Running head: PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS: A SYNOPSIS

Performance Evaluations: A Synopsis of Fire Service Use and Employee Perception

Andrew M. Dykes

City of Monroe Fire Department, Monroe, Georgia

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 the language, ideas, expressions, or writings of another.

Signed: _____

Abstract

The problem was that the employee performance evaluation process utilized by the City of Monroe Fire Department (MFD) was a generic subjective assessment of employee performance and did not accurately evaluate the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities of a fire service professional. The purpose of this research was to identify an employee performance evaluative process that accurately evaluated the necessary competencies of a City of Monroe Fire Department fire service professional. The descriptive research method was utilized and two survey instruments were developed. The survey instruments obtained data from City of Monroe Fire Department personnel and other fire departments within the state of Georgia pertaining to the performance evaluation process. Data obtained from these survey instruments were utilized to answer pertinent research questions. (a) How do other fire departments conduct employee performance evaluations? (b) What are the most common types of evaluation instruments utilized by other fire departments? (c) How do current MFD personnel perceive the employee performance evaluation process? (d) What elements of evaluation do current MFD personnel believe should be included in the employee performance evaluation process? Results from the survey instruments indicated that a majority of the surveyed fire departments utilized an employee performance evaluation. The three most popular evaluation instruments utilized were graphic rating scales, total quality management, and management by objectives. The second survey instrument revealed that participating firefighters desired a revised performance evaluation that was objective, fair, and based on the firefighter's job description. Recommendations included the need to establish a firefighter specific evaluation, the identification of critical firefighter behaviors necessary for evaluation, alteration of the current evaluation instrument, increasing the frequency of evaluation, utilization of evaluation results in

the promotional process, and the implementation of a method to correlate evaluation results with merit raises.

Table of Contents

Abstract …….. 3

Table of Contents ……... 5

Introduction ……7

Background and Significance ……7

Literature Review ……..11

Procedures ……21

Results ……...28

Discussion ……40

Recommendations ……45

Reference List ……..49

Tables

Table 1 ……..28

Table 2 ……..29

Table 3 ……..29

Table 4 ……..30

Table 5 ……..31

Table 6 ……..33

Table 7 ……..…37

Table 8 ……..38

Table 9 ……..39

Table 10 ……40

Appendices

Appendix A: MFD Employee Evaluation ……53

Appendix B: Georgia Career and Combination Department List ……....57

Appendix C: Georgia Fire Departments Survey ……..……61

Appendix D: Letter to Georgia Chiefs ……....64

Appendix E: MFD Firefighter Job Description ……65

Appendix F: MFD Perception Survey ……..68

Appendix G: MFD Revised Evaluation Survey ……...……71

Appendix H: Memo to Shift Captains ……..74

Performance evaluations are utilized throughout the private and public sector as a means to accurately reflect the overall performance of an employee. The goals of the performance evaluation process are to contribute to overall employee development (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002), provide timely feedback and goals to modify work behavior (Tziner, Kopelman, & Livneh, 2003), and improve future job performance (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). The problem is that the employee performance evaluation process currently utilized by the City of Monroe Fire Department (MFD) is a generic subjective assessment of employee performance and does not accurately evaluate the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities of a fire service professional.

The purpose of this research is to identify an employee performance evaluative process that accurately evaluates the necessary competencies of a City of Monroe Fire Department fire service professional. The descriptive research method was utilized and two survey instruments were developed. The survey instruments obtained data from Monroe Fire Department personnel and other fire departments within the state of Georgia pertaining to the performance evaluation process. Data obtained from these survey instruments were utilized to answer pertinent research questions. (a) How do other fire departments conduct employee performance evaluations? (b) What are the most common types of evaluation instruments utilized by other fire departments? (c) How do current MFD personnel perceive the employee performance evaluation process? (d) What elements of evaluation do current MFD personnel believe should be included in the employee performance evaluation process?

Background and Significance

Performance evaluations are required and performed annually on all full time personnel employed by the City of Monroe (Monroe, 2008). According to the City of Monroe's *Personnel Policies and Procedures* (2008) the performance evaluation may be used "in determining merit

raises or bonuses, as a factor in determining order of lay-off, as a basis for training, promotion, demotion, transfer or dismissal …" (p. 12). In order to complete these evaluations, all department heads are supplied with a generic performance evaluation form (Appendix A) to be completed by the employee's immediate supervisor and department head (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010).

The driving force for this research has been the perception by the researcher of dissatisfaction among employees with the current evaluation instrument and process. On numerous occasions the researcher has been approached by employees with questions and complaints pertaining to the outcome of evaluations, perceived bias and subjectivity during the evaluation, and inconsistencies in merit raises. To add further complexity to the issue, a decrease in city revenues over the past few years led to the temporary postponement of all merit and cost of living raises three years ago (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010). Therefore, personnel that have not been promoted within that period have not received a raise. The general sentiment demonstrated by numerous employees to the researcher has been that the evaluations were merely a formality of city policy and had no bearing on the employee or the department.

Furthermore, very little material on performance evaluation has been available to the company officers. Company officers within the City of Monroe Fire Department that desired to obtain National Board on Fire Service Professional Qualifications Fire Officer I and/or II utilized the Fourth Edition of Stowell's (2007) *Fire and Emergency Services Company Officer* validated by the International Fire Service Training Association (IFSTA). Stowell's (2007) text provided very little data on the performance evaluation process and how to effectively conduct the

evaluation. No other formal training on performance evaluations has been provided to the officers.

An informal discussion with City of Monroe Fire Department Chief Wayne Chancey about the current performance evaluation process substantiated many of the concerns and complaints being voiced by department personnel. According to Chancey, he viewed the current evaluation as too generic, not being related to specific fire department performance, and not being appropriate for the positions being evaluated (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010). In addition to his concerns pertaining to the actual evaluation, Chancey indicated that the current performance evaluations had been in use for over 12 years and were purchased in bulk by the city's human resources department along with disciplinary action forms and change of pay grade forms (personal communication, May 12, 2010). Therefore, all city employees, regardless of department, must utilize the same human resources forms.

When questioned about the correlation between performance evaluation results and merit pay increases, the chief indicated that in a typical year each department head was allowed to reward employees with a merit increase of two to five percent based on his or her discretion (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010). However, the chief indicated that no specific method existed to ensure that performance evaluation results correlated with merit increases (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010). The chief concluded the conversation with the reality that the current economic downturn and reduction in city revenue had further complicated the employee evaluation process due to the fact that all merit increases had been suspended for the past three years (W. Chancey, personal communication, May 12, 2010).

The significance of improving the employee performance evaluation process would allow the City of Monroe Fire Department to more accurately reflect the performance of the fire

service employee's performance of fire service duties based on observable behaviors. An accurate documentation of the employee's actual performance would assist the company officer in modifying the employee's work behavior (Tziner, Kopelman & Livneh, 2003) and ultimately assist in employee development potential (Daley, 1991). Furthermore, transitioning away from the current generic evaluation instrument would allow for the development of an evaluation that documents the observable behaviors critical to the job (Latham & Wexley, 1977). An updated evaluation procedure may be perceived to be more accurate, consistent, fair, and impartial (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002) than the process currently in use. In addition, by addressing the concerns of current personnel, a new performance evaluation system may be more successful due to the change in attitude that employees have towards the new system (Kleiman, Biderman, & Faley, 1987).

One of the significant goals of the National Fire Academy's Executive Development course is to "develop and integrate change management and leadership techniques necessary in complex organizations" (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], 2006, p. SM 0-3). A key concept discussed within the course was the utilization of adaptive leadership skills as a means to change established norms and behaviors within the fire service. This was stated best by Heifetz and Linsky (2002) who confirmed that adaptive challenges were those that "require experiments, new discoveries, and adjustments from numerous places in the organization or community. Without learning new ways – changing attitudes, values, and behaviors – people cannot make the adaptive leap necessary to thrive in the new environment" (p. 13). The scope of the present research represents a direct embodiment of this process. The research was designed to establish a foundation on which a new, fire service specific, performance evaluation could eventually be created. The current scope, however, is to merely ascertain how other fire

departments evaluate their firefighters and to determine what City of Monroe Fire Department firefighters think about the current evaluation along with elements that they would like to have included in future performance evaluations.

Tziner and Kopelman (2002) found that an effective performance evaluation contributed to employee development and improved future job performance. Currently, firefighters with the City of Monroe Fire Department are not evaluated in a manner that promotes professional development of the employee as a fire service professional because the evaluation instrument is not specific to knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary within the fire service. Thus, continuing to utilize the current performance evaluation instrument will not foster employee professionalism within the fire service. Goal 4 of the U. S. Fire Administration's (2010) strategic initiatives was designed to "improve the fire and emergency services' professional status" (p. 17). As an effort to support this goal, the U. S. Fire Administration (2010) developed three objectives. Of these objectives, one closely correlated with the scope of the research. Objective 4.1 was designed to "enhance the professionalism of the nation's fire and emergency service leaders" (p. 25). Research conducted in an effort to improve the employee performance evaluation process directly supports compliance with this objective.

Literature Review

Performance Evaluations

Numerous studies have attempted to accurately define and establish a valid performance assessment tool. Yet decades of research have still not established a concrete assessment that is most reliable and valid (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Daley (1991) indicated that performance appraisals were designed to be an objective measurement of an employee’s job performance and development potential. Latham and Wexley (1977) emphasized that performance appraisals

should only evaluate the observable behaviors that are critical to the success or failure of the job. Although a sizeable amount of definitions have been developed, several generalities of the performance appraisal process have been established throughout numerous studies. The goal of the performance appraisal has been widely accepted to accurately reflect the performance of the employee (Yun, Donahue, Dudley, & McFarland, 2005), be consistent, fair, and impartial (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2001), provide timely feedback and goals to modify work behavior (Tziner, Kopelman, & Livneh, 1993), contribute to employee development (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002), and improve future job performance (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002).

Numerous roadblocks to the appraisal process have also been identified through research. One such documented roadblock is the rater. Tziner, Murphy, and Cleveland (2001) hypothesized that different rater beliefs may result in different rating strategies. Murphy and Cleveland (1995) found that it was not uncommon to find upward of 80-90% of employees rated "above average" in the performance appraisal. Further research of raters attempted to address the hyperinflation of performance and found that leniency was often given when the rater believed that the appraisals were used for monetary or promotional purposes, or when the rater believed that other raters were inflating the appraisals of their employees (Tziner, Murphy, and Cleveland, 2001). Ultimately, Tziner, Murphy, and Cleveland (2001) concluded that attitudes and beliefs of the rater were a potential source of distortion in the performance appraisal process. Although the rater may present a roadblock to the appraisal process, employees were more likely to view a subjective appraisal as being fair if they believed that the evaluating supervisor was qualified to rate them (Kleiman, Biderman, & Faley, 1987).

Research also indicated that the rated employee could present another roadblock to the effectiveness of the appraisal process. Research conducted by Kleiman, Biderman, and Faley

(1987) concluded that the success of the evaluation system was contingent upon the attitudes that the employees had towards the system. Another potential caveat of the appraisal process addressed by research was that appraisals based on the traits and attitudes of the employee may lead to a misunderstanding and disagreement between the supervisor and subordinates (Latham & Wexley, 1977).

The evaluative process and reasoning behind the evaluation also contributed to a potential decrease in overall effectiveness. Ambiguity from vague instruction was documented as a barrier to effective appraisal because it did not indicate specifically what the employee must have done differently for improvement (Latham & Wexley, 1977). When the appraisal was used for promotion, the supervisor often utilized previous employee performance as a predictor of future performance, although no correlation between previous performance and future performance could be established (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002).

Graphic rating scales. The graphic rating scale has traditionally been widely and frequently used (Yun, Donahue, Dudley, & McFarland, 2005) as one of the two major types of appraisal (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). One of the key factors that contributed to the graphic rating scale's popularity was the documented ease of use and relative ease to create the scale (Murphy & Cleveland, 2005; Yun, Donahue, Dudley, & McFarland, 2005). Murphy and Cleveland (1995) suggested that the simplicity of the graphic rating scale was the advantage in using that type of scale. Smoke (2010) compared the process to checking a grade on a report card.

