

Running head: THE NEED TO ACCURATELY EVALUATE FIRE PROTECTION
INTERNSHIP CANDIDATES

The Need to Accurately Evaluate Fire Protection Internship Candidates

Executive Development

Jeremy J. Hansen

Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, Wisconsin
Town of Grand Chute Fire Department, Grand Chute, Wisconsin

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, expression, or writings of others.

Signed: _____

Abstract

The problem was fire departments that participated in the Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) fire protection internship program expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of criteria based guidance given to evaluate fire protection internship candidates. The purpose of the research was to determine the components of an evaluation tool for fire departments to utilize when evaluating FVTC fire protection internship candidates.

Action research was selected to guide the following four research questions: (a) what are the components that should be evaluated during the FVTC fire protection internship, (b) what components do the fire departments that participate in the FVTC fire protection internship think should be included in an evaluation tool, (c) what successful evaluation tools already exist internally for other FVTC programs and externally by organizations that offer similar programs, and (d) what components should be contained within a draft evaluation tool for comprehensive candidate evaluation. The procedure used by the author included a literature review and personal interviews from both internal and external organizations. Results indicated the components of a performance evaluation tool should include all expected activities of the candidate. The research indicated training for the supervisor and the candidate was equally important. To provide the most comprehensive evaluation possible, the performance evaluation tool should be a combination of a rubric, comment section, and self-evaluation. Interviews from both internal and external organizations found this to be a successful combination. Based on the data obtained during the literature review and interviews, a draft performance evaluation was created. Recommendations included obtaining approval from the Fire Protection Technician Advisory Committee, developing a training program for those

individuals who will be using the performance evaluation tool, informing the candidates of the evaluation criteria, and revisiting the document after one year to evaluate the tool's effectiveness.

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Table of Contents	5
Introduction	7
Background and Significance	7
Literature Review	11
Procedures	21
Results	26
Discussion	35
Recommendations	38
References	41
Appendix A Participating fire department interview questions	44
Appendix B Internal and external interview questions	45
Appendix C Phone interview with Captain Kevin Kloehn	46
Appendix D Phone interview with Lieutenant Kevin Gerarden	48
Appendix E Phone interview with Captain Shannon Young	50
Appendix F Phone interview with Carrie Thompson	52
Appendix G Phone interview with Greg Delaney	53
Appendix H Phone interview with Dr. Ann Jadin	55
Appendix I Phone interview with Marcy Bruflat	56
Appendix J Phone interview with Gary Schenck	58
Appendix K Phone interview with Edward Whittington	60
Appendix L Interview through email with Greg Burroughs	61

Appendix M	Fire Protection Technician Program Outcome Summary	62
Appendix N	Fire Protection Internship Course Outcome Summary	63
Appendix O	DRAFT - Fire Protection Internship Performance Evaluation	66

Introduction

Since 1976, Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) has required students to perform an internship as part of the two year associate degree in Fire Protection Technician. The internship allows students to get actual on-the-job training along with a better understanding of how they will be expected to perform as a career firefighter. However, performance is evaluated differently depending on which fire department they are interning with.

The problem is fire departments that participated in the FVTC fire protection internship program expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of criteria based guidance given to evaluate fire protection internship candidates.

The purpose of the research is to determine and produce the components of an evaluation tool for fire departments to utilize when evaluating FVTC fire protection internship candidates. Action Research has been selected to answer the following four research questions: (a) what are the components that should be evaluated during the FVTC fire protection internship, (b) what components do the fire departments that participate in the FVTC fire protection internship think should be included in an evaluation tool, (c) what successful evaluation tools already exist internally for other FVTC programs and externally by organizations that offer similar programs, and (d) what components should be contained within a draft evaluation tool for comprehensive candidate evaluation.

Background and Significance

Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) is located in the Fox River Valley region of Wisconsin, one of the largest and fastest growing urban centers in the state, and

supports many nationally and internationally known corporations and businesses. The Fox Cities are located in eastern Wisconsin, approximately 100 miles north of Milwaukee and 30 miles south of Green Bay.

FVTC provides post-secondary and continuing adult education to a five county district. It had a service population of 455,565 in fiscal year 2009 (Fox Valley Technical College, 2009). FVTC provides educational experiences to approximately 50,000 students per year and has over 200 different programs. At the completion of course work, a student could receive a certificate of completion or a diploma. The adopted operating costs for FVTC are \$105,394,629 for FY2009-2010 (Fox Valley Technical College, 2009). The total operating budget is funded 51% by tuition and grants and 49% by property taxes and investments. FVTC has approximately 860 employees which includes management, full-time and part-time faculty, and support staff. Adjunct staff members are not counted in the total number of employees. However, with adjunct staff FVTC's employees number nearly 3,000.

One of the educational areas within FVTC is the Fire Protection department. It is managed by a Department Chair. The Department Chair reports to the Associate Dean of Business and Health Services Division. The Fire Protection Department Chair manages and advises 438 students who are in the Fire Protection Technician associate degree and approximately 2,100 students who take continuing adult education opportunities relating to firefighting. The Fire Protection department has three full-time staff, including the Department Chair, four part-time staff, and 65 adjunct staff. The annual operating budget for the Fire Protection department is approximately \$700,000.

The Neenah Fire Training Center, located in Neenah, Wisconsin, is a satellite campus approximately 11 miles from the main campus. It is a 7,000 square foot building that is attached to Neenah/Menasha Fire-Rescue Station 31. The fire training center has two classrooms that allow FVTC to send classes via interactive television (ITV) to four other colleges throughout Wisconsin. The training ground is approximately six acres. It has a 3-story burn building and 4-story tower used for class A fires, ground ladder and ventilation training props, a tanker and drum field for hazardous materials training, and a flashover simulator. FVTC has a confined space simulator and a gas field containing a car, forklift, residential and industrial gas meters, and underground vault used for live fire training.

The associate degree training provided by FVTC is held at the Neenah Fire Training Center. The two-year program is 69 credits and was used as the model for state-wide curriculum in 2006. The associate degree program covers all aspects of firefighting training including prevention and inspection, investigation, fire protection systems, hazardous materials, fire department history, tradition and future trends, building construction, basic and advanced firefighting skills, hydraulics, and technical rescue. The program also requires Emergency Medical Technician – Basic and a semester-long internship with a full-time fire department.

The student internship program began in 1976. The Town of Grand Chute and the City of Oshkosh were the first internship sites; over time, additional fire departments throughout the Fox Valley were added. As of spring 2010, twelve fire departments across the state regularly participate in the Fire Protection Internship program.

During the internship, students are assigned to a shift on their respective fire departments. The students are expected to participate in the normal 24-hour shift rotation schedule, excluding class schedules, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Thursday – Sunday, one week in March referred to as Spring Break, and the July 4th recess. Interns are expected to attend their shifts during weekends and are not allowed to leave for their full- or part-time employment. If a student needs to be off for a day, it is the student's responsibility to make a shift trade with another interning student or arrange a time with the supervisor to make up the hours. Each student receives a formal mid-term and final evaluation by the assigned supervisor.

Fire protection intern candidates have had performance evaluations, formal or informal, since 1976 when the program began. However, the evaluation process had no guidance of expected performance and no way of tracking accomplishments. Supervisors were largely subjective with their evaluation. In the past, significant difference appeared between supervisors who were on different shifts at the same department. The issue was only compounded when candidates were at multiple stations on the same department and/or different departments across the state. Identifying a specific set of components to measure could improve consistency and accuracy when evaluating the student's performance.

This research relates directly to the pre-course reading of *Leadership on the Line* for the Executive Development course. The successful evaluation of fire protection interns is an adaptive challenge. According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002), adaptive challenges require experiments, new discoveries, and adjustments from several places within the organization and communities. Additionally, the Executive Development

course teaches students to be proactive, to seek out problems before they become one. The proactive task can be accomplished by using the A.P.I.E. (analyze, plan, initiate, and evaluate) model for proactive change management (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], 2006).

This research ultimately relates to the United States Fire Administration's Operational Goals and Objectives. Goal number five states, "Lead the Nation's fire and emergency services by establishing and sustaining United States Fire Administration as a dynamic organization" (United States Fire Administration, 2009, p. 15). This goal is further supported by objective 5.1, "maintain a positive work environment to ensure the organization's well-being and productivity, and 5.2 "continuously improve our business systems and processes" (United States Fire Administration, 2009, p. 15).

