Participant comments indicated they want to be rated on job performance verses voiced opinions of personal likes or dislikes.

Participants in the survey were asked if the evaluation process met their expectation. Three participants elected to not answer this question. Eleven of the participants, or 26%, indicated this process was meeting their expectations. Twenty-eight felt the evaluation came up short. This indicated that some 66% felt the evaluation did not meet their expectations.

The question of compensation was brought into the survey for participant feedback. The question simply asked should compensation be attached to the performance evaluation. Twenty-five participants indicated compensation should be attached to the performance evaluation. Fourteen participants felt it was inappropriate and three elected to not answer the question.

The survey followed this question by asking if attaching compensation to the evaluation would influence their comments. Fourteen participants admitted that compensation attached to the performance evaluation does influence their comments. Twenty-five participants indicated that compensation had no influence on their comments and three elected to not answer the question.

The participants were asked if they thought the evaluation was meeting the expectations of the organization. Twenty-five participants indicated that they did not feel the process was meeting the expectations of the organization. Thirteen participants felt the process was meeting the organization's expectations and 4 elected to not answer.

The survey then gave the participants an opportunity to provide comments or suggest changes that they felt needed to be made to the current evaluation process. Common suggestions included revising the form to be more relevant to our organization verses a generic city-issued form. Participants suggested some sort of digital system that would make the system more efficient to complete and place accountability on each individual. The desire for more training and developing a list of standards to measure each category was also included in the suggestions.

Interviews with the Deputy Chief ranks within the organization were conducted. Pre-scripted questions were used to keep the interview on focus.

The first question was asked about the personal expectations of the evaluation process. This question was asked to be viewed from two different approaches. The first approach was to view the question as an individual receiving the evaluation. The second viewpoint was that of a supervisor preparing an evaluation document on a subordinate. The response from both viewpoints was the same. The expectations are to get good, honest feedback that is accurate and well thought-out.

These officers were then asked if the process currently used meets their expectations. Response indicated that in some ways personal expectations are met but overall the process fails to meet their expectations. One possible reason of why the system fails to meet the expectations is that personnel don't understand how this tool aids personal development.

The interviewees were then asked to describe what they interpreted as the departmental expectations. Responses were very similar to their individual expectations. An added comment said the process needs to paint a picture of an employee to recognize the positive and find improvements

for the negative. We followed this by questioning if, in their opinion, we met the departmental expectations. Again it was indicated that in some ways we are meeting the expectations but the majority response indicated that expectations were not being met and we were simply going through the motions.

In keeping with the questions on the survey, the chief officers were asked to give examples, of feedback that was useful to foster personal growth. Similar answers were returned indicating a need for creative, direct, and honest feedback that paints a picture of the employee. One comment even suggested it was not enough to say a person is doing a good job. This leaves too many questions left unanswered. Questions like, how did he/she do a good job?

The interview ended with the following question, what improvements need to be made to the process to improve it as a performance management tool? More training was suggested. It was also recommended by the staff that the form itself be more relevant to the organization.

Discussion

The problem is the organization has experienced a lack of valuable peer review feedback. This lack of feedback is detrimental to the process of the 360 degree evaluation process. During this research 87 surveys were distributed.

A return rate of 48% was experienced. One may relate the poor return of surveys used in this research project as a similar problem.

Dennis E. Coates (2008) referred to the 360 degree feedback process as a developmental tool rather than a performance appraisal tool. Ilana DeBare (1997) reported that "personnel experts" are questioning if this type of tool is appropriate for compensation or promotional decisions.

The departmental survey results indicated that 59% of the organization (returned surveys) felt that the performance evaluation should be attached to compensation. This same survey indicated that 59% would not have their comments influenced by compensation being attached. James Fox and Charles Klein (1996) reported that companies had used this type process for pay considerations with some degree of success. While some literature review suggests that attaching compensation to the 360 evaluation process may influence comments, there is also indication of success with this type of process. Over 50% of the survey participants indicated they felt compensation should be attached and their comments would not be affected. It has been my personal experience as a chief officer that the performance evaluation is not the sole determining factor

in compensation changes. Each employee is viewed based on his/her contributions to the organization. Many times these contributions are included in the performance evaluation, however, often times some are overlooked. Administration carefully considers the educational advancements each employee makes when considering the compensation changes. A review of personnel files, driving histories, and commendable citations are referenced for compensation. Many of these items may not be reflected in the evaluation process and are taken into consideration for compensation changes.