Numerous studies have documented the negative aspects of utilizing the graphic rating scale (Daley, 1991; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Rizzo & Frank, 1977; Tziner & Kopelman, 2002; Tziner, Kopelman, & Livneh, 1993). One of the primary criticisms of the graphic rating

scale has been its subjective nature (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Other common found criticisms included lack of clarity (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995), vague and generic results (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002), and possible confusion of the employee based on generic goals (Tziner, Kopelman, & Livneh, 1993) resulting from graphic rating scale use. Further criticisms of the graphic rating scale included Rizzo and Frank's (1977) finding that the use of job related characteristics in the graphic rating scale contributed to the halo effect bias. Furthermore, Daley (1991) found that public employees had little confidence in the graphic rating scale assessment and in the managerial capabilities of those responsible for conducting the evaluations.

Behaviorally anchored rating scales. According to Murphy and Cleveland (1995), much of the research concerning performance appraisals during the 1960's and 1970's was centered on the behaviorally anchored rating scales. Although significant research was performed, the studies that evaluated the effectiveness of the behaviorally anchored rating scales over the years produced mixed results (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Schwab, Heneman, & DeCotiis, 1975; Tziner, 1984). Much of this initial research into the effectiveness of the behavior based scales indicated that the behaviorally anchored rating scale was more accurate than the other scales being utilized (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). However, Schwab, Heneman, and DeCotiis (1975) indicated that there was a lack of evidence to suggest that the behaviorally anchored rating scale was superior to other rating scales. In his earlier studies, Tziner (1984) initially postulated that behaviorally anchored rating scales were no better or worse than the other types of rating scales utilized. Although earlier studies led to this conclusion, Tziner (1984) found that when based on a study of a group of managers, the behaviorally anchored rating scale provided more accurate ratings than the graphic rating scale and was less susceptible

to the halo effect and leniency of the rater. These findings further legitimized the earlier research of Schwab, Heneman, and DeCotiis (1975) which had concluded that the behaviorally anchored rating scale was less susceptible to the leniency effect. In addition to the previous benefits, Silverman and Wexley (1984) concluded that the behaviorally anchored rating scale resulted in workers that were more motivated to improve their performance.

Tziner, Kopelman, and Livneh (1993) further studied the effects of the behaviorally anchored rating scale in comparison to the graphic rating scale. Their study utilized 16 nurse managers and 115 nurse subordinates and concluded that the use of a behavior based assessment produced more goal clarity, acceptance, and commitment from the employees being evaluated than the graphic rating scale. The findings supported the notion that a behavior based performance appraisal was more objective, global in nature, and unbiased because it pinpointed a specific behavior rather than making a conclusion of performance based on a generalization (Tziner, Kopelman, & Livneh, 1993). After continued studies into the performance appraisal methods, Tziner and Kopelman (2002) confirmed earlier assumptions that the behavioral rating systems were slightly more adventitious than that of the graphic rating scale due to its precise nature. Tziner and Kopelman (2002) also concluded that the behaviorally anchored rating scale provided an advantage in advancing employee performance and worker development, much like the earlier research of Silverman and Wexley (1984).

Management by objectives. Management by objectives originated from the work of Drucker (1954). Drucker (1954) believed that the overall performance of an organization required that each job within the organization support the objectives of the business as a whole and that all members of the organization contributed to those objectives. In order to meet these organizational goals, Drucker (1954) indicated that employees needed objectives that were

clearly defined and established. Established objectives laid out what was expected of each member within the organization and how each of the individual employee's objectives contributed to the objectives of the organization as a whole. Drucker (1954) placed the responsibility of the objective development on the managers who would in turn meet with each individual to outline what was expected within a prescribed time period.

Numerous studies have been conducted to assess the effectiveness of the management by objectives evaluation (Latham & Locke, 1979; Rodgers & Hunter, 1991). In order for management by objectives to be effective, goals should be perceived as fair and reasonable by the subordinate along with being specific, challenging, and attainable within a prescribed time period (Latham & Locke, 1979). Latham and Locke's (1979) research found that individuals that were assigned hard, challenging goals outperformed the individuals assigned easier, vague goals. In addition, participants in Latham and Locke's (1979) study indicated that the establishment of goals utilizing management by objectives allowed the employee to know for the first time what specifically was expected by the supervisor. Rodgers and Hunter (1991) performed a meta-analysis of management by objectives studies and determined that in 68 of the 70 studies evaluated that utilized management by objectives, productivity gains were noted, thus contributing to the perception of effectiveness.

Additional positive attributes of the management by objectives evaluation have been documented. Latham and Locke (1979) found that the participative approach by both the supervisor and subordinate during the establishment of goals led to a broader degree of acceptance between the individuals involved. Daley (1991) indicated that performance appraisals based on measured objectives allowed individual performance to be accurately measured. This finding by Daley (1991) mirrored the earlier findings of Latham and Locke

(1979) who indicated that the individual goals allowed the subordinate to be held responsible and evaluated individually, rather than the group as a whole. An additional positive attribute was contributed by Daley (1991) who indicated that the objective based appraisal may add value to the job performed.

Although much of the data on management by objectives has been positive in nature, several fallacies to the system have been noted. Oversimplification of the established goals may make appraisals that utilized management by objectives worthless (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). An additional downfall to the use of management by objectives was that too much emphasis may be placed on the results and easy objectives may undermine the evaluative process (Daley, 2005). Murphy and Cleveland (1995) suggested that management by objectives was not necessarily a means by which to evaluate performance, but rather a tool to define goals, priorities, and objectives.

Total quality management. The use of total quality management as a means to evaluate employees is inconsistent with its originating theory (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002). The fundamental concept of total quality management was improving goods and service delivery (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002) with an emphasis placed on teams working towards a final product or service (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002; Janz & Harel, 1993). Total quality management's founder, Dr. Deming, reportedly denounced performance appraisals as a disease affecting Western management (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002; Bruegman, 2009) and recommended the overall abolishment of the appraisal process (Janz & Harel, 1993). The perceived success of total quality management was that team work equates to team evaluation, while individual evaluation of an employee's performance led to short term goals (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002).

Critical incident technique. Flanagan (1954) discussed how the critical incident technique evolved out of the Aviation Psychology Program of the Army Air Force during World War II and focused on analyzing the activities of combat leadership and disorientation of pilots. Flanagan (1954) described the critical incident technique as a set of procedures for collecting observations of human behavior that may be used for solving problems. The term incident was used to define an observable human activity which allowed predictions to be made about the performer (Flanagan, 1954). The original critical incident technique described by Flanagan (1954) consisted of a five part assessment. First, the objectives of the activity being observed were defined and agreed upon by those involved. Second, plans for acquiring and collecting factual incidents that met the established criteria were developed. Third, data pertaining to the activity were collected. Fourth, the data was analyzed and summarized for use. The final step to Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique was to interpret and report the findings. Of the information reported, Flanagan (1954) stressed that reporting should be limited to those behaviors that make a contribution to the activity being observed.

Studies by Latham and Wexley (1977) narrowed the critical incident technique to three significant criteria. The first criteria addressed the circumstances that surrounded the incident. The second criteria documented the actions that the performer made. Latham and Wexley's (1977) final step identified how the observed behavior was an example of effective or ineffective behavior.

Ranking systems. The ranking performance appraisal was not widely accepted as a means to evaluate employee performance and was viewed as a less valid method (Miner, 1988) because it was a comparison of how well each employee did versus another (Latham & Wexley, 1981). Murphy and Cleveland (1995) reiterated that ranking compared a person to another

person while rating compared a person to a standard. Critics of the ranking system of evaluation cited numerous additional reasons for the method's inferiority. Ranking failed to identify those whose performance was outstanding (Miner, 1988), failed to identify individual levels of performance (Miner, 1988; Latham & Wexley, 1981), created conflict among members being compared (Miner, 1988), excluded definitions of performance (Miner, 1988), and did not provide information for improving performance (Latham & Wexley, 1981).

360-degree evaluations. The 360-degree evaluation, also known as multi-rater feedback, is a process that allows multiple rating sources including one's self, peers, subordinates, supervisors, employees, customers, public, etc. to evaluate the employee's performance (Smoke, 2010; Stowell, 2004). Smoke (2010) indicated that the use of multiple rating sources provided more accurate, reliable, and credible information pertaining to the employee being evaluated. In addition to the benefit to the employee, employers have documented benefits to the multi-rater system. London and Smither (1995) found that the use of multi-rater evaluations had grown in popularity based on the employer's desire to obtain the perceptions of all people that were in contact with the evaluated employee on a regular basis. The two documented goals of muli-rater feedback were to assist the employee in understanding how they were viewed by others and to utilize the feedback as a means to improve (London & Smither, 1995).

Proponents for the use of multi-rater feedback have documented several positive aspects from its use. Antonioni (1996) described five potential outcomes of utilizing the multi-rater assessment including an increased awareness of employer expectations, improved employee performance, a reduction in the discussion of personal feelings between the supervisor and employee, increased frequency of informal reviews, and increased learning by management. In

addition, multi-rater feedback could be valuable in improving the self understanding of the employee in addition to suggesting areas for employee development (London & Smither, 1995).

Several authors recommended the use of caution pertaining to the multi-rater evaluation. Atkins and Wood (2002) warned that little is known about the validity of the multi-rater assessment because significant research comparing the multi-rater assessment to an objective performance assessment had not been conducted. Furthermore, Atkins and Wood (2002) recommended not utilizing the self-ratings in the evaluation process because they do not represent actual competency. Pertaining to employee improvement, London and Smither (1995) found that feedback alone would not lead to performance improvement; rather goal setting had to be included as an integral part of the process.

Based on the information obtained in the literature, inclusion of all the previously discussed evaluation instruments into the current research occurred. The literature revealed significant advantages and disadvantages to the different types of evaluation instruments currently utilized throughout the public and private sector. It was important for the current research to identify which, if any, of the previously discussed evaluation instruments were currently being utilized within fire service organizations.

Performance Evaluation Errors

The negative aspects of each evaluation instrument were not the only difficulties documented with the performance evaluation process. Several performance evaluation errors, including the halo and horn effect along with central tendency, have been documented by numerous authors. The halo effect was described by Ward (2010) as an error that occurred when the rater distorted the employee's evaluation to the positive in all aspects of job performance based on only a few positive employee traits. In contrast, the horn effect was described as an

error that occurred when the rater regarded the employee as generally bad based on only one or two negative aspects of overall performance (Edwards, 2010; Ward, 2010).

Central tendency, another error in performance evaluation, was described by Smoke (2010) as the placement of scores in the center of the evaluation scale. Edwards (2010) described central tendency as the average rating of all personnel due to the requirement of some employers to justify in writing any rating that was above or below average or as a means to prevent conflict between the supervisor and employee. The use of central tendency during evaluation was described as defeating the purpose of the evaluation (Smoke, 2010) and that it provided no value to the employee being evaluated (Ward, 2010). Due to the documentation of evaluation errors by numerous authors, the current research was designed to address those specific errors in addition to the types of evaluation instruments that were available for use.

Procedures

Overview

The two experiments documented within this section utilized descriptive research. The first was designed to address how other fire departments conducted performance evaluations and to determine the most common types of evaluation instruments utilized in the process. The second experiment was designed to obtain the perceptions of current City of Monroe firefighters towards the current employee evaluation process and to obtain their input towards identifying the elements of an ideal firefighter performance evaluation.

Experiment 1

Participants

Career and combination fire departments within the state of Georgia were selected to be participants in the study. The Georgia Firefighter Standards and Training Council, the agency

responsible for certifying fire departments within the state, was contacted and a list of all certified career and combination departments was obtained (Appendix B). The researcher's department was excluded from the list of participants resulting in a total of 192 career and combination departments eligible for participation in the research. Due to the relatively small total population size, all 192 eligible departments were included in the research as an effort to obtain a greater participation rate and higher accuracy of data obtained. Only 65 of the 192 career and combination departments requested to participate in the research responded.

Research Procedure

Upon establishing the participants in the research, a draft survey instrument was developed. A brief 18 question questionnaire was drafted in order to ascertain what other departments in Georgia were using for the performance evaluation process and to determine which evaluation instruments were used most frequently. The survey was developed with three sections that increased in the complexity of questions being asked. The first section consisted of three basic questions and was designed to obtain both nominal and ordinal data on the types and size of the departments that participated in the research. The third, and last, question of the first section was designed as a filter question to determine if the participating department performed performance evaluations on fire service personnel. Because the scope of the research was the type of performance evaluations utilized by other departments, a response of "no" to the filter question resulted in the termination of the survey instrument.

The second section of the survey instrument was designed to determine further information of the employee performance evaluation system utilized by the participating departments. Nominal and ordinal data was obtained to address the frequency of evaluation, age of the current evaluation instrument, use of the evaluation instrument by other departments

within the jurisdiction, the use of the evaluation instrument for promotional and merit based purposes, and if the department was able to establish the evaluation criteria of the instrument.