Literature Review

A literature review was conducted to summarize what others have already published relating to evaluating individuals within an organization. The main objective of the literature review was to gain a comprehensive understanding of the subject. The literature review assisted with answering the research questions. The author reviewed countless documents, narrowing the scope to the findings of the research problem and to the intent of this research. This review examined professional trade publications, books, the internet, government documents, and prior research on the subject of performance evaluations. Research for the literature review was conducted at the National Emergency Training Center's Learning Resource Center located in Emmittsburg, Maryland, and the Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) library located in Appleton, Wisconsin.

Why should an organization conduct performance evaluations? Aurnhammer (1996) writes, “the most important resources are the people who work for the organization; because an organization would have a hard time providing service with just cash and a lot of equipment” (para. 6). The human factor is the most critical factor in the organization’s ability to provide service to its customers. A key method of managing the workplace climate, and the service being provided, is to ensure the candidates are receiving accurate and timely feedback relating to their performance (Alexon, 2002). Performance evaluations are common place throughout private industry and full-time government positions. However, evaluations are seldom done on volunteer or paid-on-call fire departments (Alexon, 2002). One of the most important factors affecting candidates’ engagement, productivity, and effectiveness in their profession, is knowing the expectations of them at work (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009). Accurately measuring performance at the individual level is important to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the organization’s workforce (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009).

How can organizational personnel be effectively evaluated? Regardless of the type of evaluations used, the process needs to have support from the very top of the organization (Alexon, 2002). Decision-makers within the organizations need to agree on a common series of measurements that accurately represent the acceptable performance at the situational or individual performance level (Hebert, 2010). During the formal evaluation process, having guidelines to follow will help ensure all supervisors and candidates understand performance expectations (Aurnhammer, 1996). The performance

evaluation should be completed by a supervisor who works with and sees the candidate every day (Clark, 1999).

In 1999, Clark's study of performance evaluation on firefighters found that if the performance evaluation is being used for probationary firefighters, it should be done four times within the first year: during the third month, sixth month, and ninth month of employment, followed by a year-end evaluation. For each individual, multiple evaluations should be completed. To get the most complete performance evaluation, the firefighters should be allowed to evaluate each other and themselves as well as the evaluation performed by their supervisor (Clark, 1999). When presented to the individual the scores should be tabulated and broken into the three categories that completed the evaluations. The final number should result from all of the scores averaged together.

In the article *How to Manage for Results and Improve the Performance Evaluation Process*, Mulder (2003) suggested that the individuals who will be conducting the evaluation must be trained for that task. Most individuals who do performance evaluations do not do them correctly because they have never been training adequately. Alexon (2002) believes the lack of training can lead to program ineffectiveness and possible legal problems, not to mention distrust toward the program.

The program must be fair. A fair program means those who are being evaluated understand why they are being evaluated, what factors are included in the evaluations, what criteria they are judged against, and how the results of the evaluation are used in the future (Alexon, 2002). Aurnhammer (1996) explains, the evaluation of organizational members serves three basic functions within the fire service:

1. To inform individuals how they are doing, and how their supervisors perceive their performance.
2. To give the supervisor an objective method of looking at individual performance. Thus, lessening the potential for subjective personal preferences.
3. To identify and correct deficient behaviors.

The process must be based largely upon clearly communicated performance expectations. The expectations must be linked to the individuals' job description, organizational rules and regulations, operational guidelines, and strategic plans (Touchstone, 2009). Ludwig (2008) suggested that individuals involved in the process, particularly those who the evaluations are being performed on, may have concerns with confidentiality, how the evaluations will be used and what follow up can be anticipated.

The process needs to evaluate the total performance throughout the entire rating period. The evaluator should avoid basing the evaluation on a single significant success or failure (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009). Candidates should be evaluated against their results and the way they achieved them. Washington University in St. Louis (2009), strongly suggested the evaluator take into account the individual's performance and how it affected other candidates. If performance was high, but done in a way that angered or demoralized co-workers, than that must be considered. Results that have counterproductive side effects are not sustainable for organizational success. There is a possibility for candidate to be helpful, considerate, and effective, but never achieve any important results; this too must be considered (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009).

How the evaluation is conducted is just as important as what evaluation tool is used. The meeting between the individual and the supervisor is the most important part of the process (Alexon, 2002). The evaluation process should serve as a stimulus for better communication between the supervisor and the candidate (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009). When performing an evaluation, Aurnhammer (1996) suggested locating a secluded, comfortable, and neutral place for the formal appraisal. A positive environment will help lower the individual's apprehension and make the process feel less like a personal attack. In the article *Professional Development: Part 5 – Performance Evaluation*, Touchstone (2009) suggested the performance evaluation process begins with a description of the position. In their studies, Aurnhammer (1996) and Clark (1999) discussed that advanced notice should be given to the individual, especially if a portion of the performance evaluation process involves a self-evaluation. Prior to the formal evaluation, the candidate should be given the self-evaluation form to review and complete. The self-evaluation should contain the same criteria and rating system as the one completed by the supervisor along with space for comments.

Aurnhammer (1996) and Washington University in St. Louis (2009) both agree that the evaluation process should accentuate the positive, yet include the negative aspects of the individual's performance. The focus of the evaluation should be on the job, not the person. The process should include two-way communications surrounding the individual's improved performance and even career development. Alexon (2002) believes the supervisor should take every opportunity to praise good performance and call attention to areas where improvement is needed. When discussing areas of improvement,

discuss methods of how improvement can be accomplished (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009).

Throughout the year, supervisors and candidates should have ongoing conversations relating to performance (Lesley University, 2010). This continual source of feedback provides candidates with an understanding of their performance level. The evaluation should not be the first time a candidate is notified of deficient behavior or performance goals that have not been met (Alexon, 2002; Aurnhammer, 1996).

Enough time should be allotted to discuss the positive and negative performance points. Differences and similarities between the supervisor's and the candidate's evaluations must be discussed (Alexon, 2002). When discussing negative points and differences, Aurnhammer (1996) suggested the supervisor must be prepared to give constructive criticism, and be prepared to handle negative reactions.

At the conclusion of the evaluation the supervisor should summarize the important points of the discussion. Any action statement, and the time frame to complete it, should be reemphasized. Allow time for the candidate to ask questions. The evaluation process should reveal areas where additional training or professional development is needed in order to benefit the organization (Ludwig, 2008). The evaluation process allows the individual and the supervisor to create a plan towards future good performance (Alexon, 2002). Lastly, the supervisor and candidate sign the evaluation form (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009). An effective performance evaluation is part of an on-going process. The supervisor should perform a follow-up at least three months after the evaluation to see how plans are proceeding. An article written at Washington University of St. Louis (2009) suggested that a good supervisor

will offer assistance to helping the candidate achieve performance objectives. It is important for the supervisor to track progress toward the specific goals established during the evaluation.

The performance evaluation tool used during the process can affect the success of the entire program. There is not one form that is universally appropriate to evaluate all ranks or job classifications (Gerspach, 1988). A generic evaluation form, used for all individuals regardless of rank, tends to lead to “pencil-whipping” because it does not specifically address what is significant to a particular position (Aurnhammer, 1996). An instructional performance review document produced by the University of Tennessee Knoxville (2005) stated that a performance evaluation form should be able to record the individual’s accomplishments in the areas of service and relationships; accountability and dependability; adaptability and flexibility; and critical decision making. The form needs to be easy and simple. Complicated forms, or a rating system that is not user friendly, can lead to errors in the process (Alexon, 2002). According to Gerspach (1988), there are five basic formats for performance evaluations:

1. Performance Essay – Requires the evaluator to develop an extensive narrative.

This type of evaluation is used when performance tasks are not well defined or performed on a routine basis. The evaluation is based on the organization’s mission statement or broad goals.

2. Critical Incident Analysis – Focuses on single significant incidents rather than daily activities. The major disadvantage to this format is the evaluator tends to remember only the most recent events.