In an attempt to get some description of what kind of comments are beneficial, we asked for examples in both the interviews and the survey. Similar results returned wanting fair, honest, unbiased, and descriptive feedback that was easy to understand. Survey participants indicated they wanted to be given the areas needing improvements in a constructive manner. These participants indicated they wanted the feedback to enhance their individual development. The survey results support the personification made by Rick Sparks. Sparks (2002) referenced an owl in his article for the Missouri Small Business Development Center. The article painted a picture of a wise owl. In his article, a reader can interpret that

the owl is wise because he is physically able to see all sides. This vision gives the owl a chance to see the opportunities that surround him and identify threats that may cause harm. This relation to the 360 degree feedback supports the desires of those surveyed. The surveyed participants indicated they wanted to know what others could see. These participants wanted to know what they did well and identify areas for improvement.

The need for improvement was obvious when 66% of the survey participants said the current process did not meet their expectations. At the same time, 59% of this same population said they didn't feel the process met the expectations of the organization.

Seeking methods of improvement, the interviewees and survey participants were asked how to improve the system. Common responses indicated that training of all employees was needed. The majority of the survey participants indicated that it had been between 12-24 or 36 months or longer since they received any formalized training. A search of departmental records indicates similar findings. The department last offered formal training in the year 2003. This training was delivered by an outside contract instructor and was delivered to all personnel. In 2006 training was again offered as an informal in-house session

with the Operations Deputy Chief instructing. This training was offered to the officers within the organization.

Additional suggested improvements included the development of a department specific form. Survey participants felt the city mandated form was not appropriate for our organization. It was also suggested that the process be made electronic with some sort of accountability system that can maintain confidentiality. Some participants indicated a need for a standardized measurement tool to be used for grading the evaluations.

Recommendations

The City of Wilson evaluation form is broken down into 4 different categories of ratings that include; (a) Exceeds expectations; (b) Meets expectations; (c) Needs improvement; and (d) Unsatisfactory. If we applied this same concept of grading to the evaluation process based upon this research project we would have to say the process "needs improvement."

All literature review for this research project recognized the benefits of the 360 degree evaluation process. Notable benefits to personal improvement are obvious throughout this literature review. The surveyed participants, while not unanimous, desired constructive

feedback that was honest, unbiased, and descriptive enough to foster growth.

Several areas have been identified through the survey that indicated needed improvement. The recommendations of this research project will echo those suggestions.

Literature review suggests that compensation, when linked to the 360 degree evaluation, can influence the quality of comments. Survey results, from the majority of those participating, indicated that the compensation did not influence the comments and they thought the compensation should be linked to the evaluation. Considering this information, one can agree that some degree of the comments may be affected by the compensation, but this is not in the majority. It is recommended as a result of this project, that the administration of the organization educate the workforce about how compensation changes are decided. Many aspects of each employee and his/her performance are considered before deciding the monetary benefits or changes.

Information received from the departmental survey indicates improvement may be needed with training each employee. Information in the survey indicated employees need training on how to communicate constructive feedback. The department has offered training; however, it is

arguable if the training has occurred often enough to achieve desired results. It is recommended that the department develop some protocol or procedure that allocates training for all personnel at least once per year.

Survey results indicated a desire to make the process more efficient by utilizing some type electronic medium. Included in some of these comments was request for improved accountability. As a proactive fire service organization we understand the importance of accountability. In an emergency situation, lack of accountability could be a life or death deficiency. In performance evaluations, we may not have a direct life or death impact; but, improving accountability in performance evaluation may enhance employee development significantly. Personal improvement may lead to better decisions or improved performance on emergency scenes. It is recommended that the organization research some type of electronic process for conducting peer review feedback and completion of the performance evaluations. This recommended improvement should be researched to insure improved efficiency and accountability when conducting all phases of the evaluation process.

The final recommendation for improving this process suggests a policy be developed to outline the procedures

for conducting the evaluation process. Research efforts found no formal policy that outlines the process. The organization currently operates within the guidelines of the citywide policy with the only exception of generating 360 degree feedback. Because the organization conducts this process differently, it is recommended a formal policy be developed to clearly define the procedures personnel are expected to follow.