The third, and final, section of the survey instrument addressed the different types of performance evaluations available for use. The section was designed to obtain nominal data based on the participant's response to questions pertaining to the use of the job description, graphic rating scales, critical incident methods, ranking, behaviorally anchored rated scales, management by objectives, total quality management, and multi-rater/360 degree evaluations. The survey instrument concluded with a question designed to ascertain if the performance evaluations utilized by other departments were perceived by the respondent to be an accurate and consistent indicator of the employee's actual performance. Due to the different types of evaluations included in the survey instrument, a brief description was included to inform the respondent of the characteristics of the types of evaluation instruments being included in the survey instrument questions.

Once the draft questionnaire was completed, it was distributed to the 6 additional personnel assigned to A-shift at the City of Monroe Fire Department. Each personnel reviewed the questions for clarity and necessity for inclusion. Suggestions and feedback were provided to the researcher and a final survey instrument (Appendix C) was developed.

Due to convenience, an online method of delivery was utilized for the survey instrument. The website http://www.QuestionPro.com was utilized as the host site for the survey instrument. A letter of request (Appendix D) was drafted and mailed to each department to request participation because the Georgia Firefighter Standards and Training Council provided only mailing addresses, and not email addresses, for the participating departments. The letter requested participation in the study and reiterated the fact that the responses of the participants

were anonymous. A completion deadline was provided to ensure that adequate time would be available for results analysis.

Definition of terms. Behaviorally anchored rating scales- "Various performance levels shown along a scale and described in terms of an employee's specific job behavior" (Edwards, 2010, p. 367).

Career fire department- A fire department that is staffed with full time fire service personnel.

Combination fire department- A fire department that is staffed with a combination of full time, part time, and volunteer fire service personnel.

Critical incident method- "Requires that written records be maintained of highly favorable or highly unfavorable performance" (Edwards, 2010, p. 208).

Graphic rating scales- "One of the oldest and most widely used assessment techniques is the graphic rating scale. The rating scale appears as a line or a series of boxes along which performance levels are recorded" (Edwards, 2010, p. 207).

Job description- "A document that provides information regarding the tasks, duties, and responsibilities of the job. These tasks, duties, and responsibilities are observable actions" (Edwards, 2010, p. 369).

Management by objectives- "A formal set of procedures that establishes and reviews progress toward common goals for managers and subordinates. Management by objectives specifies that superiors and subordinates will jointly set goals for a specified period of time and then meet again to evaluate the subordinate's performance in terms of the previously established goals" (Bruegman, 2009, p. 667).

Multi-rater/360 degree evaluations- An evaluation technique in which "performance review data are received from managers, subordinates, customers, peers, and others" (Edwards, 2010, p. 221).

Ranking- A performance evaluation technique in which "the supervisor places all employees from a group in rank order of overall performance" (Edwards, 2010, p. 208).

Total quality management- "Recommends that the major focus of performance appraisal should be to provide employees with feedback in the areas that they can improve. The focus of TQM is on teams and groups of people achieving results as opposed to individuals" (Edwards, 2010, p. 372).

Limitations

Several limitations to the above research were noted. The primary limitation to the study was that the research conducted was restricted to career and combination fire departments within the state of Georgia. No data pertaining to similar sized departments in other states was solicited or obtained. Thus, data collected was regional in nature, rather than a nationwide cross sectional evaluation. The second observable limitation was the survey delivery. The survey request was distributed by mail via the United States Postal Service and the survey was hosted by http://www.QuestionPro.com on the internet. A change in address or lack of internet service prevented participation in the study. A third noted limitation was the survey instrument itself. Several participants contacted the researcher via email to confirm certain aspects of the data being obtained as it pertained to the different types of performance evaluations utilized. A future survey instrument designed to obtain the same information would be designed with further clarity pertaining to the types of performance evaluations utilized and whether or not a

department utilizes a single performance evaluation instrument or a combination of several performance evaluation instruments.

Experiment 2

Participants

Full time firefighters at the City of Monroe Fire Department that had previously been evaluated utilizing the current employee performance evaluation instrument were included in the study. Of the department's 21 full time positions, only 16 were eligible to participate in the research based on the inclusion criteria. Due to the small eligible population size, all 16 eligible personnel were included in the research. Thirteen of the possible 16 personnel participated in the study.

Research Procedure

Upon establishing the eligible participants in the research, the first of two draft survey instruments was developed to address firefighter's perceptions. A brief 15 question 5 point Likert scale questionnaire was drafted in order to ascertain what personnel thought of the current performance evaluation process. The questionnaire allowed each participant to respond with strongly disagrees, disagrees, undecided, agrees, or strongly agrees to each of the questions. The questions included in the survey instrument addressed the importance and necessity of performance evaluation, the firefighter's job description as it pertains to employee evaluation, the use of performance evaluation for merit raise and promotional use, the subjectivity of the current evaluation process, the perception of central tendency, the presence of halo and horn effect, the perceived need for revision, and the consistency of appraisal among raters.

The second draft survey developed utilized the current City of Monroe Firefighter job description (Appendix E) and reduced the overall job description into individual components.

Personnel were asked to select the components of the current firefighter job description that they believed should be included in a revised employee performance evaluation. In addition to the job description, several criteria were added based on suggestions from other officers within the department.

Once the draft questionnaires were completed, they were distributed to the additional 6 personnel assigned to A-shift at the City of Monroe Fire Department. Each personnel reviewed the questions for clarity and necessity for inclusion. Suggestions and feedback were provided to the researcher and two final survey instruments (Appendices F and G) were developed.

Due to convenience, an online method of delivery was utilized for both survey instruments. The website http://www.QuestionPro.com was utilized as the host site for the survey instruments. A letter of request (Appendix H) was drafted and placed in each shift Captain's mailbox to request the participation of shift personnel. The letter requested participation in the study and reiterated the fact that the responses of the participants were anonymous.

Definition of terms. Central tendency- A phenomenon that occurs when an evaluator rates all personnel as average (Edwards, 2010).

Halo effect- A phenomenon that occurs when an evaluator has a tendency to consider an employee as good overall (Edwards, 2010).

Horn effect- A phenomenon that occurs when an evaluator has a tendency to consider an employee as overall bad (Edwards, 2010).

Limitations

The primary limitation to the study was that the research conducted was restricted to career personnel that had previously participated in an employee evaluation. Due to several

recent vacancies and a leave of absence, only 16 personnel met the inclusion criteria. This reduction in available participants did not allow for 100 percent of the department's personnel to respond. Thus, the data obtained did not represent the perceptions of all departmental personnel. Another limitation to the study was that the surveys were designed with closed ended questions. Therefore, personnel were unable to add additional areas for future evaluation. The closed ended method was utilized due to its convenience as a means to compile data.

Results

Experiment 1

All career and combination fire departments within the State of Georgia were contacted with a request for participation in the research. Of the 192 departments identified as being eligible for participation, 65 initiated the survey. This represented 33.85% of the departments selected for participation. As Table 1 demonstrates, 20 career departments and 45 combination departments participated. The majority of departments, 46 of 65 (70.77%), represented departments that have less than 50 uniformed personnel. However, there was representation by departments in all of the personnel categories. Table 2 represents the distribution of uniformed personnel per responding department. The filter question was only answered by 64 respondents and indicated that 58 departments performed evaluations on employees while six departments did not. The six departments that did not conduct evaluations were then thanked for participating and the survey was terminated.

Table 1
Classification of Participating Departments

Classification	Responses	Percentage
Career	20	30.77
Combination	45	69.23

Table 2
Number of Uniformed Personnel in Participating Departments

Number of Personnel	Responses	Percentage
1-50	46	70.77
51-100	12	18.46
101-150	2	3.08
151-200	2	3.08
200+	3	4.62

Table 3 represents the frequency of performance evaluation performed by the respondents. The majority, 82.14%, indicated that performance evaluations were performed on an annual basis.

Table 3
Frequency of Performance Evaluation in Participating Departments

Frequency	Responses	Percentage
Quarterly	2	3.57
Bi annually	5	8.93
Yearly	46	82.14
Other	3	5.36

Table 4 represents the age of the evaluation instrument currently utilized by the participating departments. Pertaining to the age of the evaluation instrument, 23 departments (41.07%) indicated that current evaluation process was six to ten years in age. Other responses included 32.14% for one to five years, 17.86% for more than ten years, and 8.93% indicated that they were unaware of the age of the evaluation instrument.

Table 4
Age of Current Evaluation Instrument Utilized by Participating Departments

Instrument Age	Responses	Percentage
1-5 years	18	32.14
6-10 years	23	41.07
10+ years	10	17.86
Unknown	5	8.93

Another question of interest was whether or not all departments under the governing body utilized the same evaluation instrument. Over two thirds, 38 of 56 (67.86%), indicated that all departments utilized the same evaluation instrument. The remaining 18 respondents (32.14%) indicated that all departments did not utilize the same evaluation instrument.

Participants were questioned about the use of evaluation results for promotional and merit raise purposes. Over 70% of participating departments indicated that the evaluations were used for both purposes. Thirty nine (70.91%) of the 55 responding departments indicated that they utilized employee evaluations in the promotional process. Forty three (76.79%) of the participating departments indicated that the evaluations were utilized for the purpose of monetary compensation.

Departments were asked if they established the criteria for evaluation. Thirty seven (66.07%) departments responded yes while the remaining 19 (33.93%) responded no. Departments were asked if the job description was utilized in the evaluation process. Forty (86.96%) of 46 respondents answered yes, the remaining 6 (13.04%) responded no.

Table 5 identifies the types of evaluation instruments being utilized by the participating departments. All categories received votes for yes, however the three most prominent responses

were graphic rating scales (38.30 %), total quality management (38.64%), and management by objectives (44.44%).

Table 5
Performance Evaluations Utilized by Participating Departments

Instrument	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage	Total Responses
Graphic Rating Scale	**18**	**38.3**	29	61.7	47
Critical Incident Method	11	23.91	35	76.09	46
Ranking System	10	21.28	37	78.72	47
Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale	15	31.91	32	68.09	47
Management by Objectives	**20**	**44.44**	25	55.56	45
Total Quality Management	**17**	**38.64**	27	61.36	44
360-Degree Evaluation	10	22.22	35	77.78	45

Note. Boldface numbers represent the most popular instrument selections.

The final question of the survey instrument was designed to ascertain if the departments perceived that the evaluations administered produced results that were accurate and consistent with the employee's actual performance. Thirty three (70.21%) departments responded yes, while the remaining 14 (29.79%) responded no.

Based on responses to the survey, a definitive response to the initial research question that addressed how other fire departments conducted performance evaluations remains undefined. There does not appear to be one specific proven manner in which to perform fire service performance evaluations as demonstrated by the vast assortment of responses. What is known from the research is that the participating departments performed employee evaluations in many different manners with different uses for their results. Generalities that can be deduced from the research are that a majority of the participants conducted employee evaluations, performed them on a yearly basis, utilized an evaluation instrument that was six to ten years in

age, shared the evaluation instrument with other departments under the governing body, utilized the evaluations for both promotional and merit based reasons, established the criteria for evaluation, and utilized the firefighter's job description as a foundation for evaluation.

The second research question was designed to determine the most common evaluation instruments utilized by other fire departments. It should be noted that the responding population to this survey instrument was small, thus, the data obtained may not be an accurate cross sectional view of performance evaluation in the fire service. With that being stated, the three most common types of evaluation instruments utilized by the participating departments were graphic rating scales, total quality management, and management by objectives.

Experiment 2

Determining the perception towards the current employee evaluation by City of Monroe firefighters was one of the initial goals of the research. In order to obtain this information, 15 questions aimed at addressing these perceptions were formulated and placed into a 5-point Likert scale. Table 6 provides a breakdown of the responses to the Likert scale questionnaire.

All 13 participants (100%) agreed or strongly agreed that performance evaluations should be performed on each employee. Seven of the thirteen participants (53.84%) agreed or strongly agreed that the employee evaluation was effective in assessing strengths and weaknesses. The remaining six participants (46.16%) disagreed or strongly disagreed in the evaluation's ability to assess the employee's strengths and weaknesses. When asked about the importance of the employee evaluation in regards to overall professional development, seven participants (53.84%) agreed or strongly agreed with the effectiveness. Five participants (38.46%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, while one participant (7.69%) was undecided.