3. Forced Choice – Requires the evaluator to make a statement that the individual is performing at some pre-designated level. The scope is usually not broad enough to provide a clear picture of the candidate's performance.
4. Forced Distribution – Follows the bell curve. Similar to the Forced Choice format, this format is not broad enough and does not have a clear definition of what constitutes acceptable performance.
5. Graphic Scale – Requires the evaluator to indicate the individual's performance on a numbered statement of relativity. Each scale calls for a specific performance factor to be rated on a sliding scale that has a defined rating statements. The graphic scale is supported by an area where the evaluator can make comments.

The fire service and emergency medical services often go hand-in-hand as a career. Many medical professionals utilize the S.O.A.P (Subjective, Objective, Assessment, Plan) acronym when writing emergency medical services narratives. Hiraki (2010) argues this acronym, with some minor modification, can also be used for performance evaluation. The S.O.A.P (Situation, Objective, Assessment, Plan) process would include:

1. Situation – What activity did the individual perform in relationship to the assignment or performance expectation?
2. Objective – What activity was observed, what evidence was present, and what evidence was received?
3. Assessment – What was the impact of the individual's performance?
4. Plan – What measures have been installed to ensure future performances will have positive outcomes?

Gerspach (1988) stated that a majority of the performance evaluations forms found within the fire service are the graphic scale and the performance essay formats. Together these two formats work quite well. The performance evaluation forms and/or tools used in the program should be based on the job description. This would include the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary for minimum competency in each of the areas (Alexon, 2002).

Each different type of performance evaluation has advantages and disadvantages. When creating an evaluation tool, Lesley University (2010) suggests that supervisors and candidates should aim to define S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable/Attainable, Result Oriented and Time Bound) goals and objectives when it comes to candidate performance.

1. Specific: What needs to be accomplished?
2. Measurable: How will completion of the desired outcomes be accomplished?
3. Achievable/Attainable: Is the outcome within the individual's ability to accomplish?
4. Result Oriented: How do the outcomes produce results?
5. Time Bound: When will the individual reach the desired outcome?

When developing a tool specific to an organization, it is advantageous to utilize the positive aspects of various forms and eliminate the negative (Gerspach, 1988). Alexon (2002) stated that evaluation form needs to be tailored toward the expectations of the job. The form must allow for space where comments can be written by the supervisor and the individuals being evaluated (Alexon, 2002). The comments section of the evaluation tool can be used for setting future benchmarks, for improving behavior, or goals and

objectives for professional growth activities. The tool should focus on the individual's behavior rather than personal characteristics (Alexon, 2002). Hiraki (2010) mentions the importance of taking time to observe the individual prior to completing an evaluation. The supervisor should look for both good and bad elements of performance. The evaluator should be very objective and only evaluate based on the behavior that is observed. The narrative itself needs to be concise. Concise reports are easier to read and understand.

Hebert (2010) asked the question, "How can we affect meaningful change without some way to measure performance?" (para. 8). There are many good reasons for conducting performance evaluations including improving individual performance, increasing motivation, and identifying organizational or individual training needs (Hiraki, 2010). The Lesley University's Human Resources' web page lists six benefits to performing performance evaluations:

1. Develop the skills and abilities consistent with the goals of the organization.
2. Improved performance production.
3. Maximizes equality in evaluation, recognition, and compensation.
4. Improve communication and understanding between supervisor and candidate.
5. Individual development for future promotions.
6. Provide supervisors with a model to develop, improve, and recognize performance excellence (Lesley, 2010).

In the article *Personnel Evaluations – Are We Being Effective*, Aurnhammer (1996) states that performance evaluations can benefit the organization, the supervisor, and the individual. From the organization's standpoint, the evaluation process minimizes

marginal performance and assists with identifying training needs, both which assist with improving services to the customers. From the perspective of the supervisor, the evaluation can provide a better understanding of the candidate (Aurnhammer, 1996). The evaluation process can give information about the individual's life outside the work environment. Family, friends, and outside activities have the potential to affect work performance. The individual benefits in several ways from receiving a performance evaluation. Most importantly, Alexon (2002) and Aurnhammer (1996) agree, individuals will have a better understanding of where they stand within the organization. This is very important for the security, ego, and well-being.

As Aurnhammer (1996) states, the personnel are the organization's best assets. A successful evaluation program consists of more than just sitting down and talking. A performance evaluation program can assist with letting individuals know what is expected and where they stand within the organization (Lesley, 2010). The format chosen by the organization can help guide and mentor with setting expected performance benchmarks. The evaluation process can document exceptional behavior and correct the negative. A successful performance evaluation program can affect the individual's overall engagement, productivity, and effectiveness within the organization and foster communication between the supervisor and candidate (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009).

Procedures

The procedures used to meet the goals of this research were built on the APIE (Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation) change model. An executive analysis of the fire protection internship program determined there was an issue with the

evaluation of fire protection internship candidates. The problem statement, “the problem was fire departments that participated in the FVTC fire protection internship program expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of criteria based guidance given to evaluate fire protection internship candidates,” was created to drive the research.

During the planning process to mitigate the identified problem, a vision or purpose statement of change was developed. The purpose statement, the purpose of the research is to determine the components of an evaluation tool for fire departments to utilize when evaluating FVTC fire protection internship candidates, was developed to answer the question of what was expected to be accomplished during the research. More specifically, four questions were developed to identify particular areas to be addressed: (a) what are the components that should be evaluated during the FVTC fire protection internship, (b) what components do the fire departments that participate in the FVTC fire protection internship think should be included in an evaluation tool, (c) what successful evaluation tools already exist internally for other FVTC programs and externally by organizations that offer similar programs, and (d) what components should be contained within a draft evaluation tool for comprehensive candidate evaluation. Action Research was selected to guide the questions.

Interviews were implemented as a method of gathering information about the performance evaluation process. An in-depth analysis of the problem statement, purpose statement, and research questions was performed to develop two sets of interview questions. The first set of interview questions was created for fire departments that currently participate in the fire protection technician internship (Appendix A). The second set of questions was created to gather information from internal and external

sources (Appendix B). Internal sources consisted of other programs offered at FVTC that have an internship as part of the degree requirements. The external sources consisted of other colleges within the State of Wisconsin and across the United States that offered a similar fire protection program.

A phone interview was conducted with Kevin Kloehn, Captain, Neenah/Menasha Fire Department (NMFD), Neenah, Wisconsin on April 20, 2010 (Appendix C). Captain Kloehn was selected for this research due to his longtime involvement as the internship program coordinator for his fire department.

A phone interview was conducted with Kevin Gerarden, Lieutenant, Oshkosh Fire Department (OFD), Oshkosh, Wisconsin on April 20, 2010 (Appendix D). The OFD has participated in the FVTC internship program since 1977. Since 1977, OFD has been the most requested internship site.

A phone interview was conducted with Shannon Young, Captain, Appleton Fire Department (AFD), Appleton, Wisconsin on April 20, 2010 (Appendix E). Captain Young and the AFD were selected for two reasons. First, Captain Young is an adjunct staff member for FVTC and serves as the college's internship coordinator for the twelve fire departments that participate in the internship program. Secondly, the AFD averages six interns per semester. The AFD has participated in the program since the early 1980s and has been a supporter of the technical college.

A phone interview was conducted with Carrie Thompson, Department Chair of Nursing, Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, Wisconsin on April 23, 2010 (Appendix F). The Associate Degree of Nursing (ADN) program was selected

specifically for the clinical requirements of the program. The nursing program requires a combination of interpersonal dynamics and hands-on skills for successful completion.

A phone interview was conducted with Greg Delaney, Department Chair and Lead Instructor for the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Program (ADOA), Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, Wisconsin on April 23, 2010 (Appendix G). The ADOA program was selected based on the strong interpersonal dynamics requirement of the program's internship.

A phone interview was conducted with Dr. Ann Jadin, faculty member within the Occupational Therapy Program (OTP), Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, Wisconsin on April 23, 2010 (Appendix H). Dr. Jadin and the OTP was selected for two reasons. First, within the OTP, a combination of interpersonal dynamics and hands-on skills are required for successful completion of the program. Second, Dr. Jadin is a clinical site advisor for the students. She has extensive experience with the evaluation of clinical students.