Reference List

- Coates, D. (2008). *The Prudent Path. How to Avoid the Dangers of using 360 Feedback in Performance Management*. Retrieved February 01, 2008, from <http://www.360-degree-surveys.com/prudentpath.htm>
- DeBare, I. (1997, May 5). 360-Degrees of Evaluation More companies turning to full-circle job reviews [Electronic version]. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved February 01, 2008, from <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/1997/05/05/BU65200.DTL>
- Edwards, S.t. (2005). *Fire Service Personal Management* (2nd ed). Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Fox, J., & Klein, C. (1996, November). The 360-Degree Evaluation. *Public Management*. Retrieved February 01, 2008, from <http://www.foxlawson.com/govSector/articles/360.cfm>
- Heathfield, S.M. (2008). 360 Degree Feedback: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. *Human Resources*. Retrieved April 15, 2008, from <http://humanresources.about.com/od/360feedback/a/360feedback.htm>
- Heathfield, S.M. (2008). Outcomes From Your 360 Degree Feedback Process. *Human Resources*. Retrieved April 15, 2008, from http://humanresources.about.com/od/360feedback/a/360_outcomes.htm
- International City/County Management Association. (1988). *Managing Fire Services* (2nd ed). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association
- National Fire Academy. (2005). *Executive Fire Officer Program Operational Policies and Procedures* (Rev. ed). Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy
- National Fire Academy. (2006). *Executive Development Student Manual* (3rd ed). Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy

Sparks, R. (2002). *360 Performance Evaluation*. Creating Quality Newsletter, 11, 9. Retrieved February 01, 2008, from http://www.missouribusiness.net/cq/2002/360_performance_eval.asp

Wilson, City of (2008). City of Wilson Performance Evaluation

Appendix A

(City of Wilson Policy D-3 Performance, Planning &
Evaluation)

STANDARD PROCEDURE

CITY OF WILSON MANUAL

PERSONNEL

SUBJECT	NUMBER	REVISED	EFFECTIVE DATE	SUPERSEDES	PAGE
Performance, Planning & Evaluation	D – 3		June 6, 2000		1 of 2
Prepared By:	Policy Review Committee		Approved By:	Edward A. Wyatt City Manager	

1.0 Purpose

To provide a system for the establishment, communication and evaluation of employee performance expectations and for granting merit increases.

2.0 Policy

The Performance Management System is designed to increase productivity and reward employees on the basis of individual and team work performance.

3.0 Scope

All full-time and permanent part-time employees are covered by this policy.

4.0 Definitions

4.1 Interim Performance Evaluation: An unscheduled evaluation of an employee's work performance by a supervisor

to recognize exemplary performance, or to identify performance deficiencies.

4.2 Performance Cycle: The 12-month period between August 1 and July 30.

4.3 Performance Evaluation Form: The form used by supervisors to communicate performance expectations and evaluations to employees.

- 4.4 Performance Expectations: The performance plans and objectives by which employees' work performance will be measured.
- 4.5 Reviewer: The department head or designee, whose function is to review performance expectations and evaluations prepared by supervising personnel of an employee's work, prior to discussions with the employee.
- 4.6 Rater: The individual who regularly assigns, checks, and evaluates the work of the employee.

5.0 Rules / Procedures

- 5.1 Performance expectations are developed by the supervisor and discussed with the employee during the performance cycle.
- 5.2 Performance evaluations are prepared and presented to the employee by the rater. These evaluations cover the performance cycle.
- 5.3 When an employee has been supervised by more than one supervisor during the performance cycle, such as when a lateral transfer, promotion or demotion occurs, the current supervisor will prepare the evaluation with input from the previous supervisor.
- 5.4 An employee's performance cycle may be extended for a specific period of time ranging from 30-90 days due to insufficient opportunities to observe performance due to absences or changes in job duties. The employee may be considered for a salary increase at the end of that period.
- 5.5 An employee who works for two or more supervisors at the same time will be evaluated by only one of the supervisors who will receive input from the other supervisor(s).
- 5.6 The reviewer will complete an evaluation when a department head determines that a supervisor will not, due to his/her absence or limited time as supervisor.
- 5.7 The full-time or permanent part-time employee who has successfully completed the probationary period within his/her current position may appeal his/her evaluation to the rater within seven (7) calendar days following receipt of the evaluation.