Table 6
Current Perceptions of Performance Evaluation by City of Monroe Firefighters

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA
Performance evaluations should be performed on each employee	0	0	0	2	11
The employee performance evaluation is effective in assessing my strengths and weaknesses	2	4	0	6	1
The employee performance evaluation is an important tool to assist in my professional development	4	1	1	5	2
The employee performance evaluation effectively evaluates my job based on the job description of my position	6	5	1	1	0
Annual merit increases in salary correlate with the annual performance evaluation	7	1	2	2	1
The employee performance evaluation should be included in the promotional process for employees	0	0	0	4	9
I know what is expected of me in my current job position	0	0	2	9	2
The employee performance evaluation is fair and is based on my performance in my current job duties	2	6	1	4	0
The employee performance evaluation is more subjective than objective	0	1	2	7	3
My supervisor rates all employees "average" rather than low or high	2	4	2	4	1
Performing well in one aspect of my job will result in an overall positive evaluation	0	6	1	3	2
Performing poorly in one aspect of my job will result in an overall negative evaluation	0	7	1	4	1
The employee performance evaluation should be revised to meet the needs of the fire service	0	0	1	3	9
An annual performance evaluation meeting with my supervisor is sufficient to outline what is expected of me for the next year	4	4	0	4	1
My performance evaluation would be identical if my performance was evaluated by a supervisor from another shift	4	6	1	2	0

Note. SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

Questioning pertaining to the correlation between evaluation and the employee's job description resulted in 11 participants (84.61%) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the evaluation's effectiveness. One participant (7.69%) remained undecided and one participant (7.69%) agreed with the statement.

When asked about the correlation between evaluation results and merit increases awarded, 8 participants (61.53%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that a correlation existed. Two participants (15.38%) remained undecided and three participants (23.07%) agreed or strongly agreed with the presence of a correlation. A question pertaining to the need for the evaluation to be utilized in the promotional process resulted in all 13 participants (100%) agreeing or strongly agreeing with the need for inclusion. Eleven participants (84.61%) agreed or strongly agreed that they knew what was expected in the current job position. Two participants (15.38%) remained undecided, while no participants (0%) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked about the perception of being fair and based on performance, eight participants (61.53%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, one participant (7.69%) was undecided, and four participants (30.77%) agreed. No participants (0%) strongly agreed with the perception of evaluation fairness. Along the same terms, when questioned about the perception of the evaluation being more subjective than objective, 10 participants (76.92%) agreed or strongly agreed while two participants (15.38%) were undecided, and one participant (7.69%) disagreed. No participants (0%) strongly disagreed with the statement.

When asked about central tendency, six participants (46.16%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, two participants (15.38%) were undecided, and five participants (38.46%) agreed or strongly agreed. A statement designed to determine the presence of halo effect in the evaluation process resulted in only 12 responses. Six of the participants (50%) disagreed that halo was

present, one participant (8.33%) was undecided, and five participants (41.67%) agreed or strongly agreed. No participants (0%) strongly disagreed with the presence of halo in the evaluation process. A statement designed to determine the presence of horn effect was answered by all 13 participants. Seven participants (53.85%) disagreed, one participant (7.69%) was undecided, and the remaining five participants (38.46%) agreed or strongly agreed that the horn effect was present in the current evaluative process.

A statement indicating the need to revise the evaluation process to meet the needs of the fire service resulted in 12 participants (92.30%) agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. One participant (7.69%) was undecided and no participants (0%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the need to establish a new evaluation that addressed the needs of the fire service.

Participants were asked if the annual performance evaluation meeting with the supervisor was sufficient to outline what was expected for the next year. Eight participants (61.53%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, no participants (0%) were undecided, and five participants (38.46%) agreed or strongly agreed. The final statement was designed to ascertain the consistency of the evaluation process. Participants were asked if they believed that their performance would be the same if evaluated by a supervisor from another shift. Ten participants (76.92) disagreed or strongly disagreed, one participant (7.69%) was undecided, and two participants (15.38%) agreed. No participants (0%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The following generalizations represent a response to the research question pertaining to the perceptions of current City of Monroe firefighters. For the purpose of these results, general statements of agreed are utilized to represent the combined responses of agreed and strongly agreed and disagreed are utilized to represent the combined responses of disagreed and strongly disagreed. All participating employees (100%) agreed that performance evaluations should be

performed on each employee and that the employee performance evaluation should be included in the promotional process. Ninety two percent of participants agreed that the performance evaluation should be revised to meet the needs of the fire service. Eighty five percent of participants disagreed that the employee evaluation effectively evaluated the job based on the job description while the same percentage agreed that they knew what was expected based on the current job position.

A generalization based on majority response of agreement was that the performance evaluation was more subjective than objective. Further generalizations based on a majority response of disagreement were that participants disagreed that annual merit increases in salary correlated with the annual performance evaluation, performance evaluations were fair and based on current job duties, an annual performance evaluation meeting with the supervisor was sufficient to outline what was expected for the next year, and that there was a perception of consistency among the ratings of shift supervisors.

The following perceptions were rated too closely to determine an overall perception representative of the entire department. Personnel closely agreed and disagreed that employee performance evaluations were effective in assessing strengths and weaknesses, an important tool to assist in professional development, contained the central tendency evaluation error, contained the halo effect evaluation error, and that they contained the horn effect evaluation error.

The final research question was designed to determine which elements City of Monroe firefighters desired to have included within a revised evaluation process. The first step was to determine which current evaluation instrument elements should be included within a revised evaluation. Table 7 represents the responses of the participants in the study. Job knowledge, drive, and dependability were chosen by all participants (100%) for inclusion in a revised

performance evaluation. Housekeeping, selected by seven participants (53.84%), along with courtesy and creativity, selected by nine participants (69.23%), were the least selected elements. Performance under pressure and interpersonal relationships were chosen by 12 participants (92.31%). Attendance, accuracy, and quality of work were all chosen by ten or more participants.

Table 7
Elements Currently Included in Employee Evaluation

Which of the following elements utilized in the CURRENT employee performance evaluation should be included in a revised employee performance evaluation?		
Element	Selected	Percentage
Job Knowledge	13	100
Quality of Work	11	84.61
Drive	13	100
Performance Under Pressure	12	92.31
Accuracy	11	84.61
Dependability	13	100
Attendance	10	76.92
Interpersonal Relationships	12	92.31
Creativity	9	69.23
Housekeeping	7	53.84
Courtesy	9	69.23

Table 8 represents a breakdown of the essential duties and responsibilities found within the current firefighter job description. Participation in training; representing the department in a professional, courteous, and considerate manner; and performing all tasks in a safety conscious manner were selected by all participants (100%) for inclusion in a revised performance evaluation. Performing fire safety inspections and reporting to all training, meetings, and off-

duty calls were the least selected elements with 30.76% desiring their inclusion. The remaining elements were selected by 53.84% to 92.31% of the participants.

Table 8
Firefighter Job Description Essential Duties and Responsibilities

Which of the ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation?		
Element	Selected	Percentage
Performs Emergency & Non-emergency Activities	12	92.31
Performs Life, Safety, and Property Conservation Efforts	10	76.92
Effective Fire Suppression Techniques	11	84.61
Mechanical Inspection of Equipment	9	69.23
Replenishment, Replacement, and/or Repair of Equipment	7	53.84
Documentation and Notification of Mechanical Defects	8	61.53
Operates City Vehicles in a Safe and Lawful Manner at All Times	11	84.61
Abides by Department's Emergency Vehicle Policy	9	69.23
Participates in Community Service and/or Special Details	7	53.84
Participates in Training	13	100
Participates in Minor Repair/Maintenance of Vehicles and Facilities	8	61.53
Maintains Cleanliness of Vehicles and Facilities	9	69.23
Performs Fire Safety Inspections	4	30.76
Represents Dept. in Professional, Courteous, and Considerate Manner	13	100
Performs Activities in a Safety-Conscious Manner/ Utilizes PPE	13	100
Performs All Other Firefighter Tasks/Duties as Assigned	9	69.23
Assists in Completion of Proper Documentation of Fire/EMS Calls	10	76.92
Reports to All Training, Meetings, and Off-duty Calls	4	30.76
Performs Any and All Duties as Assigned by CO, Chief, or City	11	84.61

Table 9
Additional Elements of the Firefighter Job Description

Which of the LANGUAGE SKILLS, MATHEMATICAL SKILLS, REASONING ABILITIES, & PHYSICAL DEMANDS found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation?		
Element	Selected	Percentage
Ability to Read and Interpret Documents	11	84.61
Ability to Write Routine Reports and Correspondence	9	69.23
Ability to Add, Subtract, Multiply, and Divide	10	76.92
Ability to Solve Practical Problems	7	53.84
Ability to Interpret a Variety of Instructions	8	61.53
Stand	10	76.92
Walk	10	76.92
Sit	8	61.53
Reach	11	84.61
Climb or Balance	10	76.92
Stoop	10	76.92
Kneel	11	84.61
Crouch	11	84.61
Crawl	11	84.61
Taste	3	23.07
Smell	5	38.46
Vision	9	69.23
Lift 25 to 125 pounds	11	84.61
Assist Lifting/Carrying up to 500 pounds	11	84.61

Table 9 represents the remaining elements found within the firefighter's job description. No single element was selected by all participants. The ability to read and interpret documents, reach, kneel, crouch, crawl, lift 25 to 125 pounds, and assisting in lifting up to 500 pounds were the most commonly selected elements with 84.61% of participants selecting inclusion. The least selected items were taste (23.07%) and smell (38.46%). The remaining elements were selected by 53.84% to 76.92% of the participants.

Table 10 represents the elements that are not included in the firefighter job description that participants suggested for inclusion. All participants (100%) indicated that the knowledge of apparatus and equipment operation should be included in a revised evaluation. Knowledge of departmental standard operating procedures and knowledge of response territory was selected by 92.31% of participants.

Table 10
Elements Not Currently Included in the Firefighter Job Description

Which of the following elements NOT INCLUDED in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation?		
Element	Selected	Percentage
Knowledge of Departmental Standard Operating Procedures	12	92.31
Knowledge of Response Territory	12	92.31
Knowledge of Apparatus and Equipment Operation	13	100

The final question proposed for inclusion within a revised employee performance evaluation was whether or not actions above and beyond those required by the current job description should be included in the employee performance evaluation. Eleven participants (84.62%) indicated yes, while the remaining two participants (15.38%) selected no.

Discussion

The research conducted provided some significant, and at times, surprising results. The initial experiment was designed to answer the first two research questions by surveying other fire

departments. As discussed in the procedures, only a small portion of the eligible population participated in the research. Thus, as a disclaimer, it should be noted that the results obtained may not represent a cross sectional view of the employee performance evaluation process in Georgia fire departments. With that being said, the results obtained by those that participated will be discussed.

Literature had already established that through decades of research a concrete evaluation that is most reliable and valid had not been established (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). The objective of current research was to determine what fire departments were currently using as their evaluation instrument to determine if a better instrument for use by the City of Monroe Fire Department was available. The three most common evaluation instruments utilized by the participating departments were the graphic rating scale, total quality management, and management by objectives. The absence of a behavior based system was surprising to the researcher. Although Tziner and Kopelman (2002) stated that no single best evaluation had been established, they had determined after numerous studies that the behavioral rating systems were slightly more adventitious. The behaviorally anchored rating scale was not included in the top three selections of participating departments.

The selection of the graphic rating scale by a significant number of participants was not surprising to the researcher. Yun, Donahue, Dudley, and McFarland (2005) indicated that the graphic rating scale was widely and frequently used in addition to being easy to create. Tziner and Kopelman (2002) described the graphic rating scale as one of the two major types of evaluation along with being vague, generic, and subjective. What is probably most concerning about the extensive use of graphic rating scales in public safety organizations were the findings of Daley (1991). Daley (1991) found that public employees had little confidence in the graphic

rating scales and the managerial capabilities of those charged with conducting them. Therefore, it can be surmised that many employees within the organizations that utilize the graphic rating scales do not find the evaluation beneficial. This feeling was echoed by the participants in the second experiment of this study who perceived the evaluation to be subjective and unfair in its attempt to evaluate employee performance.