A phone interview was performed with Marcy Bruflat, Fire Coordinator, Chippewa Valley Technical College (CVTC), Eau Claire, Wisconsin on April 19, 2010 (Appendix I). CVTC was selected to help determine the components of a performance evaluation. CVTC has a program that is similar to FVTC. CVTC has a 436-hour internship that includes fire and emergency medical service (EMS) skills. Both the fire fighting and EMS disciplines require a lot of knowledge, skill, and ability to do them correctly.

A phone interview was conducted with Gary Schenck, Fire Coordinator, Blackhawk Technical College (BTC), Janesville, Wisconsin on April 19, 2010 (Appendix

J). BTC was selected to help determine the components of a performance evaluation. BTC is part of the Wisconsin State-wide Fire Protection Technician associate degree curriculum. The author of this applied research project assumed BTC had an internship as part of their college's curriculum. However, during the interview it was determined that BTC does not have an internship program as part of its associate degree. The interview was completed in full and information gathered from the fire coordinator was utilized in this research paper.

A phone interview was conducted with Edward Whittington, Fire Science Program Coordinator, Rock Valley College, Rock Valley, Illinois on April 26, 2010 (Appendix K). An internet search was performed using the keywords "fire protection internship." Several colleges were identified. Rock Valley College was selected because it was outside of Wisconsin and had an internship requirement.

An interview was conducted through email with Greg Burroughs, Instructor, Southeast Community College, Lincoln, Nebraska on April 27, 2010 (Appendix L). An internet search was performed using the keywords "fire protection internship." Several colleges were identified. Southeast Community College was selected because it was outside of Wisconsin and had an internship elective within their fire training program.

The evaluation step of the APIE change model will be used in the future to measure the results of this research. Follow-up interviews will be conducted with the fire departments that use the evaluation tool to measure its effectiveness. The evaluation of the performance evaluation tool will be mentioned again in the recommendation section of this applied research project.

Limitations

There are possible limitations with this research. The evaluation components listed in this research document are based on the opinions of the individuals interviewed. Information gathered during the interviews assumed the individuals had the requisite knowledge to accurately respond to each question. It was assumed the individuals interviewed gave the necessary time to fully answer the interview questions and provided an accurate account of what their organization used during evaluations. Finding internship programs similar to what FVTC offers proved to be difficult. The internship offered by FVTC appears to be much more rigorous than other college requirements. The author contacted additional colleges in Connecticut, Illinois, Texas, Nebraska, and Virginia multiple times over a three-week period with no response to phone calls or email. With the exception of Nebraska, all of the individuals or organizations interviewed are from the Midwest region of the United States.

Results

Research Question 1: What are the components that should be evaluated during the FVTC fire protection internship? The evaluation process should not reveal new information. Student should have a fair idea of how they are performing most of the time (Aurnhammer, 1996). Throughout the year, candidates and company officers should have ongoing conversations related to performance (Lesley University, 2010). Alexon (2002) believes the supervisor should take every opportunity to praise good performance and call attention to areas where improvement is needed. Aurnhammer (1996) and Washington University in St. Louis (2009) both agree, the evaluation process should accentuate the positive, yet include the negative aspects of the individual's performance.

Candidates should be evaluated on their ability to complete the tasks and assignments given to them by their supervisor, along with work ethics and behavior (G. Burroughs, personal communication, April 27, 2010). Individuals should be evaluated against their results and the way they achieved them. Washington University in St. Louis (2009), strongly suggests the evaluator take into account the candidate's performance and how it affected others. If performance was high, but done in a way that angered or demoralized others, that must be taken in account. Results that have counterproductive side effects are not sustainable for organizational success. There is a possibility for a candidate to be helpful, considerate, and effective, but never achieve any important results (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009).

Captain Young believes everything an internship candidate could possibly be asked to do should be included in the evaluation. This would include things like personal dynamics, conflict resolution, appearance, maturity level, communication skills, and overall job performance (personal communication, April 20, 2010). Captain Kloehn (personal communication, April 20, 2010) suggested the evaluation process needs to weigh heavily on the candidate's self motivation and initiative. Lieutenant Gerarden (personal communication, April 20, 2010) agrees, the evaluation should include the candidate's attitude; customer service and interpersonal skills; and written and verbal communication.

Candidates must be evaluated on how well they complete routine station duties and how well they perform on an emergency incident (K. Gerarden, personal communication, April 20, 2010). Internship candidates at Chippewa Valley Technical College use a check sheet that contains all of the basic firefighting skills. The check

sheet allows the company officer to see what skills have been successfully performed throughout the semester (M. Bruflat, personal communication, April 19, 2010).

Additionally, candidates should be required to produce a journal detailing what they learned about the organization and the profession (G. Burroughs, personal communication, April 27, 2010). Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010) believes the candidate is at the internship site to learn, so if the candidate's skills are not up to par it is the responsibility of the company officer to work on the hands-on skills, including physical fitness. Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010) is less concerned with the skill level of candidates as she is with their ability to learn. Part of the evaluation should contain a test of mechanical aptitude and how well the candidate completes the internship responsibilities (E. Whittington, personal communication, April 26, 2010). At the conclusion of the internship, final skills verification should be used to determine if the candidate has retained the information (S. Young, personal communication, April 20, 2010).

Research Question 2: What components do the fire departments that participate in the FVTC fire protection internship think should be included in an evaluation tool? There are many components that should be included in an internship evaluation tool. Training the evaluators to properly use the tool must not be forgotten. Interviews with fire departments that participate in the FVTC internship program found training may be lacking on how to properly complete a performance evaluation. Captain Kloehn has been an internship coordinator for thirteen years (personal communication, April 20, 2010). During his time as the internship coordinator, he did not recall receiving any training on how to properly complete performance evaluations for the internship candidates (K.

Kloehn, personal communication, April 20, 2010). K. Gerarden (personal communication, April 20, 2010), stated that a few years ago, when an internal fire department evaluation process was created, all of the officers had an orientation on the procedure and forms. The third interview conducted was the most revealing as to the need for training of those who are expected to complete performance evaluations. Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010), gave an example where a full-time probationary firefighter was terminated after 17 ½ months of an 18-month probationary period. Captain Young explained, the first indications of a problem with the candidate should not be two weeks before the candidate's probation is completed. Since this example, training has been conducted on how to properly perform a performance evaluation on members of her fire department (S. Young, personal communication, April 20, 2010).

Results from all three of the interviews indicated the internship candidate's evaluation needs to be completed by the respective supervisor/company officer. Captain Kloehn and Captain Young both described a process where the performance evaluation is completed by the next higher rank (K. Kloehn, personal communication, April 20, 2010; S. Young, personal communication, April 20, 2010). The company officers performed the evaluation on their firefighters and engineers, captains performed the evaluation on the lieutenants, and chief officers on the captains. The City of Oshkosh has a slightly different approach. Lieutenant Gerarden (personal communication, April 20, 2010) explained, the company officers switch shifts every four months. This allows each company officer to work on all three shifts during the year. During the annual evaluation process, all three company officers collaborate on the performance evaluations for the

firefighters and engineers. The collaboration between officers reduced the bias one officer could have for a particular individual and assisted with ensuring the evaluation was measuring the performance throughout the entire year, not one particular positive or negative event (K. Gerarden, personal communication, April 20, 2010).

Rubric can be used to standardize the evaluation process and make the process equal from one shift to another (K. Kloehn, personal communication, April 20, 2010). Lieutenant Gerarden (personal communication, April 20, 2010) believes a rubric can be used to measure expected performance. During the interview, Lieutenant Gerarden expressed that he believes a rubric-style evaluation is the best performance measuring tool (K. Gerarden, personal communication, April 20, 2010). Narrative and comment sections are useful to express concerns and complements about the candidate (K. Kloehn, personal communication, April 20, 2010). Captain Kloehn (personal communication, April 20, 2010) stated, the self-evaluation component assists with identifying how the student perceived their own skills and how the candidate feels about the fire department. Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010) believes the evaluation tool needs to be as comprehensive as possible; this would include a combination of rubric, narrative, comment section, and self-evaluation.

Research Question 3: What successful evaluation tools already exist internally for other FVTC programs and externally by organizations that offer similar programs? C. Thompson (personal communication, April 23, 2010), Department Chair for the FVTC Nursing program, recommends the evaluation tool be tied to the program outcomes. The student should demonstrate competency in all areas related to the program outcomes. Each program outcome must have a set of criteria that can be used to determine if the

outcome has been met (C. Thompson, personal communication, April 23, 2010).