SUBJECT	NUMBER REVISED	EFFECTIVE DATE	SUPERSEDES	PAGE
Performance, Planning & Evaluation	D – 3	June 6, 2000		2 of 2

- 5.8 The employee may present his/her concern about the evaluation to the reviewer, if the dispute is not satisfactorily resolved with the rater. The reviewer will meet with the rater regarding the appeal and provide a response to the employee within seven (7) calendar days.
- 5.9 An employee may place a written response regarding a performance evaluation within his/her personnel file.
- 5.10 The employee whose overall performance is rated as "unsatisfactory", will not be eligible to receive a merit increase or a longevity payment.
- 5.11 The supervisor of an employee who has successfully completed the probationary period for his/her current position and who receives an overall rating of "unsatisfactory", must meet with that employee within three (3) weeks to establish performance expectations for the next three (3) month period.
- 5.12 The performance expectations must be signed by the rater, supervisor and the employee.
- 5.13 The employee must receive an informal review within four (4) weeks after signing the expectations.
- 5.14 The employee will be given a formal evaluation within three (3) months after signing the performance expectations. If the employee's performance is not rated as "meets expectations" or higher at that time, he/she may be given up to three (3) additional months to improve his/her performance and receive an overall rating of "meets expectations".
- 5.15 An employee who after the six (6) months period fails to either receive an overall rating of "meets expectations", or find other suitable employment within the City, may be dismissed.
- 5.16 The employee who receives two (2) consecutive overall ratings of "needs improvement" will not be eligible to receive a Longevity Payment during the upcoming longevity payment period.

Appendix B

(City of Wilson Performance Evaluation Form)



City of Wilson Performance Evaluation

Employee:

Department:

Classification:

Years in Current Position:

Manager:

Current Annual Salary:

% of Increase:

New Salary:

Employee SS#:

Overall Rating: (Please check one)

DEFINITION OF RATINGS

- ☐ **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** - Performance exceeds expectations in many areas. Accomplishes complex and difficult parts of the job on a thorough and timely basis. Decisions, recommendations and plans usually very sound. Initiates and accomplishes worthwhile objectives.
- ☐ **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** - Performance meets the expectations in all areas. Performance is reliable, consistent and occurs with a minimum of supervision. Generally accomplishes objectives and operates on own initiative at times. Decisions and recommendations usually sound.
- ☐ **NEEDS IMPROVEMENT** - Expectations are met in some areas, however objectives are either not met at the minimum acceptable level on a frequent basis or decisions and recommendations are usually not sound. A concentrated effort to improve performance against established deadlines is a must if the individual is to remain in the job.
- ☐ **UNSATISFACTORY** - Expectations not met. Immediate improvement is required. Employee will be reevaluated in three months. If overall improvement does not meet expectations, the employee may be dismissed.

Please use the above DEFINITION OF RATINGS and select the rating that is the most appropriate for each of the factors found on the following pages. Please give a brief written explanation for the rating you chose for each factor.

FACTORS OF PERFORMANCE

1. ADMINISTRATIVE

Plans one's own time by setting goals and developing plans for meeting those goals. Anticipates problems and defines alternative strategies. Organizes work, processes paperwork and maintains records efficiently and effectively.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

2. INTERPERSONAL

Developing and maintaining cooperative working relationships with peers, subordinates, and superiors. Shows awareness and consideration for the opinions and feelings of others. Demonstrates the ability to appropriately resolve conflict.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Effectively informs appropriate people of decisions, changes, and other relevant information on a timely basis. Demonstrates effective listening and speaking skills by paying attention to and showing understanding of the comments or questions of others.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

4. TEAMWORK

Works effectively with other employees, departments and agencies in providing City services. Is flexible, willing to accept change, and contributes positively to City and departmental goals.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

5. CUSTOMER-FOCUSED

Constantly demonstrates the importance of the customer to the organization. Demonstrates professional behavior by responding to the needs of all customers (internal and external), works to meet and or exceed customer expectations and demonstrates professional appearance and demeanor.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

6. TIME MANAGEMENT

Recognizes the importance of and demonstrates punctual behavior. Willingly works overtime and standby when required, especially to respond to customer services. Completes tasks and jobs in a timely and efficient manner. Plans and uses time wisely, including showing initiative to go to the next task without specific instructions when appropriate.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EXPLAIN:

7. JOB SAFETY

Demonstrates and applies on the job safety standards as they relate to the assigned tasks. Promotes and emphasizes a safe working environment among other members of the work team. Attends safety training as required.

Rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------

EXPLAIN:

Note to Participants:

The next portion of the evaluation focuses on the occupational/technical knowledge of the employee in his or her specific job responsibilities. The manager will list those job elements and or projects, rate the employee on each one and supply an explanation to support the rating. Finally, the manager will select an overall rating for this portion.

This portion of the evaluation is found on page 5 today. In the future, this portion will be an insert to the evaluation.

8. OCCUPATIONAL/TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE

Applying the knowledge and skills needed to do the job, including technical competence in one's own field and familiarity with policies and practices of the City of Wilson.

E=Exceeds Expectations M=Meets Expectations N=Needs Improvement

U=Unsatisfactory

Job Elements/Projects	E	M	N	U

EXPLAIN:

Overall Occupational/Technical Knowledge rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL RATING

Rater will prepare an overall summary of performance that will support rating.

Overall rating this performance period:

<i>Please check one:</i>	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

Rater will prepare his/her thoughts on the long-term development of this employee including next steps, training, and behavior modifications that will assist in employee reaching his/her peak performance.

WRITTEN COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE

Employee is invited to offer his/her written input.

Employee
Signature_____Date_____

Rater
Signature_____Date_____

Reviewer
Signature_____Date_____

Appendix C
(Departmental Survey Form)

Introduction:

Wilson Fire and Rescue Services has utilized a 360-degree or multi-rater evaluation process for performance appraisals for about 10 years now. Like most processes there are aspects that work well and those that can be improved upon. As a part of a research study in the Executive Fire Officer-Executive Development Course I am conducting research on the performance appraisal process.

Your participation will be kept completely anonymous. Comments provided by you will be utilized in aggregate format only. You are not asked nor encouraged to include you rank, shift/station assignment, name or years of service. You are encouraged to include any additional comments as you see fit at the end of the survey.

Please return the survey to Ben Smith via interoffice mail system by May 09, 2008.

1. Have you participated in our 360-degree evaluation process?

YES _____ NO _____

2. Have you received training on conducting a 360-degree evaluation?

YES _____ NO _____

3. If answered yes to #2 when was the last time you received this training?

<12 Months _____ 12-24 Months _____ 36 Months or more _____

4. Has your training and preparation been adequate to prepare you to complete a performance evaluation?

YES _____ NO _____

5. Describe what you feel are quality comments to foster the personal development of a co-worker?

6. In your own words describe your expectations of the 360-degree evaluation?

7. Does our current 360-degree evaluation process meet your expectations?

YES _____ NO _____

8. Should compensation be attached to the performance evaluation?

YES _____ NO _____

9. Does attaching compensation to the evaluation influence your comments?

YES _____ NO _____

10. In your opinion does the current 360-degree evaluation process meet the expectations of the organization?

YES _____ NO _____

11. What changes (if any) do you feel need to be made to the current evaluation process?

Please include any additional comments you feel are beneficial to this research process.

Appendix D
(Survey Form Cover Memo)



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 22, 2008
TO: Survey Participant
FROM: Ben Smith, Battalion Commander
RE: EFO Survey

You are being asked to take part in an Executive Fire Officer research study about the performance evaluation process used by Wilson Fire and Rescue Services. Attached with this memo you will find a questionnaire to complete. Please complete the questionnaire and return to my office by May 09, 2008. You are not being asked for name, rank, shift or station assignment to help maintain anonymity. Please be honest and provide the feedback requested in your own words. Comments gathered in this survey will be used only in aggregate format with no reflection of ownership. Feel free to add any additional comments you wish at the end of the survey. Your help is appreciated and I say thanks in advance for participating.

Appendix E
(Departmental Survey Results)

Introduction:

Wilson Fire and Rescue Services has utilized a 360-degree or multi-rater evaluation process for performance appraisals for about 10 years now. Like most processes there are aspects that work well and those that can be improved upon. As a part of a research study in the Executive Fire Officer-Executive Development Course I am conducting research on the performance appraisal process.

Your participation will be kept completely anonymous. Comments provided by you will be utilized in aggregate format only. You are not asked nor encouraged to include you rank, shift/station assignment, name or years of service. You are encouraged to include any additional comments as you see fit at the end of the survey.

Please return the survey to Ben Smith via interoffice mail system by May 09, 2008.