The most surprising result from the research was the number of departments that utilized total quality management as an evaluative technique. One of the key concepts of total quality management is the team component (Janz & Harel, 1993). Clearly, the fire service is an organization that relies on the team approach. However, evaluation of performance is typically performed on an individual basis. Proponents of total quality management believed that team evaluation led to organizational goals and individual performance evaluations led to short term goals (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002). Thus, a fire company that performed well would receive a positive evaluation and a company that performed poorly would receive a negative evaluation. The problem with this approach is that individual strengths and weaknesses are ignored for the sake of success or failure of the total group. It should be noted that Deming, the founder of total quality management, believed that the performance evaluation process should be abolished (Janz & Harel, 1993). Thus, there may be areas of the fire service, such as overall service delivery, that may find the total quality management approach beneficial. However, the researcher cautions departments on the use of total quality management as the sole evaluative technique due to its inability to address specific actions of the individual team members.

On the converse of total quality management's ability to evaluate the team as a whole, management by objectives evaluates each individual on specific criteria. Management by objectives requires that the supervisor establish what is expected of each member of the

organization and how the member may achieve the goals (Drucker, 1954). This allows the individual to be held responsible and evaluated individually rather than the group as a whole (Latham & Locke, 1979). Daley (1991) indicated that performance evaluations based on the measured objectives established allow for individual performance to be accurately measured. This type of evaluation instrument can prove to be beneficial in the fire service. As company officers plan for the coming year, implementation of management by objectives as a portion of the overall evaluation could be beneficial in steering employees in the direction needed by the department. Examples of management by objectives in the fire service could include objectives that required new certifications, training, or the development of programs within the department. However, as Edwards (2010) suggested, management by objectives should not be utilized as the sole evaluation instrument because it only evaluates progress on the established objectives and not the other pertinent aspects of the job.

The second research experiment was designed to address current City of Monroe firefighter's perceptions of the current evaluation and ideal components of a revised evaluation. Yun, Donahue, Dudley, and McFarland (2005) indicated that the primary purpose of a performance evaluation was to accurately reflect the performance of the employee. As documented in the results, all participating personnel agreed that performance evaluations should be performed on each employee. However, the value of the evaluations to the employee received mixed review and a majority felt that the evaluation was unfair. As Murphy and Cleveland (1995) found, it was not unusual to find 80-90% of employees rated above average. If this is indeed the case, it is understandable that the current employees may not find the current evaluation effective in addressing strengths and weaknesses due to a hyperinflation of performance. In order to be valuable to the employee, and in turn the organization, the

evaluation process must be conducted in a manner that provides a sense of benefit to the employee. If employees do not perceive the evaluation as being legitimate, then the goals of providing feedback and modifying work behavior (Tziner, Kopleman, & Livneh, 1993) cannot be obtained. Furthermore, Tziner and Kopelman (2002) indicated that some of the advantages of the employee evaluation process were to contribute to employee development and improve future job skills. When questioned about the current employee evaluation's ability to assist in professional development, again mixed reviews were obtained.

When addressing the use of performance evaluation results for merit raises and promotional purposes, the research results indicated that there was a perceived lack of correlation between evaluation and raises, and that the evaluation should be used for future promotion. While it is common practice for performance evaluations to be used as a criteria for raises (Aldakhilallah & Parente, 2002), further research indicated that raters tend to show leniency when the evaluation is used for monetary or promotional purposes (Tziner, Murphy, & Cleveland, 2001). This suggests that although the evaluation process plays an important role in the awarding of raises and promotion, it must be performed fairly in order to reduce the perception of leniency. Furthermore, when utilizing the performance evaluation for promotional purposes, Aldakhilallah and Parente (2002) found that the evaluation of previous events may not be a decent predictor of future performance. Although literature indicated that previous evaluations may not be a good predictor, the participating personnel clearly indicated that they desired to have the evaluation process included for future promotional use.

Over three quarters of the participating firefighters indicated that they believed that the evaluation results would be different it performed by a supervisor on another shift. Different rating strategies have been identified by other researchers. Tziner, Murphy, and Cleveland

(2001) found that different rater beliefs may result in different rating strategies. Thus, if all three shift supervisors have different rating beliefs, then all three shifts could receive different evaluations. This result indicated that there is a need for both an objective based assessment as described by Daley (1991) and the need for training of the supervisors. To further support the need for supervisor training, Kleiman, Biderman, and Faley (1987) found that employees were more likely to view a subjective evaluation as being fair if they believed that the evaluating supervisor was qualified to rate them. Supervisor training could also assist in reducing the perceptions of central tendency, halo effect, and horn effect.

In the end, the research revealed several significant findings. First of all, although current City of Monroe Fire Department firefighters view the current performance evaluation as subjective and unfair, they believe that the evaluations should be performed. Current employees want an evaluation that is perceived as objective and fair. Current employees desire to have a revised evaluation that is pertinent to the firefighter job position. Lastly, of the departments that participated, the most commonly utilized evaluation instruments were the graphic rating scale, total quality management, and management by objectives.

Recommendations

Based on the results from the research, there are several recommendations that would be beneficial to the City of Monroe Fire Department as well as other departments that are currently considering a revision of their current employee performance evaluation process.

The first recommendation is to address that there is a need for a fire department specific evaluation. All City of Monroe firefighters indicated the need for a firefighter specific evaluation. Like the City of Monroe, 67.86% of the participating departments indicated that the fire department utilized the same performance evaluation instrument that was utilized by all

other departments under the governing body. The research clearly indicated that fire service personnel desire a fire service specific performance evaluation.

The second recommendation addresses the type of evaluation instrument utilized. The participating career and combination fire departments in Georgia utilized many different evaluation instruments. While the questionnaire utilized in the research did not specify to select only one instrument, it can be reasoned based on the number of responses that many of the departments utilize an evaluation process that is a combination of several different evaluation instruments. The department must establish which instruments are to be used. An example would be a department that utilized graphic rating scales for certain criteria not specific to the firefighter's position, a behaviorally anchored rating scale for criteria that was firefighter specific, and management by objectives as a means for the supervisor and employee to establish goals that benefit the employee and department for the next evaluation cycle.

The third recommendation would be to address the frequency of evaluation. Both the City of Monroe Fire Department and 82.14% of the participating departments performed evaluations on a yearly basis. However, over 60% of the participating firefighters indicated that an annual meeting with the supervisor was not sufficient in establishing what was expected in the coming year. Performing quarterly meetings between supervisor and employee would significantly reduce the time between evaluations. This recommendation could prove to be beneficial to the supervisor, employee, and department as a whole.

The fourth recommendation addresses the use of the performance evaluation in the promotional process and for merit raises. Based on the reported perceptions of the participating firefighters, the employee performance evaluation should be utilized in the department's future promotional policy. In regards to merit raises, many of the participants perceived a lack of

correlation between performance evaluation results and the award of a merit raise. One recommendation would be to establish an objective scoring criterion in a revised performance evaluation. Scores earned on the performance evaluation would correlate to a merit raise scale. An example would be an overall numeric scoring of the performance evaluation. In turn, a merit increase correlation scale would also be established. Thus, an employee that scored an overall 70 on the performance evaluation would know that he or she was eligible for a three percent raise based on an established scale of 60 to 75 percent equating to a three percent raise.

The fifth recommendation is that the department should establish which critical behaviors should be evaluated. The results indicated that many department members perceived the current evaluation process to be too subjective. Establishing critical behaviors to the firefighter position for evaluation could lessen the perception of subjectivity. For instance, an employee that was unable to don full personal protective equipment in an established two minute time period would not receive an acceptable evaluation for that critical behavior. However, because the evaluation was based on an observed behavior, and not opinion of the employee, the employee would be less likely to view the evaluation as subjective and unfair.

The sixth recommendation is that the department should establish which criteria from the firefighter's job position to be included in a revised performance evaluation. Based on the research results, it was clearly emphasized that current departmental members desired to have aspects of the job description included in the performance evaluation. However, it would not be practical to include all aspects of the job description. Therefore, the most important criteria from the job description should be included in a revised performance evaluation.

The final recommendations are based on results that indicated a majority of participants perceived inconsistency in the evaluation of personnel among different supervisors. There are

two recommendations for this aspect. First, the implementation of more objective evaluation criteria may result in a decrease in the perception of inconsistency. A second recommendation would be for the department to establish and implement a performance evaluation training program for supervisors responsible for evaluating employees. Requiring all supervisors to attend such a training program could reduce confusion and inconsistencies among the raters. Consistency, objectivity, and fairness among evaluations would be key concepts. Other concepts for training consideration would be the elimination of the common evaluation errors of central tendency, halo effect, and horn effect.

The implementation of these recommendations within the City of Monroe Fire Department should ultimately lead to the development and implementation of an employee performance evaluation instrument that is viewed as being valuable to both the employee and the department.

References

Aldakhilallah, K. A., & Parente, D. H. (2002). Redesigning a square peg: Total quality management performance appraisals. *Total Quality Management, 13*(1), 39-51.

Antonioni, D. (1996). Designing an effective 360-degree appraisal feedback process. *Organizational Dynamics, 25*(2), 24-38.

Atkins, P., & Wood, R. (2002). Self- versus others' ratings as predictors of assessment center ratings: Validation evidence for 360-degree feedback programs. *Personnel Psychology, 55*(4), 871-904.

Bruegman, R. R. (2009). *Fire administration I*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

City of Monroe. (2008). *Personnel policies and procedures*. Monroe, GA: Author.

Daley, D. M. (1991). Great expectations, or a tale of two systems: Employee attitudes toward graphic rating scales and MBO-based performance appraisal. *Public Administration Quarterly, 15*(2), 188-209.

Daley, D. M. (2005). Designing effective performance appraisal systems. In S. E. Condrey (Ed.), *Handbook of human resource management in government* (pp. 499-527). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Edwards, S. T. (2010). *Fire service personnel management* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2006). *Executive development student manual* (3rd ed.). Emmitsburg, MD: Author.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 327-358.

Heifetz, R., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Janz, T., & Harel, G. H. (1993). Performance appraisal for TQM: A team approach. *Total Quality Management, 4*(3), 275-281.

Kleiman, L. S., Biderman, M. D., & Faley, R. H. (1987). An examination of employee perceptions of a subjective performance appraisal system. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 2*(2), 112-121.

Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (1979). Goal setting – a motivational technique that works. *Organizational Dynamics, 8*(2), 68-80.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1977). Behavioral observation scales for performance appraisal purposes. *Personnel Psychology, 30*(2), 255-268.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1981). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

London, M., & Smither, J. W. (1995). Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes? Theory-based applications and directions for research. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 803-839.

Miner, J. B. (1988). Development and application of the rated ranking technique in performance appraisal. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*(4), 291-305.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rizzo, W. R., & Frank, F. D. (1977). Influence of irrelevant cues and alternate forms of graphic rating scales on the halo effect. *Personnel Psychology, 30,* 405-417.

Rodgers, R., & Hunter, J. E. (1991). Impact of management by objectives on organizational Productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(2), 322-336. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.2.322

Schwab, D. P., Heneman, H. G., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1975). Behaviorally anchored rating scales: A review of the literature. *Personnel Psychology, 28,* 549-562.

Silverman, S. B., & Wexley, K. N. (1984). Reaction of employees to performance appraisal interviews as a function of their participation in rating scale development. *Personnel Psychology, 37*(4), 703-710.

Smoke, C. H. (2010). *Company officer* (3rd ed.). Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Cengage.

Stowell, F. M. (2004). *Chief officer* (2nd ed.). Stillwater, OK: Fire Protection Publications.

Stowell, F. M. (2007). *Fire and emergency services company officer* (4th ed.). Stillwater, OK: Fire Protection Publications.

Tziner, A. (1984). A fairer examination of rating scales when used for performance appraisal in a real organizational setting. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 5*(2), 103-112.

Tziner, A., & Kopelman, R. E., (2002). Is there a preferred performance rating format? A non-psychometric perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*(3), 479-503.

Tziner, A., Kopelman, R. E., & Livneh, N. (1993). Effects of performance appraisal format on perceived goal characteristics, appraisal process satisfaction, and changes in related job performance: A field experiment. *The Journal of Psychology, 127*(3), 281-291.

Tziner, A., Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (2001). Relationships between attitudes toward organizations and performance appraisal systems and rating behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(3), 226-239.

U. S. Fire Administration. (2010). *America's fire and emergency services leader strategic plan: Fiscal years 2010-2014.* Retrieved from http://www.usfa.dhs.gov /downloads/pdf/strategic_plan.pdf

Ward, M. (2010). Fire officer principles and practice (2nd ed.). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Yun, J. G., Donahue, L. M., Dudley, N. M., & McFarland, L. A. (2005). Rater personality, rating format, and social context: Implications for performance appraisal ratings. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *13*(2), 97-107.