Instructor Burroughs would agree. He stated assignments need to be related to the learning objectives of the course. Candidates should be evaluated on how well they completed the assignments. Following the program outcomes allows candidates to know what is expected of them (G. Burroughs, personal communication, April 27, 2010).

In addition to program outcomes, G. Delaney (personal communication, April 23, 2010), Department Chair for the Alcohol and Other Drug Addictions (ADOA) program at FVTC, believes the evaluation form should also contain information related to specific professional standards. He recommended competent performance of essential skills and knowledge/utilization of equipment would be a minimum standard (G. Delaney, personal communication, April 23, 2010).

A majority of the organizations interviewed use a combination of the methods to perform the evaluations. Chippewa Valley Technical College in Eau Claire, Wisconsin uses an extensive performance evaluation process. The mentor performs a daily evaluation of the candidate and evaluates how well the student got along with the crew at the station. The candidate records a daily log of what they did. The candidate works on completing the skills check-off sheet, and each time the skill is completed the supervisor must sign off on it. This shows repetition of training. Each candidate has a formal evaluation half way through the internship. The final formal evaluation is on the last day of the internship. The candidate is required to write a paper on the experience (M. Bruflat, personal communication, April 19, 2010). Rock Valley College in Rockford, Illinois is very similar. Candidate must complete a daily log of their activities, attitude, and how they performed overall. The final grade is based on the daily logs and a ten-

page paper on what they learned during their internship (E. Wittington, personal communication, April 26, 2010). The AODA program uses a series of three site visits. Additional visits may occur if there are identified issues with the student (G. Delaney, personal communication, April 23, 2010). G. Delaney (personal communication, April 23, 2010) incorporates a rubric style scoring sheet and a comment or narrative section within the evaluation tool. Dr. Jadin (personal communication, April 23, 2010) uses a rubric scale to evaluate students in the Occupational Therapy program. According to E. Wittington (personal communication, April 26, 2010), a rubric works best for Rock Valley College because it allows students to have an idea of what is expected of them.

Research Question 4: What components should be contained within a draft evaluation tool for comprehensive candidate evaluation? Having guidelines to follow during the formal evaluation process will help ensure all supervisors and the internship candidates understand performance expectations (Aurnhammer, 1996). Gerspach (1988) stated a majority of the performance evaluation forms found within the fire service utilize the graphic scale and performance essay format. Together these two formats seem to work quite well. Most importantly, Alexon (2002) and Aurnhammer (1996) agree, candidates will have a better understanding of where they stand within the organization.

According to Alexon (2002), the evaluation form needs to be tailored towards the expectations of the job. The performance evaluation tool used in the program should be based on the job description. This would include the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary for minimum competency in each of the areas (Alexon, 2002). In addition to a job description, the tool can be linked to the organizational rules and regulations, operational guidelines, and strategic plans (Touchstone, 2009). The Fire Protection

Technician Program at FVTC has expected performance guidelines. Each program within the college has program outcomes listed for the associate degree. Program outcomes are an overview of what the student will be able to do at the completion of the program. G. Delaney (personal communication, April 23, 2010) recommended a list of competencies be provided to the on-site supervisors/mentors as a basis for evaluation. The development of a draft evaluation tool began with an analysis of the program's expected outcomes (Appendix M).

As in most cases, the program outcomes are very broad in nature. It was difficult to review the program outcomes and create a detailed performance evaluation. Courses within the Fire Protection Technician associate degree also have an individual course outcome summary (Appendix N). The individual course outcome summary contained greater detail of expected performance. This document was used while developing the performance evaluation tool.

To get the most complete performance evaluations, candidates should also be allowed to evaluate each other and themselves as well as the evaluations performed by their supervisor (Clark, 1999). In their studies Aurnhammer (1996) and Clark (1999) discussed that advance notice should be given to the individual, especially if a portion of the performance evaluation process involves a self-evaluation. Prior to the formal evaluation, the candidate should be given the self-evaluation form to review and complete. The self-evaluation should contain the same criteria and rating system as the one completed by the supervisor, along with space for comments. The self-evaluation is important to see what the candidates think of themselves and their fire departments (K. Kloehn, personal communication, April 20, 2010). In an interview with C. Thompson

(personal communication, April 23, 2010), she believes self-evaluation, journaling, and discussions with their mentor can be used to determine if candidates are meeting the program outcomes.

The performance evaluation needs to be a combination of narrative, rubric, comment sections, and self-evaluation to produce the most comprehensive evaluation of a student (S. Young, personal communication, April 20, 2010). A narrative alone is too subjective (G. Schenck, personal communication, April 19, 2010). In an interview with G. Schenck (personal communication April 19, 2010), he believes self-evaluations can assist with determining how the candidates views themselves. It can be used to see if it is in line with what others think. A rubric works well while the narrative could be too subjective (M. Bruflat, personal communication, April 19, 2010). The form must allow for space where comments can be written by the supervisor and the individual (Alexon, 2002). The comments section of the evaluation tool can be used for setting future benchmarks for improving behavior or goals and objectives for professional growth activities. The evaluation process allows the individual and the supervisor to create a plan for future good performance (Alexon, 2002).

The fire protection internship is the capstone course of the associate degree. The evaluation tool was linked back to the program outcomes. Course work throughout the two-year associate degree prepares the candidate to successfully complete the job requirements of a firefighter. Linking the performance evaluation tool back to expected performance will assist with identifying deficiencies within the fire protection program. A draft Fire Protection Internship Performance Evaluation tool (Appendix O) was created based on the results of the research questions. The Fire Protection Technician Program

Outcomes (FPT PO) were identified on each line of the performance evaluation. The numbers directly after the FPT PO relate to the expected performance of the program outcome.

Discussion

Since 1976, FVTC has required students to perform an internship as part of the two-year associate degree in Fire Protection Technician. The internship allows students to get actual on-the-job training along with a better understanding of how they will be expected to perform as a career firefighter. Formal or informal performance evaluations were completed on fire protection intern candidates since the program began. However, the evaluation process had no guidance of expected performance and no way of tracking accomplishments. Supervisors were largely subjective with their evaluations. In the past, significant difference appeared between supervisors who were on the same department but different shifts.

Mulder (2003) suggested, the individuals who will be conducting the evaluation must be trained for that task. Individuals who incorrectly complete performance evaluations do so because they have never been trained adequately. During his thirteen years as an internship coordinator, Captain Kloehn (personal communication, April 20, 2010) does not recall receiving any training how to properly complete a performance evaluation for the internship candidates. The need for performance evaluation training is strongly enforced by the example given by Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010), where a full-time probationary firefighter was terminated after 17 ½ months of an 18-month probationary period. The first indications of a problem should not be two weeks before the candidate's probation is completed. Since this example,

training has been conducted on how to properly complete a performance evaluation on members of her fire department (S. Young, personal communication, April 20, 2010).

The evaluation process should not reveal any new information to the candidate, meaning most of the time the candidate should have a fair idea of personal performance (Aurnhammer, 1996). Supervisors and candidates should have ongoing conversations throughout the year relating to performance (Lesley University, 2010). The supervisor should take every opportunity to praise good performance and call attention to areas where improvement is needed (Alexon, 2002). Ongoing open communication may have eliminated Captain Young's illustration from even occurring.

Alexon (2002) believes a fair program requires that those who are being evaluated understand what components are included in the evaluations and what criteria will they be judged against. The criteria must be linked to the job description, organizational rules and regulations, operational guidelines, and strategic plans (Touchstone, 2009). This would include the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary for minimum competency in each of the areas (Alexon, 2002). G. Burroughs (personal communication, April 27, 2010) suggested that candidates be evaluated on their ability to complete the tasks and assignments given to them by their supervisor, along with work ethics and behavior. Lieutenant Gerarden (personal communication, April 20, 2010) agrees, the evaluation should include the candidate's attitude; customer service and interpersonal skills; and written and verbal communication. It is the author's opinion that since a job description does not exist for fire protection students, the program outcomes can be the guide used for developing the evaluation tool. An interview with C.

Thompson supports the author's opinion. C. Thompson (personal communication, April 23, 2010) recommends the evaluation tool be tied to the program outcomes.