12. Have you participated in our 360-degree evaluation process?

YES 38 NO 4

13. Have you received training on conducting a 360-degree evaluation?

YES 32 NO 10

14. If answered yes to #2 when was the last time you received this training?

<12 Months 2 12-24 Months 15 36 Months or more 15

15. Has your training and preparation been adequate to prepare you to complete a performance evaluation?

YES 25 NO 7

16. Describe what you feel are quality comments to foster the personal development of a co-worker?

- Comments that are accurate, unbiased and constructive.
- Describe in detail what the co-worker does well and give specific detail and documentation. Praise the co-worker for going above and beyond and also doing certain tasks without being advised to do so.
- Comments on performance that can be measured and that are related to the job performance. Comments should be solicited in areas of performance that have measurements in place. Objective comments are best. Subjective categories and comments don't help.
- Justification in which the comments are given (good or bad) not just a rating.
- I think one bad comment is looked at as the person being a bad employee. It should be looked at as one bad comment and who it is coming from.
- Subjective peer comments do not help personal or professional development of a co-worker unless there is a standard of measurement in place to objectively evaluate performance. Without quantitative means by which comparisons can be made any value is meaningless.
- Good personality, easy to work with, not afraid to stand up for the training needs of your company instead of having to follow the training schedule, stand up for personnel and does not let admin run all over them!
- I feel you need to give a comment on strength and weakness of the person been evaluated.
- I believe the comments should be honest and of a constructive manner. There should also be documentation to support your views or opinions.
- Type courses the employee should take over the next evaluation period. Timeframes to complete certain training and education commitments. Employee goals and things they can do to reach these goals. Positive accomplishments completed during the evaluation period with specific examples.
- Highlight negative behavior but in a positive light.
- Participates in activities that improve the quality and productivity of the organization. Work ethics beliefs and traditions. Are they beneficial or not. Values and ownership in being the best they can be. Example, are they striving to be promoted or do they just do what is required to draw a paycheck. What outside organizations do they maintain to give back to the community? Understanding that some cannot due to family obligations but give credit to those that do. How is the individual fostering other members of the organization? What solid contributions do they contribute, rate them somehow, again paycheck or dedication.
- Proactive suggestions, positive comments towards employee development.
- Comments constructively relating to the individual and their recent service...
- Any comments that cite a specific action are beneficial.
- Genuine concern. If you care – show you care enough to approach them in a helpful matter. Make the assistance to a co-worker be open to communication.

- True & descriptive comments that your supervisor can use/explain to help with your personal development.
- By informing the appropriate information they need to be effective in there job description giving possible feed back in a respectful way.
- True accurate statements.
- The comments sections of our evaluations are not flawed. The personnel need more training to learn how to comment better.
- Listing good performance and areas to improve on.
- Quality comments involve suggestions that would best give the person being evaluated goals to strive for. In other words, the comments would help the person to improve his or her work performance and become an even more important part of the team.
- This person is a great co-worker who shows respect to his or her leadership. This person knows his or her job well.
- Character, safety, dependability, work ethic and ability to function as a team member. How the person work with different ranges of personality and culture differences. Attitude towards co-workers, the public we serve.
- Comments that focus on behavior rather than the person.
- How they work with co-workers, how they apply their self to the job.
- Objective, constructive, and retrospective, with earnest sincerity.
- How to improve his or her work.
- I feel that the best feedback for the 360 evaluation is being as honest as possible – highlighting what someone is doing well and where they can improve. Negative feedback can be good as long as it is represented as a learning tool and not a way of “getting even” or setting your own agenda. Constructive criticism gives the employee the opportunity to learn and change the things that they can before they “wreck” their career.

17. In your own words describe your expectations of the 360-degree evaluation?

- To get an honest reflection of job performance. Constructive criticism on how to improve.
- The 360 degree evaluation should be expanded to where BC's should be evaluated by lower ranking officers.
- As an employee it should define areas that my performance is weak in and offer suggestions for ways to improve.
- To be fair, honest and to the point. This evaluation process should not be done on favoritism.
- I don't have expectations because I was never given training on the process.
- I expect only persons working directly with me at my station to have any legitimate opinion of my performance. Furthermore without a system of measurement in place their opinions remain purely subjective and based only on

what they value or know to be acceptable knowledge and performance as compared to their own performance which may not be adequate.