Appendix A
City of Monroe Fire Department Employee Evaluation

Employee Evaluation Form

Name:_____ Date: _____

Department:_____ Job Title: _____

Purposes of this Employee Evaluation:
To take a job related personal inventory, to pin-point weaknesses and strengths and to outline and agree upon a practical improvement program. Periodically conducted, these Evaluations will provide a history of development and progress.

Instructions Listed below are a number of traits, abilities and characteristics that are important for success in business. Place an "X" mark on each rating scale over the descriptive phrase which most nearly describes the person being rated. (If this form is being used for self-evaluation, you will be describing yourself.)

Carefully evaluate each of the qualities separately.

Two common mistakes in rating are: (1) A tendency to rate nearly everyone as "average" on every trait instead of being more critical in judgment. The rater should use the ends of the scale as well as the middle. And (2) The "Halo Effect," i.e., a tendency to rate the same individual "excellent" on every trait or "poor" on every trait based on the *overall* picture one has of the person being rated. However, each person has strong points and weak points and these should be indicated on the rating scale.

JOB KNOWLEDGE is the information concerning work duties which an individual should know for a satisfactory job performance.	Poorly informed about work duties.	Lacks knowledge of some phases of work.	Moderately informed; can answer most common questions.	Understands all phases of work.	Has complete mastery of all phases of job.
QUANTITY OF WORK is the amount of work an individual does in a work day.	Does not meet minimum requirements.	Does just enough to get by.	Volume of work is satisfactory.	Very industrious; does more than is required.	Superior work production record.

Form 102

DRIVE is the desire to attain goals, to achieve.	Has poorly defined goals and acts without purpose; puts forth practically no effort.	Sets goals too low; puts forth little effort to achieve.	Has average goals and usually puts forth effort to reach these.	Strives hard; has high desire to achieve.	Sets high goals and strives incessantly to reach these.
PERFORMANCE UNDER PRESSURE is the ability to withstand pressure and to remain calm in crisis situations.	Cannot handle pressure; utterly incapable of performing job during crises.	Occasionally "blows up" under pressure; low tolerance for crises.	Has average tolerance for crises; usually remains calm.	Tolerates most pressure; very good tolerance for crises.	Thrives under pressure; really enjoys solving crises.
ACCURACY is the correctness of work duties performed.	Makes frequent errors.	Careless; makes recurrent errors.	Usually accurate; makes only average number of mistakes.	Requires little supervision; is exact and precise most of the time.	Requires absolute minimum of supervision; is almost always accurate.
DEPENDABILITY is the ability to do required jobs well with a minimum of supervision.	Requires close supervision; is unreliable.	Sometimes requires prompting.	Usually takes care of necessary tasks and completes with reasonable promptness.	Requires little supervision; is reliable.	Requires absolute minimum of supervision.
ATTENDANCE is maintaining an acceptable attendance record.	Often absent and/or late without good excuse.	Lax in attendance and/or reporting for work on time without good excuse.	Usually conforms to work hours and maintains an average attendance record.	Conforms to work hours and maintains a good attendance record.	Always conforms to work hours and maintains an excellent attendance record.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS means willingness and ability to cooperate and communicate with co-workers, subordinates, supervisors/managers, customers, and other outside contacts.	Little or no cooperation; poor communication skills.	Reluctance to cooperate and communicate.	Usually communicates and cooperates.	Always willing to cooperate and communicate.	Inspires cooperative spirit and practices pro-active communication.
CREATIVITY is talent for having new ideas, for finding new and better ways of doing things and for being imaginative.	Rarely has a new idea; is unimaginative.	Occasionally comes up with a new idea.	Has average imagination; has reasonable number of new ideas.	Frequently suggests new ways of doing things; is very imaginative.	Continually seeks new and better ways of doing things; is extremely imaginative.
HOUSEKEEPING is the orderliness and cleanliness in which an individual keeps his/her work area.	Disorderly or untidy.	Some tendency to be careless and untidy.	Ordinarily keeps work area fairly neat.	Quite conscientious about neatness and cleanliness.	Unusually neat, clean and orderly.
COURTESY is the polite attention an individual gives other people.	Blunt; discourteous; antagonistic.	Sometimes tactless.	Agreeable and pleasant.	Always very polite and willing to help.	Inspiring to others in being courteous and very pleasant.
OVERALL EVALUATION in comparison with other employees with the same length of service on this job.	Definitely unsatisfactory.	Substandard but making progress.	Doing an average job.	Definitely above average.	Outstanding.

COMMENTS

Major weak points are—

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

and these can be strengthened by doing the following:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Major strong points are—

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

and these can be used more effectively by doing the following:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Rated by _____ _____
(Name) *(Title)*

EMPLOYEE'S COMMENTS

(After you have reviewed this form and discussed it with your supervisor, please state your comments regarding this evaluation. If you have no comments please state "none.")

❑ I agree with this evaluation. ❑ I disagree with this evaluation.

Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix B
Georgia Career and Combination Fire Departments

ADEL FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 1530	ADEL	31620
ALBANY FIRE DEPT.	320 NORTH JACKSON STREET	ALBANY	31701
ALMA-BACON CO. FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 429	ALMA	31510
ALPHARETTA FIRE DEPT.	2970 WEBB BRIDGE RD	ALPHARETTA	30004
AMERICUS FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES	119 SOUTH LEE STREET	AMERICUS	31709
ASHBURN FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES	P.O. BOX 766	ASHBURN	31714
ATHENS-CLARKE CO. FIRE DEPT.	700 COLLEGE AVENUE	ATHENS	30601
ATLANTA FIRE RESCUE DEPT.	675 PONCE DE LEON Ave. NE STE.2001	ATLANTA	30308
AUGUSTA FIRE DEPT.	3117 DEANS BRIDGE RD	AUGUSTA	30906
AUSTELL FIRE DEPT.	2716 BROAD STREET	AUSTELL	30106
BAINBRIDGE DPS	P. O. BOX 481	BAINBRIDGE	39818
BALDWIN (CITY OF) FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 247	BALDWIN	30511
BALDWIN CO. FIRE RESCUE	312 ALLEN MEMORIAL DRIVE	MILLEDGEVILLE	31061
BANKS CO. FIRE & EMS DEPT.	155 YONAH-HOMER ROAD	HOMER	30547
BARNESVILLE FIRE DEPT.	111 FORSYTH STREET	BARNESVILLE	30204
BARROW CO. FIRE DEPT.	233 EAST BROAD STREET	WINDER	30680
BARTOW CO. FIRE DEPT.	5435 HWY 20, NE	CARTERSVILLE	30121
BLAKELY FIRE DEPT.	12667 MAGNOLIA STREET	BLAKELY	39823
BREMEN FIRE DEPT.	516B TALAPOOSA STREET EAST	BREMEN	30110
BRUNSWICK FIRE DEPT.	1201 GLOUCESTER STREET	BRUNSWICK	31520
BRYAN COUNTY FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 430	PEMBROKE	31321
BURKE CO. EMR. SERV.	277 HIGHWAY 24 SOUTH	WAYNESBORO	30830
BUTTS CO. FIRE DEPT.	625 THIRD STREET SUITE 14	JACKSON	30233
BYRON FIRE DEPARTMENT	P. O. BOX 129	BYRON	31008
CAIRO FIRE DEPT.	555 SECOND AVENUE SE	CAIRO	39828
CALHOUN FIRE DEPT.	P.O.BOX 248	CALHOUN	30703
CAMDEN CO. FIRE & RESCUE	125 NORTH GROSS ROAD	KINGSLAND	31548
CAMILLA FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 328	CAMILLA	31730
CANTON FIRE DEPT.	190 WEST MAIN STREET	CANTON	30114
CARROLL CO. FIRE & RESCUE	P.O. BOX 338	CARROLLTON	30117
CARROLLTON FIRE DEPT.	115 WEST CENTER STREET	CARROLLTON	30117
CARTERSVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 1390	CARTERSVILLE	30120
CATOOSA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT	800 LAFAYETTE ST	RINGGOLD	30736
CEDARTOWN FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 45	CEDARTOWN	30125
CENTERVILLE FIRE DEPT.	101 MILLER COURT	CENTERVILLE	31028
CENTRAL FIRE DEPARTMENT	P. O. BOX 920	THOMASVILLE	31799
CHATSWORTH FIRE DEPT.	P.O.BOX 516	CHATSWORTH	30705
CHATTAHOOCHEE HILL COUNTRY	6505 RICO RD STE A	PALMETTO	30268
CHEROKEE CO. FIRE & RESCUE	150 CHATTIN DRIVE	CANTON	30115
CLARKESVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 21	CLARKESVILLE	30523
CLAYTON CO. FIRE AND EMERGENCY SVCS.	7810 HIGHWAY 85	RIVERDALE	30274
COBB COUNTY FIRE DEPT.	1595 COUNTY SERVICES PARKWAY	MARIETTA	30008
COCHRAN-BLECKLEY FIRE DEPT.	202 FIRST STREET	COCHRAN	31014
COFFEE CO. FIRE DEPT.	941 MAHOGANY ROAD	DOUGLAS	31533
COLLEGE PARK FIRE DEPT.	3737 COLLEGE STREET	COLLEGE PARK	30337
COLUMBUS DEPT. OF FIRE & EMS	510 10TH STREET	COLUMBUS	31901
CORDELE FIRE DEPT.	509 NORTH 7TH ST	CORDELE	31015
CORNELIA FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 785	CORNELIA	30531

COVINGTON FIRE DEPT.	2101 PACE STREET	COVINGTON	30014
COWETA CO. FIRE DEPT.	483 TURKEY CREEK RD	NEWNAN	30263
CRISP CO. FIRE & RESCUE	112 EDDIE ROAD	CORDELE	31015
CUTHBERT FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 100	CUTHBERT	39840
DALTON FIRE DEPT.	404 SCHOOL STREET	DALTON	30720
DAWSON CO. EMERGENCY SERVICES	393 MEMORY LANE	DAWSONVILLE	30534
DAWSON FIRE DEPT.	308 NORTH MAIN STREET	DAWSON	39842
DECATUR (CITY OF) FIRE DEPT.	230 EAST TRINITY PLACE	DECATUR	30030
DECATUR CO. FIRE & RESCUE	404 FOURTH RAMP	BAINBRIDGE	39817
DEKALB CO. FIRE & RESCUE	1950 WEST EXCHANGE PL	TUCKER	30084
DONALSONVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 308	DONALSONVILLE	39845
DOUGLAS (CITY OF) FIRE DEPT.	306 EAST CHERRY STREET	DOUGLAS	31533
DOUGLAS CO. FIRE DEPT.	8700 HOSPITAL DRIVE	DOUGLASVILLE	30134
DUBLIN FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 690	DUBLIN	31040
EAST DUBLIN FIRE DEPT.	119 SOPERTON AVENUE	EAST DUBLIN	31027
EAST POINT FIRE DEPT.	2727 EAST POINT STREET	EAST POINT	30344
EASTMAN FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 40	EASTMAN	31023
EFFINGHAM FIRE RESCUE	601 N. LAUREL STREET	SPRINGFIELD	31329
ELBERTON FIRE DEPT.	203 ELBERT STREET	ELBERTON	30635
FAYETTE CO. FIRE DEPT.	140 STONEWALL AVE. W. SUITE 214	FAYETTEVILLE	30214
FAYETTEVILLE FIRE DEPT.	95 JOHNSON AVENUE	FAYETTEVILLE	30214
FITZGERALD FIRE DEPT.	315 EAST PINE STREET	FITZGERALD	31750
FOREST PARK FIRE DEPT.	4539 JONESBORO ROAD	FOREST PARK	30297
FORSYTH (CITY OF) FIRE DEPARTMENT	P.O. BOX 1447	FORSYTH	31029
FORSYTH CO. FIRE DEPT.	3520 SETTENDOWN ROAD	CUMMING	30040
FORT VALLEY FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 956	FORT VALLEY	31030
FULTON CO. FIRE DEPT.	3977 AVIATION CIRCLE	ATLANTA	30336
GAINESVILLE FIRE DEPT.	118 JESSIE JEWELL PARKWAY, SE	GAINESVILLE	30501
GARDEN CITY FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 7103	GARDEN CITY	31408
GILMER CO. FIRE DEPT.	325 HOWARD SIMMONS RD	ELLIJAY	30540
GLYNN CO. FIRE DEPT.	121 PUBLIC SAFETY BLVD	BRUNSWICK	31525
GORDON CO. FIRE DEPT.	400 BELWOOD RD, SE	CALHOUN	30701
GRIFFIN FIRE DEPT.	401 NORTH EXPRESSWAY	GRIFFIN	30223
GROVETOWN DPS	306 E. ROBINSON AVENUE	GROVETOWN	30813
GWINNETT CO. FIRE & EMERGENCY SVCS	408 HURRICANE SHOALS ROAD NE	LAWRENCEVILLE	30045
HABERSHAM CO. FIRE DEPT.	4263 HOLLYWOOD HWY	CLARKESVILLE	30523
HALL CO. FIRE SERVICES	P.O. BOX 907730	GAINESVILLE	30501
HAPEVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O.BOX 82311	HAPEVILLE	30354
HARALSON CO. FIRE DEPT.	3997 Hwy 120 W.	BUCHANAN	30113
HART COUNTY FIRE DEPT.	800 CHANDLER STREET	HARTWELL	30643
HARTWELL FIRE DEPT.	500 EAST HOWELL STREET	HARTWELL	30643
HAWKINSVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 475	HAWKINSVILLE	31036
HAZLEHURST - JEFF DAVIS CO. FIRE & RESCUE	31 PAT DIXON ROAD	HAZLEHURST	31539
HEARD CO. EMR. SERVICES	PO BOX 490	FRANKLIN	30217
HENRY CO. FIRE DEPT.	110 S ZACK HINTON PKW	MCDONOUGH	30253
HEPHZIBAH FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 250	HEPHZIBAH	30815
HINESVILLE FIRE DEPT.	103 LIBERTY STREET	HINESVILLE	31313
HOUSTON CO. FIRE DEPT.	200 CARL VINSON PARKWAY	WARNER ROBINS	31088
JACKSON FIRE DEPT.	PO BX 838	JACKSON	30233
JASPER FIRE DEPT.	277 BURTON STREET	JASPER	30143