A majority of the performance evaluation forms found within the fire service utilize the graphic scale and performance essay formats. Together these two formats seem to work quite well (Gerspach, 1988). This idea of a multiple format approach is supported by the views of the interviewees. Captain Young (personal communication, April 20, 2010) believes the performance evaluation needs to be a combination of narrative, rubric, comment sections, and self-evaluation so that you are able to do the most comprehensive evaluation of a candidate. G. Delaney (personal communication, April 23, 2010) incorporates both a rubric style scoring sheet and a comment or narrative section within the evaluation tool. Additional support is provided by Rock Valley College. According to E. Whittington (personal communication, April 26, 2010), the rubric and comment section works best for their college because it allows candidates to have an idea of what is expected of them. The comments section of the evaluation tool can be used for setting future benchmarks for improving behavior or establishing goals and objectives for professional growth activities. The evaluation process allows the individual and the supervisor to create a plan for future good performance (Alexon, 2002).

The research indicated there is not one method that can solely be used to perform an accurate evaluation of fire service personnel. The research strongly suggests using an evaluation tool that incorporates several evaluation methods. It is the author's opinion that a rubric style assessment can be used to evaluate skills and expected performance, items normally found on a job description or within the program outcomes. A narrative

could be too subjective suggests M. Bruflat (personal communication, April 19, 2010). However, when used in conjunction with a rubric, the narrative can be used to discuss the evaluator's comments and set benchmarks for the individuals being evaluated. The self-assessment can be used in conjunction with the supervisor's assessment to determine if both the supervisor and the candidate have the same opinions on individual performance.

The self-evaluation should contain the same criteria and rating system as the one completed by the supervisor as well as with space for comments. G. Schenck (personal communication April 19, 2010), believes self-evaluations can assist with determining how candidates view themselves. Alexon (2002) and Aurnhammer (1996) agree, candidates will have a better understanding of what is expected of them and where they stand within the organization.

The results from this research vividly show the need for creating a performance evaluation tool that measures the level of expected performance. A successful performance evaluation program can affect the candidate's overall engagement, productivity, and effectiveness within the organization (Washington University in St. Louis, 2009). Ultimately, the evaluation tool has the ability to identify areas where fire protection internship candidates need additional instruction to better meet the program outcomes.

Recommendations

The following recommendations resulted from the research conducted on a way to complete performance evaluations on fire protection internship candidates. While this research looked into what components should be evaluated during an internship, what participating fire departments think should be included in a performance evaluation tool,

what successful tools already exist, and the components of a draft evaluation tool, the research indicates the following recommendations:

1. The performance evaluation tool needs to be supported from the very top of the organization (Alexon, 2002). The draft evaluation should be presented to the Fire Protection Technician Advisory Committee for approval.
2. Upon approval, a training program must be created. Mulder (2003) suggest that most individuals who conduct performance evaluations do not do them correctly because they have never been properly trained. The training program must be offered to all of the supervisors/company officers who will be filling out the performance evaluation forms. An emphasis must be placed on the benefit of the evaluation process and how it will be used for grading and benchmarking candidate and program performance.
3. The internship candidates must be made aware of the purpose of the performance evaluation tool before they begin their internship. Candidates need to be aware of the ways the evaluation will be used, emphasizing the benefits and grading implications. Candidates should also be presented with a copy of the performance evaluation, guaranteeing the criteria to which they will be held accountable for will not be a surprise.
4. The last recommendation is to complete the final part of the APIE change model, the evaluation phase. One year after the performance evaluation tool is implemented, and every few years thereafter, the evaluation tool should be evaluated for its effectiveness.

Future readers could assist with further development of the performance evaluation tool. The research led to the conclusion that an internship candidate performance evaluation would benefit from a firefighter skills check-off booklet. The individual firefighting skills check-off would only enhance the performance evaluation. It would provide documentation of what the candidate actually was able to perform during the internship. Study and research could be conducted on the components of the skills check-off booklet, along with a method for evaluating what would be considered an acceptable level of booklet completion. Also, a performance based practical skills test could be created that would allow the candidate to demonstrate skill proficiency.

References

- Alexon, D. (2002, January/February). Developing a performance appraisal program. *Minnesota Fire Chief*, 38(3), 37-38.
- Aurnhammer, T. W. (1996, August). Personnel evaluations – Are we being effective. *Fire Chief*, 40(3), (102-106).
- Clark, S. J. (1999). Performance evaluation for firefighters. *The Voice*, Oct, 12-13.
- FEMA. (2006). Executive Development Student Manual 3rd Edition. Washington D.C.: Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Fox Valley Technical College, Business, Health & Services Program Outcomes. (2007). *Fire Protection Technician Program Outcomes*. Retrieved from <http://www.fvtc.edu/public/content.aspx?ID=1667&PID=19>
- Fox Valley Technical College, Course Curriculum Summaries. (2010). *Program Curricula: 503 Fire Protection*. Retrieved from <https://intranet.fvtc.edu/resources/misc/coursecurriculumsummaries/Documents/Forms/Sorted%20by%20Course%20Numbers.aspx>
- Fox Valley Technical College, Financial Services. (2009). *2009 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)*. Retrieved from <https://intranet.fvtc.edu/adminservices/finservice/Documents/2009%20CAFR%20Fox%20Valley%20Tech%20College%20final.pdf>
- Fox Valley Technical College, Financial Services. (2009). *Fox Valley Technical College Adopted 2009-2010 Budget*. Retrieved from <https://intranet.fvtc.edu/adminservices/finservice/Documents/Budget%20Books/Budget%20Board%20Book%20final%20-Adopted.pdf>

- Gerspach, J. E. (1988). Performance evaluation formats. In Author, Employee performance evaluations: A “how to” process for fire and rescue service leaders (pp. 9-11, 30-43). Location: unknown.
- Hebert, P. C. (2010). Measuring performance is essential to patient-centered care. *Canadian Medical Association*, 182(3), 1. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1976389781&Fmt=3&clientId=13915&RQT=309&VName=PQD&cfc=1>
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). Leadership on the line. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Hiraki, R. (2010, February). Stepping up: Writing performance evaluations. *Fire Engineering*, 133(2). Retrieved from <http://www.fireengineering.com/index/articles/display/2165384941/articles/fire-engineering/leadership/admin/2010/02/stepping-up-writing-perform.html>
- Lesley University, Human Resources. (2010). *Performance Evaluation Program*. Retrieved from http://www.lesley.edu/hr/performance_evaluation_program.html
- Ludwig, G. (2008, Oct). Can you handle it? Using 360-degree evaluations to assess your leadership style. *JEMS*, 33(10), 32. Retrieved from http://www.jems.com/news_and_articles/articles/jems/3310/can_you_handle_it.html
- Mulder, E. R. (2003). How to manage for results and improve the performance evaluation process. *Journal of California Law Enforcement*, 37(2), 8-11.
- Touchstone, M. (2009, June). Professional development: Part 5 – Performance evaluation. *EMS Magazine*, 37(6). Retrieved from <http://license.icopyright.net/user/viewFreeUse.act?fuid=NzU2NDU3MQ%3D%3D>

- University of Tennessee Knoxville, Human Resources. (2005). *The University of Tennessee Performance Review Instruction Form*. Retrieved from <http://hr.utk.edu/performance-evaluation/>
- United States Fire Administration. (2009). *America's Fire and Emergency Service Leaders Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2009-2013*. Retrieved from http://www.usfa.dhs.gov/downloads/pdf/strategic_plan.pdf
- Washington University in St. Louis, Engineering Department. (2009). *Performance Evaluation Planning 2009 (Supervisors)*. Retrieved from [http://engineering.wustl.edu/contentfiles/otherfiles/performance%20evaluation%20planning%20checklist%20\(supervisor\).pdf](http://engineering.wustl.edu/contentfiles/otherfiles/performance%20evaluation%20planning%20checklist%20(supervisor).pdf)

Appendix A
Participating fire departments interview questions

Name:

Rank:

Organization:

Date:

Time:

1. How long have you been the fire protection internship coordinator for your fire department?
2. Are performance evaluations currently done on members of your fire department; excluding internship candidates?