- Its not an honest evaluation. I have had 3 evaluations for people I have never worked with. Also if an individual does not like you then they can really affect your evaluation. It should be done by your captain and station personnel only!
- It is not effective, do to inaccuracy. It cannot reach my level of expectations.
- I feel like it is not very good cause sometimes you get a eval from someone you very seldom work with.
- I expect to receive both positive feedback on the good side but also some constructive “criticism” on areas that need improvement.
- It describes a person’s positive work, areas of improvement, and a directions to improve or continue their positive work as seen by their co-workers.
- A fair eval of my performance, without cheap shots or stuff that happened two years ago.
- To help meeting the needs of the employee/supervisor work performance, social and interpersonal needs.
- That the response and input would constructively aid in job performance and service to the city.
- A simple honest evaluation that is job relevant does not take into account personality differences.
- Helpful concern and potential growth. Be respectful but honest. Take personal attacks out of the comments.
- To receive feedback from both sides of the table to foster growth.
- Not to be tied to money!!!
- To learn my strengths and to learn areas where I need to improve.
- My expectations are to come out of the meeting with an idea of what I need to improve on and find ways how to do that.
- I expect the personnel providing input to have reached a certain level of maturity before providing input that may influence the evaluatee’s career.
- My expectations of the 360 evaluation are to receive comments that would allow me as a supervisor to look at the person being evaluated as a whole, not just the areas that I see them in. It gives me the chance to look at both strong and weak areas, just making the strong areas even stronger and improving the weak areas. Without the 360 evaluation, some of these areas may be overlooked by the supervisor.
- It is a fair process that should describe a person work performance only. I expect this to be done without any personal opinions or criticism.
- 360 degree evaluation should inform an employee and his direct supervisor, what the strengths, potentials and short comings are. It should also guide a person in the right direction to a successful career path and options.
- To be specific, no cheap shots and truthful. Do not let problem go for 1 year and wait to get them with evaluation.
- To get a fair evaluation.

- New people need to be evaluated before their yr. probation is up. (I think this is being done). And if their performance does not meet expectations this strongly needs to be looked at.
- Fair and objective constructive criticism that is useful and without malice or personal bias.
- To get a raise.
- I think if the 360 degree evaluation is used properly, the organization can benefit from performance improvement and the employee can enhance their career development. Focusing on strengths and weaknesses gives employees the best opportunity to pinpoint key development areas. It also gives supervisors the opportunity to work with the employee in those same areas.

18. Does our current 360-degree evaluation process meet your expectations?

YES 11 NO 28 (3 did not answer)

19. Should compensation be attached to the performance evaluation?

YES 25 NO 14 (3 did not answer)

20. Does attaching compensation to the evaluation influence your comments?

YES 14 NO 25 (3 did not answer)

21. In your opinion does the current 360-degree evaluation process meet the expectations of the organization?

YES 13 NO 25 (4 did not answer)

22. What changes (if any) do you feel need to be made to the current evaluation process?

- Periodic training to emphasize the importance of accurate, thorough evaluations to help improve our co-workers and the organization.
- Being able to evaluate your supervisor without any repercussions.
- The form is terrible. Its dimensions do not reflect job performance and they are very redundant. It seems all we are looking is how the person acts or gets along w/ others, not how they do the job.

- There needs to be an expected standard of performance that can be measured to effect change in an employees performance.
- I would like to see the Immediate Supervisor do the evaluation on his own employees and no one else.
- I think the process is good as of today, as long as the process is being done fair.
- Let only your captain, BC, and station personnel have your evaluation.
- Do away with the 360* process.
- Use a different process to evaluate that is more accurate.
- I think that the negative or constructive “criticism” should be taken more serious. It seems to me that too often after people have gone over their evaluation that the good actions continue but so do the actions that need to stop or need to be improved on. I feel that this is the entire point of the evaluation, to realize your strong points but also realize the weak areas and make the appropriate commitment to change and improvement. I also feel that once having gone over your evaluation there should be a time period given to see some improvement or at least an effect to improve. It not I think some sort of corrective action should be enforced by the officers or administration.
- A version online would be beneficial. Personnel could be notified with their code, they could complete the evaluation and the results tabulated and forwarded for final approval. This would track completed and incomplete evaluation by personnel assigned. There also needs to be an appeals process for inaccurate or out of date information with scale adjustment
- As an officer sometimes it is hard to apply a needs improvement when the comments from co-workers don’t reflect this.
- Track the comments, continuous training including new hire after 1 year. Shorten the comments and make it geared toward the fire service.
- Evaluations should be followed up with actions to correct and improve that persons needs.
- Most “filers” need specific instruction about “evaluation of personal needs/professional needs”.
- The evaluation form may be adequate for other city depts. Most of the categories are irrelevant to our job. How often does a person from a different station see a co-worker complete reports or other “administrative” tasks.
- Hold employees accountable for the completion of a 360...Also have a non-bias party review to see if any effort was given towards the eval to the person to be graded.
- Digital submission may make it easier on the officers.
- Evaluate people that you work with everyday.
- Gear it more towards the fire dept instead of a citywide evaluation.
- Evals are not taken seriously enough by co-workers to attach compensation. More training needs to take place before compensation is involved.
- There needs to be a standard of measurement. How can one be measured without a standard. One officer may think an employee far exceeds expectations and another may think that same employee does not meet expectations. This happens often.