JEKYLL ISLAND FIRE DEPT	200 STABLE ROAD	JEKYLL ISL.	31527
JESUP FIRE DEPT.	411 WEST BAY ST	JESUP	31545
JOHNS CREEK FIRE DEPT.	12000 FINDLEY ROAD, SUITE 400	JOHNS CREEK	30097
KINGSLAND FIRE RESCUE	P.O. BOX 250	KINGSLAND	31548
LAFAYETTE FIRE DEPT.	208 NORTH MAIN STREET	LAFAYETTE	30728
LAGRANGE FIRE DEPT.	PO BOX 430	LAGRANGE	30241
LAMAR CO. FIRE & RESCUE	118 ACADEMY DRIVE, SUITE E	BARNESVILLE	30204
LAURENS CO. FIRE DEPT.	650 COUNTY FARM ROAD	DUBLIN	31021
LEE CO. FIRE DEPT.	342 LESLIE HIGHWAY	LEESBURG	31763
LOGANVILLE FIRE DEPT.	605 TOM BREWER ROAD SUITE 103	LOGANVILLE	30052
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN FIRE DEPT.	1214 LULA LAKE ROAD	LOOKOUT MTN	30750
LOUISVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 527	LOUISVILLE	30434
LOWNDES CO. FIRE - RESCUE	2981 US HWY 84 E	VALDOSTA	31606
LUMPKIN CO. VFD	57A PINETREE WAY, S.E.	DAHLONEGA	30564
LYONS FIRE DEPT.	109 SOUTH LANIER STREET	LYONS	30436
MACON-BIBB CO. FIRE DEPT.	1191 FIRST STREET	MACON	31201
MANCHESTER FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 366	MANCHESTER	31816
MARIETTA FIRE & EMR SERVICES	112 HAYNES STREET	MARIETTA	30060
MARTINEZ-COLUMBIA FIRE RESCUE	P. O. BOX 204231	MARTINEZ	30917
MCDONOUGH FIRE DEPT.	88 KEYS FERRY STREET	MCDONOUGH	30253
MCDUFFIE CO. FIRE DEPT.	1061 SALEM RD SE	THOMSON	30824
MCRAE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 157	MCRAE	31058
MILLEDGEVILLE FIRE DEPT.	201 WEST THOMAS ST.	MILLEDGEVILLE	31061
MILLEN-JENKINS CO. FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 929	MILLEN	30442
MILTON (CITY OF) FIRE - RESCUE DEPT	13000 DEERFIELD PARKWAY, STE 107F	MILTON	30004
MONROE CO. EMR. SERVICES	507 MONTPELIER AVE	FORSYTH	31029
MONTEZUMA FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES	P. O. BOX 388	MONTEZUMA	31063
MORGAN CO FIRE DEPT. HEADQUARTERS	1640 Mission Road	MADISON	30650
MORROW FIRE DEPT.	1500 MORROW ROAD	MORROW	30260
MOULTRIE FIRE DEPT.	26 SECOND AVENUE, NE	MOULTRIE	31768
MURRAY CO FIRE DEPT.	810 G.I.MADDOX PARKWAY	CHATSWORTH	30705
NASHVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 495	NASHVILLE	31639
NEWNAN FIRE DEPT.	23 JEFFERSON STREET	NEWNAN	30263
NEWTON CO. FIRE DEPT.	PO BOX 987	OXFORD	30054
OCILLA FIRE RESCUE	216 E. FIFTH ST.	OCILLA	31774
OCONEE CO. FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 732	WATKINSVILLE	30677
PAULDING CO. FIRE - RESCUE	535 SEABOARD AVENUE	HIRAM	30141
PEACH CO. FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 570	FORT VALLEY	31030
PEACHTREE CITY FIRE DEPT.	105 PEACHTREE PKWY, N	PEACHTREE CITY	30269
PELHAM FIRE DEPT.	333 W. RAILROAD STREET S	PELHAM	31779
PERRY FIRE DEPT.	P. O.BOX 2030	PERRY	31069
PICKENS CO FIRE & RESCUE SERVICES	1266 EAST CHURCH ST.	JASPER	30143
POOLER FIRE & RESCUE	100 SW U.S. HWY. 80	POOLER	31322
PUTNAM CO. FIRE DEPT.	882 OAK STREET	EATONTON	31024
QUITMAN FIRE DEPT.	205 SOUTH MADISON STREET	QUITMAN	31643
RICHMOND HILL FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 250	RICHMOND HILL	31324
RIVERDALE FIRE DEPT.	782 ORME STREET	RIVERDALE	30274
ROCKDALE CO. FIRE DEPT.	1496 ROCKBRIDGE RD NW	CONYERS	30012
ROCKMART FIRE DEPT.	651 GOODYEAR AVENUE	ROCKMART	30153
ROME FIRE DEPT.	617 WEST 1ST STREET	ROME	30161
ROSSVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 159	ROSSVILLE	30741

ROSWELL FIRE & RESCUE	1810 HEMBREE ROAD	ALPHARETTA	30004
SANDERSVILLE FIRE DEPT.	125 WARTHEN STREET	SANDERSVILLE	31082
SANDY SPRINGS FD	7840 ROSWELL RD, BLDG 500	SANDY SPRINGS	30350
SAVANNAH FIRE & EMER. SERVICES	121 E. OGLETHORPE AVENUE	SAVANNAH	31401
SCREVEN COUNTY FIRE DEPT.	618 FRONTAGE ROAD WEST	SYLVANIA	30467
SMYRNA FIRE DEPT.	2620 ATLANTA ROAD	SMYRNA	30080
SOCIAL CIRCLE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 310	SOCIAL CIR.	30025
SOUTHSIDE FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 13250	SAVANNAH	31416
SPALDING CO. FIRE DEPT.	600 CARVER RD	GRIFFIN	30224
ST. MARYS FIRE DEPT.	201 N. DANDY STREET	ST. MARYS	31558
STATESBORO FIRE DEPT.	1533 FAIR ROAD	STATESBORO	30458
SUMMERVILLE FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 180	SUMMERVILLE	30747
SWAINSBORO FIRE DEPT.	115 EAST MORING STREET	SWAINSBORO	30401
SYLVANIA FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 555	SYLVANIA	30467
SYLVESTER FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 370	SYLVESTER	31791
TALLAPOOSA FIRE DEPT.	16 EAST LIPHAM STREET	TALLAPO0SA	30176
THOMAS CO FIRE RESCUE	P. O. BOX 920	THOMASVILLE	31799
THOMASTON FIRE DEPT.	121 W. THOMPSON ST	THOMASTON	30286
THOMASVILLE FIRE RESCUE	100 S. CRAWFORD STREET	THOMASVILLE	31792
THOMSON FIRE DEPT.	228 MCCOMMONS STREET	THOMSON	30824
TIFTON-TIFT COUNTY FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 229	TIFTON	31794
TOCCOA FIRE DEPT.	61 COLONIAL DR	TOCCOA	30577
TROUP CO. FIRE DEPT.	2471 HAMILTON ROAD	LAGRANGE	30241
UNION CITY FIRE BUREAU	5060 UNION STREET	UNION CITY	30291
UNION CO. FIRE DEPT.	771 SHOE FACTORY ROAD	BLAIRSVILLE	30512
VALDOSTA FIRE DEPT.	106 SOUTH OAK STREET	VALDOSTA	31601
VIDALIA FIRE DEPT.	1415 AIMWELL ROAD	VIDALIA	30474
WALKER CO. EMR. SERVICES	P.O. BOX 130	CHICKAMAUGA	30707
WALTON CO. FIRE RESCUE	303 SOUTH HAMMOND DRIVE	MONROE	30655
WARE CO. FIRE-RESCUE	3395 HARRIS ROAD, SUITE 200	WAYCROSS	31503
WARNER ROBINS FIRE DEPT.	P. O. BOX 1488	WARNER ROBINS	31093
WASHINGTON FIRE DEPT.	212 COURT STREET	WASHINGTON	30673
WAYCROSS FIRE DEPT.	1820 MARY STREET	WAYCROSS	31503
WAYNESBORO FIRE DEPT.	628 MYRICK STREET	WAYNESBORO	30830
WEST JACKSON FIRE DEPT	69 WEST JACKSON RD	BRASELTON	30517
WEST POINT FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 487	WEST POINT	31833
WHITE CO. FIRE DEPT.	1241 HELEN HIGHWAY, SUITE 140	CLEVELAND	30528
WHITFIELD CO. FIRE DEPT.	804 PROFESSIONAL BLVD.	DALTON	30720
WINDER FIRE DEPT.	96 NORTH BROAD STREET	WINDER	30680
WOODSTOCK FIRE & RESCUE	225 ARNOLDMILL ROAD	WOODSTOCK	30188
WORTH CO. FIRE DEPT.	203 EAST WILLINGHAM STREET	SYLVESTER	31791
WRENS FIRE DEPT.	P.O. BOX 125	WRENS	30833
WRIGHTSVILLE FIRE DEPT.	298 EAST COLLEGE STREET	WRIGHTSVILLE	31096

Appendix C
Georgia Fire Departments Survey

Hello:You are asked to participate in my survey regarding the types of employee performance evaluations being utilized by other fire departments. In this survey, approximately 200 people representing all career and combination fire departments in Georgia will be asked to complete a survey that asks questions about the specific employee performance evaluation process utilized by each department. The questionnaire consists of 18 multiple choice questions and will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point. Your survey responses will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be coded and will remain confidential. If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact Andrew Dykes by email at adykes@monroega.gov.Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start with the survey now by clicking on the Continue button below.

What is the classification of your department?

- ❑ Career
- ❑ Combination

How many full time uniformed personnel are employed by your department?

- ❑ 1-50
- ❑ 51-100
- ❑ 101-150
- ❑ 151-200
- ❑ 200+

Does your department conduct performance evaluations on uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

How often are performance evaluations performed on uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Quarterly
- ❑ Bi annually
- ❑ Yearly
- ❑ Other

How old is the current performance evaluation process utilized by your department?

- ❑ 1-5 years
- ❑ 6-10 years
- ❑ 10+ years
- ❑ Unknown

Do all departments (police, public works, etc.) under your governing body utilize the same evaluation form to evaluate employee performance?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Are employee evaluations utilized in the promotion process within your department?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Are employee evaluations utilized to increase employee pay (merit based pay system)?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department establish the criteria utilized for the evaluation of uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize a job description to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize graphic rating scales to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize the critical incident method to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize the ranking appraisal system to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize behaviorally anchored rating scales to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize management by objectives to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize total quality management to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Does your department utilize 360 degree evaluations to evaluate uniformed personnel?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Do the performance evaluations administered by your department produce results that are accurate and consistent with the uniformed personnels actual job performance?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Appendix D
Letter to Georgia Chiefs

Since 1821
THE CITY OF Monroe

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Post Office Box 1249 • 139 South Madison Avenue • Monroe, Georgia 30655
Telephone 770-267-4446 • Fax 770-267-4579

April 15, 2010

Dear Chief:

I am writing to request your help with an important project. As a student in the National Fire Academy's Executive Fire Officer Program I am required to complete an applied research project. As a part of this research, I am conducting a survey of career and combination fire departments in Georgia to ask about their employee performance evaluation process.