Yes or No

3. Who is responsible for completing the performance evaluations on members of your fire department?
4. Are members of your fire department formally trained to complete performance evaluations?

Yes or No

5. Who is responsible for completing performance evaluations on fire protection internship candidates?
6. In your professional opinion, what components should be evaluated during the fire protection internship?
7. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

Appendix B
Personal interview with _____

Name:

Position:

Organization:

Date:

Time:

1. How long have you been in your current position?
2. Does your training program have an on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes or No
3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?
4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?
5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

Appendix C
Phone interview with Captain Kevin Kloehn

Name: Mr. Kevin Kloehn

Rank: Captain and FVTC Internship Coordinator

Organization: Neenah/Menasha Fire Department, Neenah, Wisconsin

Date: April 20, 2010

Time: 0951 hours

- 1. How long have you been the fire protection internship coordinator for your fire department?**

13 years

- 2. Are performance evaluations currently done on members of your fire department; excluding internship candidates?**

Yes, for about two years.

- 3. Who is responsible for completing the performance evaluations on members of your fire department?**

The company officers evaluate the firefighter and engineers. The shift commanders evaluate the company officers. The deputy chief evaluates the shift commanders. The assistant chief evaluates the deputy chief and the chief evaluates the assistant chief.

- 4. Are members of your fire department formally trained to complete performance evaluations?**

I don't recall any formal training; at least not when I [K. Kloehn] was working.

- 5. Who is responsible for completing performance evaluations on fire protection internship candidates?**

The company officer that is assigned to the intern will do the evaluation. It could be either a lieutenant or captain depending on the station and shift the intern is assigned to.

6. In your professional opinion, what components should be evaluated during the fire protection internship?

The performance evaluation process should focus around the candidate's motivation and initiative. The intern should be evaluated on whether they understand the vehicle they are assigned to and knowing the location of equipment and where to find it. The evaluation should weigh heavily on the interns self motivation.

7. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

It should be a combination of the types you [Author] mentioned. The rubric can be used to standardize the evaluation process and make the process equal from one shift to another. Comments are good to express concern with something specific or complement the intern if they are excelling in an area. The self-evaluation is important to see what the intern thinks about themselves and the fire department. This only works if the intern is honest about how they feel. The self-evaluation can be used to improve the internship program at our [Neenah/Menasha] department by identifying areas we need to improve.

Appendix D
Phone interview with Lieutenant Kevin Gerarden

Name: Mr. Kevin Gerarden

Rank: Lieutenant and FVTC Internship Coordinator

Organization: Oshkosh Fire Department, Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Date: April 20, 2010

Time: 1523 hours

- 1. How long have you been the fire protection internship coordinator for your fire department?**

3 years

- 2. Are performance evaluations currently done on members of your fire department; excluding internship candidates?**

Yes, annually.

- 3. Who is responsible for completing the performance evaluations on members of your fire department?**

The company officers meet annually to discuss the evaluation of the members. Lieutenants evaluate the firefighter and engineers. The captains evaluate the lieutenants. Chief officers evaluate the captains. The fire chief evaluates the chief officers. The officers get together to discuss what score should be given to each of the individuals who are being evaluated. They all agree what score is given.

- 4. Are members of your fire department formally trained to complete performance evaluations?**

Yes, a few years ago when the current system was implemented all of the officers had to attend an orientation session on the procedures and forms. Officers who were promoted after the system was implemented have not been given training.

- 5. Who is responsible for completing performance evaluations on fire protection internship candidates?**

The company officer the intern is assigned to completes the performance evaluation. Our officers rotate shift every four months so that each year they are

able to work with all of the crew assigned to that station. Depending on when the rotation occurs, one or more officers may collaborate to evaluate an intern.

6. In your professional opinion, what components should be evaluated during the fire protection internship?

The interns need to be evaluated on how well they complete routine station duties. They need to be evaluated on how well they perform tasks on emergency scenes. Additionally they need to be evaluated on their attitude, customer service and interpersonal dynamics and communications skills both verbal and written.

7. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

In my professional opinion rubric is the best measuring tool. Most interns do a “standard” job. Rubrics measure the standard performance. Our fire department [Oshkosh] uses performance above the standard, standard performance, and below standard performance. Anything that is checked above or below standard must have a comment explaining why the firefighter was marked above or below standard.

Appendix E
Phone interview with Captain Shannon Young

Name: Ms. Shannon Young

Rank: Captain and FVTC Internship Coordinator

Organization: Appleton Fire Department, Appleton, Wisconsin

Date: April 20, 2010

Time: 1647 hours

- 1. How long have you been the fire protection internship coordinator for your fire department?**

6 years

- 2. Are performance evaluations currently done on members of your fire department; excluding internship candidates?**

Yes, annually for all employees who are not on probation.

- 3. Who is responsible for completing the performance evaluations on members of your fire department?**

The company officers evaluate the firefighters and engineers. Both the firefighters and engineers do a self-evaluation as part of the process. Firefighters are on probation for 18 months. Probationary firefighters get evaluated at month five, eleven and seventeen. All of these also include a self-evaluation. All others are done annually with a self-evaluation.

- 4. Are members of your fire department formally trained to complete performance evaluations?**

Yes, there was some training after a probationary firefighter was terminated at month 17 ½ of an 18 month probationary period. Month 17 ½ should not be the first time a problem comes to light. Since then, training on how to correctly complete an evaluation form is standard for all those who complete the forms.

- 5. Who is responsible for completing performance evaluations on fire protection internship candidates?**

The company officer that is assigned to the intern will do the evaluation. This would include the officer's evaluation and a self-evaluation.

6. In your professional opinion, what components should be evaluated during the fire protection internship?

Everything...personal dynamics, conflict resolution, appearance, maturity level, communication skills, and job performance level. What is their skill level? Are they trainable? I [S. Young] am less concerned on their level of training as I am with are they trainable. If the candidate's skills are not up to par it is the responsibility of the company officer to work on them. We can teach them what they need to know, as long as they are able to process what they are being taught. Fitness level is also something that should be part of the student's evaluation. Knowing the job and performing the job are two completely different skill sets. Basically, they need to be evaluated on everything they are expected to do; and that's a lot of stuff.

7. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

It needs to be a combination of all so that you are able to do the most comprehensive evaluation of a student. What I [S. Young] would like to see is a final skills evaluation or check-off as part of the evaluation process. We would have a better idea if the student can repeat the expected job requirements.

Appendix F
Phone interview with Carrie Thompson

Name: Ms. Carrie Thompson

Position: Department Chair of Nursing

Organization: Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton Wisconsin

Date: April 23, 2010

Time: 1410 hours

1. How long have you been in your current position?

6 years.

2. Does your training program have an on the on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes. In Nursing we call it a preceptorship.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

I [C. Thompson] believe that during the preceptorship the student should demonstrate competence in all six of the program outcomes.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

The ADN Program has a clinical evaluation tool that measures the student's competence in each of the program outcomes. Under each competency, criteria is listed that can be evaluated to determine if the competency are met.

5. In your professional opinion, how should candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

I [C. Thompson] believe that the students should be evaluated to the outcomes of the program. I believe the final evaluation tool should be a rubric and multiple different assessment techniques could be utilized to determine if the competence have been met. I believe self-evaluation, journaling, and discussions with their mentor or faculty facilitator can all be used to determine if the student meets the program outcomes.

Appendix G
Phone interview with Greg Delaney

Name: Mr. Greg Delaney

Position: Department Chair and Lead Instructor, AODA Program

Organization: Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton Wisconsin

Date: April 23, 2010

Time: 1530hrs

1. How long have you been in your current position?

About five years as department chair, with another half year as acting department chair.

2. Does your training program have an on the on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

In the AODA program, the starting point of intern evaluation is the Program Outcomes approved by the Advisory Committee. These outcomes are achieved through student competence in twelve core functions of substance abuse counseling. The core functions are the basis for course design, improvement, and competencies. Additional standards for evaluation include areas of professional conduct, ethical beliefs, and personal/professional growth.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

Every intern has a faculty advisor who serves as an off-site mentor. There are three on-site evaluations completed during the period of time the learner is interning. These evaluations are completed by the learner and on-site supervisor prior to the faculty advisor's visit, and then shared with the advisor. Learners are included in the process from the beginning. The first evaluation takes place 1/3 of the way through internship, the second at the 2/3 point and the third evaluation upon completion of the internship. The evaluation forms refer to specific professional standards and core counseling functions. The first evaluation emphasizes knowledge of and familiarity with the site's professional standards and manifestations of the core functions. The second evaluation focuses on initial performance of the core functions and professional conduct. The third, and final

evaluation, is a measure of acquired competency in all these areas. The clinical supervisor, mentoring counselor(s), and learner all have input into the final evaluation. It is the expectation of the faculty that each intern will show job readiness by the time the internship is completed.