- List standards of performance in each category...leadership, responsibility, technical proficiency, courtesy/respect, representing dept, uniforms, etc.
- More training on how to do an evaluation and training on give feed back after the evaluation is completed.
- As mentioned earlier, the comments received need to be more involved. I think that if we took the anonymity out of the process, the quality of comments would be much better and therefore assist the supervisor in finalizing the evaluation. Additionally, the better the comment quality, the easier it is for the person being evaluated to make changes where necessary to improve his or her work performance.
- Attached compensation.
- Can't say have not been in the process at WFRS. But have been involved in 360 degree evaluations for several years.
- It should be tied into whatever raise you would get – ie. Exceed expectation 5%.
- Let the shift personnel do the BC's evaluation also, we see them more than the 8 hr personal.
- Recognition and elimination of personal attacks.
- None
- I guess the only real way to improve would be more training. I'm sure that many employees feel that this is just something else they “**have**” to do. They don't look at as being beneficial to themselves or co-workers. On the other hand, they might consider it as detrimental to careers if comments to and from are negative. Since comment sheets are turned in to administration, I have the opportunity to see many of them and most o the time, the same comments are repeated over and over again (year to year) for all employees.

Please include any additional comments you feel are beneficial to this research process.

- To be effective, the evaluation must be for the evaluation period, not based on reputation, (good or bad), or past performance.
- We are the only department (city wide) that has adopted this process. I think what ever evaluation process we used should be on the same lines as everybody else in the city. I would like to see us go back to the way we used to do them (the officer only).
- How can a person that has been in a dept for less than 3 years truly evaluate a person that they don't really have a lot of dealing with, but yet it happens and it's a bad eval, I think you should be in the dept for at least 3 yrs before you can do evals and some type of training is given.
- Please let the chiefs read your research findings so that they may evaluate the effectiveness of the 360 degree in this organization.
- Being attached to compensation, the current process is a two-edged sword used to give good reviews to underachieving workers at specific levels and negative reviews to supervisors when possible. The process is cumbersome with the amount of time and work required to complete at all levels of the process.

Technology needs to be utilized to streamline the process and personnel need to be held accountable for not fully completing these documents.

- I believe a good/informative eval should be given time and compensation. Someone's free time after a busy work day is not the type of time that should be given to do these 360 forms.
- We need more training and accountability.
- In one of my evals, I got great comments in all areas, however, in each section I got one comment that went against all the others. I think that these comments in such a case should be omitted. It was obvious that one person was vindictive toward me. I do not like the fact that this could have affected my raise.
- You can be lazy, not care, you may even not have your heart in the fire service at all, but if your friend is doing your eval, then you get a great looking eval. Even though you are lazy, don't care, no heart for fire service, and the other bro, who bust his tail and has a heart for the fire service can get a bad review because of who's doing the eval. NO STANDARD = BAD EVAL. PROCESS
- Evaluatee should have the opportunity to challenge comments made by evaluators, face to face. Comments made on the evaluation should never be a surprise. Personnel issues should be dealt with at time of infraction and not saved until evaluation.
- 360 will never be free and clear of personal issues.

Appendix F
(Interview Questions)

360-Degree Evaluation Research

Person Interviewed _____ Date: _____

Time: _____ Location: _____

1. What are your personal expectations of the evaluation process?
2. Has the process met your personal expectations?
3. In your own words please describe what you see as the departmental expectations of the performance evaluation.
4. In your opinion are we meeting these expectations?
5. Describe or give examples of feedback that fosters individual growth or personal development.
6. What improvements do you feel can be made to improve the process as a performance management tool.