You were selected to be part of this project because you are registered as a career or combination fire department with Georgia Firefighter Standards and Training Council. I know that you are extremely busy, but I hope that you (or a designee) will take just a little time to participate in this brief web survey that I have created. The 18 question survey is designed to address the research question: How do other fire departments conduct employee performance evaluations?

To complete the survey online, please go to **http://DykesARP.questionpro.com** and enter the password **EDR123** to access the survey. The survey should only take approximately 10 minutes to complete and will be available online until May 8, 2010.

Your participation is voluntary and answers will be completely confidential. The results of the survey will be reported in a summary format, so again no one will link you to your responses.

In addition to the online survey, I am also compiling examples of fire service specific performance evaluations. I would greatly appreciate a copy of a fire service specific performance evaluation if your department has developed such a tool. Hard copies may be submitted to the address above or electronic files may be submitted to the email address listed below.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this important project. If you have any questions about the survey or data request, please contact me at 770-267-4446 or adykes@monroega.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Dykes, MS
Lieutenant

Appendix E
City of Monroe Fire Department Firefighter Job Description

SOP 15 G: JOB DESCRIPTION
Issued: 01/01/08

Position Title: Firefighter
Department: Fire
Class Code:
Pay Grade: 58
FLSA Status: Nonexempt
Established: January 2001
Revised: August 2008 (Approved 9/9/08 by City Council)

SUMMARY:

This is a Shift-Level Position (works 24/48 schedule) that is responsible for protecting lives and property endangered by fires and other emergency situations.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Primarily concerned with emergency and non-emergency activities to include fire suppression, emergency medical rescue, fire prevention and the life safety/education/planning/enforcement components of Fire operations. Performs general life, safety and property conservation efforts at fires, medical emergencies, physical entrapments to include motor vehicle crashes; and at natural and man-made disasters including hazardous materials incidents as assigned.

- Protection of life and property through safe and effective fire suppression techniques inclusive of hose stream application, water supply, forcible entry tools and equipment, ladders, extrication, rescue and building searches, salvage and overhaul functions, ventilation, etc. Refer to NFPA 1001 for further specific skills.
- Assists in performing scheduled mechanical inspection of all fire, medical and other equipment carried on the units assigned to them. Assists with replenishment, replacement, and/or repairs of these items as required. Shall document and notify the appropriate authorities of any mechanical or operational defects found during vehicle or equipment inspection.
- Operates City vehicles in a safe and lawful manner at all times. Abides by Department policy concerning use of emergency vehicles.
- Participates in the following evolutions as directed:
- Community service/special details.
- Training (classroom/practical) as assigned by the company officer and directives.
- General minor repair/maintenance of equipment and facilities.
- Maintains cleanliness of vehicles and facilities.
- Performs fire safety inspections as part of the fire company.
- At all times represents the department in a professional, courteous, and considerate manner when dealing with fellow employees, other municipalities, City or private agencies, the public, City officials or superiors within the department.
- Performs all department activities in a safety-conscious manner and utilizes universal precautions on all medical emergencies.
- Performs all other tasks and/or duties as required or assigned within the skills/abilities of the firefighter.

by the Company Officer. This documentation shall include, but not limited to, patient medical reports and State fire reports.
· Is expected to report to all training, meetings and paged off-duty calls.
· Performs any and all duties as assigned by the Shift Officer on Duty, Department Chief, City Administrator and City Council.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES:

This job has no supervisory responsibilities.

QUALIFICATIONS:

To perform in this position successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.
· Citizen of the United States of America.
· Certified by Georgia Firefighters Standards and Training Council.
· Current Georgia Firefighting Certificate of Compliance.
Per Georgia Firefighter Standards & Training Council – and/or O.C.G.A. 25-4-8, Qualifications are as follows:
· Must be at least 18 years of age.
· Not have been convicted of a felony in any jurisdiction within ten years prior to employment/appointment.
· Have good moral character as determined by investigation under procedure approved by the council.
· Be fingerprinted and a search made of local, state, and national fingerprint files to disclose any criminal record.
· Be in good physical condition as determined by a medical examination and successfully pass the minimum physical agility requirements as established by the council.
· Possess or achieve within 12 months after employment/appointment a high school diploma or general education development equivalency.
· Complete the Georgia Basic Firefighter Training Course approved by Council and verified by successful completion of the State Firefighter Certification Test.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE:

As stated above under qualifications, must possess or achieve within 12 months after employment/appointment a high-school diploma or general education development equivalency.

LANGUAGE SKILLS:

Ability to read and interpret documents such as safety rules, operating and maintenance instructions and procedure manuals. Ability to write routine reports and correspondence.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS:

Ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide in all units of measure, using whole numbers, common fractions, and decimals.

REASONING ABILITY:

Ability to solve practical problems and deal with a variety of concrete variables in situations where only limited standardization exists. Ability to interpret a variety of instructions furnished in written, oral, diagram, or schedule form.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS:

- Current Georgia Firefighting Certificate of Compliance
- Current Georgia First Responder (Medical) Certification
- Current Basic Cardiac Life Support (CPR)
- Valid Class B Noncommercial Driver's License or better

PHYSICAL DEMANDS:

The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this position. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions. While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to use hands to finger, handle or feel and talk or hear. The employee frequently is required to stand, walk, sit and reach with hands and arms. The employee is occasionally required to climb or balance; stoop, kneel, crouch, or crawl; and taste or smell. The employee must frequently lift/carrying twenty five (25) pounds to one hundred, twenty five (125) pounds; occasionally assisting lifting/carrying up to five hundred (500) pounds. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, color vision, peripheral vision, depth perception and ability to adjust focus.

WORK ENVIRONMENT:

The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this position. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions. Work under physically demanding conditions and in potentially hazardous, confined and/or stressful situations. The work is performed inside a fire station and outside at fire scenes. The employee is exposed to noise, dirt, machinery with moving parts, heat, smoke, irritating chemicals, and occasional inclement weather. The work requires the use of protective clothing and devices.

SELECTION GUIDELINES:

Formal application, rating of education and experience, oral interview and reference check; must meet physical standards test, and other related tests may be required. Drug screen required. Hire is subject to criminal history investigation.

Appendix F
MFD Perception Survey

Performance evaluations should be performed on each employee.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The employee performance evaluation is effective in assessing my strengths and weaknesses.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The employee performance evaluation is an important tool to assist in my professional development.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The employee performance evaluation currently used effectively evaluates my job based on the job description of my position.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Annual merit increases in salary correlate with the annual performance evaluation (lower scoring evaluations receive less monetary compensation than higher scoring evaluations).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The employee performance evaluation should be included in the promotional process for employees.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

I know what is expected of me in my current job position.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The employee performance evaluation is fair and is based on my performance in my current job duties.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The current employee performance evaluation is more subjective (opinion of the employee) than objective (observation of employee performance).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

My supervisor rates all employees "average" rather than low or high to prevent controversy among employees.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Performing well in one aspect of my job or being liked by my supervisor will result in a positive evaluation in all areas of the employee performance evaluation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Performing poorly in one aspect of my job or being disliked by my supervisor will result in a negative evaluation in all areas of the employee performance evaluation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

The current employee performance evaluation should be revised to meet the needs of the fire service.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

An annual performance evaluation meeting with my supervisor is sufficient to outline what is expected of me for the next year.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

My performance evaluation would be identical if my performance was evaluated by a supervisor from another shift (evaluations consistent among all supervisors).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Appendix G
MFD Revised Evaluation Survey

Which of the following elements utilized in the CURRENT employee performance evaluation should be included in a revised employee performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Job Knowledge
- ❑ Quantity of Work
- ❑ Drive
- ❑ Performance Under Pressure
- ❑ Accuracy
- ❑ Dependability
- ❑ Attendance
- ❑ Interpersonal Relationships
- ❑ Creativity
- ❑ Housekeeping
- ❑ Courtesy

Which of the ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Performs emergency and non-emergency activities to include fire suppression, emergency medical rescue, fire prevention, and life safety/education/planning/enforcement components of fire operations.
- ❑ Performs general life, safety, and property conservation efforts at fires, medical emergencies, physical entrapments to include motor vehicle crashes; and at natural and man-made disasters including hazardous materials incidents as assigned.
- ❑ Protection of life and property through safe and effective fire suppression techniques inclusive of hose stream application, water supply, forcible entry tools and equipment, ladders, extrication, rescue and building searches, salvage and overhaul functions, ventilation, etc. Refer to NFPA 1001 for further specific skills.
- ❑ Assists in performing scheduled mechanical inspection of all fire, medical, and other equipment carried on the units assigned to them.
- ❑ Assists with replenishment, replacement, and/or repairs of fire, medical, and other equipment as required.
- ❑ Documents and notifies the appropriate authorities of any mechanical or operational defects found during vehicle or equipment inspection.
- ❑ Operates city vehicles in a safe and lawful manner at all times.
- ❑ Abides by department policy concerning the use of emergency vehicles.
- ❑ Participates in community service and/or special details.
- ❑ Participates in training (classroom/practical) as assigned by the company officer.
- ❑ Participates in general minor repair/maintenance of vehicles and facilities.

- ❑ Maintains cleanliness of vehicles and facilities.
- ❑ Performs fire safety inspections as a part of the fire company.
- ❑ At all times represents the department in a professional, courteous, and considerate manner.
- ❑ Performs all department activities in a safety-conscious manner and utilizes universal precautions on all medical emergencies.
- ❑ Performs all other tasks and/or duties as required or assigned within the skills/abilities of the firefighter.
- ❑ Assists in the completion of proper documentation of fire and EMS calls, as directed by the company officer.
- ❑ Reports to all training, meetings, and off-duty calls.
- ❑ Performs any and all duties as assigned by the shift officer, Chief, City Administrator, and City Council.

Which of the LANGUAGE SKILLS found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Ability to read and interpret documents such as safety rules, operating and maintenance instructions, and procedure manuals.
- ❑ Ability to write routine reports and correspondence.

Which of the MATHEMATICAL SKILLS found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide.

Which of the REASONING ABILITIES found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Ability to solve practical problems and deal with a variety of concrete variables in situations where only limited standardization exists.
- ❑ Ability to interpret a variety of instructions furnished in written, oral, diagram, or schedule form.

Which of the PHYSICAL DEMANDS found in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Stand
- ❑ Walk
- ❑ Sit

- ❑ Reach with hands and arms
- ❑ Climb or balance
- ❑ Stoop
- ❑ Kneel
- ❑ Crouch
- ❑ Crawl
- ❑ Taste
- ❑ Smell
- ❑ Vision
- ❑ Lift 25 to 125 pounds
- ❑ Assist lifting/carrying up to 500 pounds

Which of the following elements NOT INCLUDED in the firefighter job description should be utilized in a revised performance evaluation? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Knowledge of departmental standard operating procedures.
- ❑ Knowledge of response territory.
- ❑ Knowledge of apparatus and equipment operation.

Should actions above and beyond those required for the current job position be included in the employee performance evaluation.

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

Please indicate any pertinent elements of the firefighters job that should be included in the employee performance evaluation. If you do not have an addition, please respond with N/A.

Appendix H
Memo to Shift Captains

Memo

Date: 4/15/2010

To: Captain Dial, Captain Fonda, Captain Owens

Cc:

From: Lt. Dykes

RE: Request for Participation in EFO Survey

I am conducting research on employee performance evaluations as a part of my Executive Fire Officer applied research project. Please distribute the following survey access information to your personnel. The surveys pertain to the current performance evaluation that is utilized and also that characteristics that personnel would like to see in an ideal performance evaluation. These surveys are designed for current full time personnel that have gone through the performance evaluation in the past with our department.

Each survey should only take a few minutes and the results are completely anonymous. Please take each survey once and respond honestly to the questions being asked.

The surveys may be accessed at the following websites.

Survey 1: http://MFD1.questionpro.com Password: MFD1

Survey 2: http://MFD2.questionpro.com Password: MFD2

Please contact me ASAP if you have any questions.

AMD