5. In your professional opinion, how should candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

I [D. Delaney] would recommend that competent performance of essential skills and knowledge/utilization of equipment would be a minimum standard. Assuming that an internship for these learners includes genuine on-the-job implementation of skills and knowledge, those responsible for on-site teaching and evaluation would be best suited to provide evaluation, provided that they are clear about the evaluation methods and standards. Some form of listed competencies would provide on-site supervisors/mentors with a basis for evaluation and also focal points for instruction/experiential efforts. We [ADOA program] use a numerical scale of 1-5 (1=inadequate, 2=major problems with this competency, 3=minor and correctable problems, 4=adequate, 5=surpassing expectations). All numerical evaluations are based “on experience level.” There is also an opportunity for supervisor comments.

Appendix H
Phone interview with Dr. Ann Jadin

Name: Dr. Ann Jadin

Position: Faculty in Occupational Therapy Program (OTP)

Organization: Fox Valley Technical College, Appleton, Wisconsin

Date: April 23, 2010

Time: 1615hrs

1. How long have you been in your current position?

14 years

2. Does your training program have an on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes. In order to graduate from the OTP there are two levels of fieldwork experience or internship.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

Safety issues, professional behavior, clinical reasoning or critical thinking, initiative, ethics, communication (written and verbal) supervision response, teamwork, empathy, and dependability are all areas that need to be evaluated.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

Students are assigned a placement in the clinical setting, and a practicing clinician supervises and the student completes the evaluation.

5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

Rubric with a likert scale, and comment section by their supervisor seems to work well in our [OTP] program.

Appendix I
Phone interview with Marcy Bruflat

Name: Ms. Marcy Bruflat

Position: Fire Coordinator

Organization: Chippewa Valley Technical College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Date: April 19, 2010

Time: 1334 hours

1. How long have you been in your current position?

14 years

2. Does your training program have an on the on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes. Chippewa Valley Technical College has a Fire Medic associate degree. The degree meets the requirements for paramedic and firefighting.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

Need to have a method to rate individuals skill. We use a check sheet that contains all of the IFSTA firefighting skills. The check sheet allows the mentor to see what has been accomplished. A method needs to be in place that can evaluate the individual's ability to get along with others and their communications skills. Soft skills are what will make or break the individual's ability to maintain employment, not whether they are able to tie a knot in 20 seconds.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

Our students are evaluated on fire and emergency medical skills. For the fire side of the evaluations, the mentor must do a daily evaluation of the student's daily log sheet. The students have a list of fire competencies they must complete every day. The student must fill out a log sheet on what they did during their shift. Daily the mentor must evaluate how well the student got along with other members at the same fire house and department. Each intern has a list of IFSTA firefighting skills in a manual. When the student completes a skill they must have the evaluator sign off on the skill and date it every time the skills are completed. This documents the number of skills completed and the repetition of training. The student will have a formal evaluation half way through the assigned time. If any "issues" are identified, I [M. Bruflat] will perform a site visit and meet with the

individuals and their mentor. Lastly, the student needs to write a paper on their experience while performing the internship.

5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

A rubric does not work well because skills based evaluation and narratives are too subjective. The best way to evaluate a fire based internship is to use a combination of methods to get the most accurate reflection of the student abilities.

Appendix J
Phone interview with Gary Schenck

Name: Mr. Gary Schenck

Position: Fire Coordinator

Organization: Blackhawk Technical College, Janesville, Wisconsin

Date: April 19, 2010

Time: 1442 hours

1. How long have you been in your current position?

3 ½ years

2. Does your training program have an on-the-job training or internship requirement?

No. Our college has a fire protection associate degree but we do not have an internship established at this time.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

The evaluation process should determine if the individual can perform the required job duties of a firefighter. The evaluation should look at if the student can work with others and get along with them for 24 hours at a time. The student's motivation and work ethic need to be evaluated.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

We do not have an internship.

5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

A performance evaluation should be a combination of the ones you [Author] listed. A narrative is too subjective. A self-evaluation would be helpful in determining if the student's view of him/herself is in line with what others think. If it is close there are no problems, but if they are way off a more serious discussion will be needed. A rubric reduces the amount of subjectivity. It can be correlated with other program outcomes. By far, the rubric is the most accurate way to measure performance of firefighting skills. Overall it doesn't really matter

what type is used as long as the evaluation tool is the same as the self evaluation which the student does.

Appendix K
Phone interview with Edward Whittington

Name: Mr. Edward Whittington

Position: Fire Science Program Coordinator

Organization: Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois

Date: April 26, 2010

Time: 1402 hours

1. How long have you been in your current position?

2 years full time and 4 years part time

2. Does your training program have an on the on-the-job training or internship requirement?

Yes.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

Part of the evaluation process should contain mechanical aptitude and how well they perform their internship responsibilities.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

Our students are assigned to a local volunteer or career fire department. The student is assigned a mentor on that department. Daily the student is evaluated on their completion of daily activities, attitude, how well they perform and their overall skill level. The student's final grade will be based on the performance evaluations, daily journal, and a ten page paper. The paper needs to be on what they learned during their time at the fire department.

5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

A rubric would work best for our college. It allows the student to know what they are going to be evaluated on and how they will be graded.

Appendix L
Interview through email with Greg Burroughs

Name: Mr. Greg Burroughs

Position: Instructor

Organization: Southeast Community College, Lincoln, Nebraska

Date: April 27, 2010

Time: 1131 hours

1. How long have you been in your current position?

7 years

2. Does your training program have an on the on-the-job training or internship requirement?

It is an option open to the student to be used as an elective.

3. In your professional opinion, what components should be included during the evaluation process?

The student should be evaluated on their ability to complete the tasks assigned to them by the organization along with their work ethic and behaviors as observed by their site supervisor. Additionally, they should have to produce a journal detailing what they learned about the nature of the work within the organization wherein they served their internship.

4. How does your organization evaluate candidates during their internship?

They are given a set of assignments by the organization which is related to learning objectives within the program. They are then evaluated by their supervisor and the instructor on their ability to complete those assignments in a professional manner and in accordance with the desires of the organization with whom they are interning.

5. In your professional opinion, how should the fire protection internship candidates be evaluated (narrative, rubric, comment sections, self-evaluation, other)?

The internship should be evaluated using a combination of narrative and comments accompanied by their own self-evaluation and one can use a rubric for journal evaluation.

Appendix M
Fire Protection Technician Program Outcome Summary

Fire Protection Technician

Program Outcome Summary

Program Information:

Program Name:	Fire Protection Technician
Program Number:	10-503-XXX
Credits:	69
Organization:	Fox Valley Technical College
Division:	Business, Health & Services
Department:	Fire Protection
Instructional Level:	Associate Degree



Program Outcomes:

1. Demonstrate professional conduct by displaying personal code of ethics, positive work ethics, flexibility, teamwork skills, physical fitness, safe procedures, and sensitivity to diverse cultures and individuals
2. Perform fire prevention activities including preplanning, public education, inspections, and investigations
3. Apply management skills to emergency incidents
4. Meet professional fire and emergency medical credentialing standards
5. Apply critical thinking skills to both emergency and non-emergency situations
6. Communicate clearly and effectively both verbally and through written documentation with clients, coworkers, other agencies, and supervisors

Note. Program Outcomes. Fox Valley Technical College, Business, Health & Services Program Outcomes. (2007). *Fire Protection Technician Program Outcomes*. Retrieved from <http://www.fvtc.edu/public/content.aspx?ID=1667&PID=19>

Appendix N
Fire Protection Internship Course Outcome Summary

Fire Protection Internship

Course Outcome Summary

Information

<i>Project Title</i>	Fire Protection Internship
<i>Course Number</i>	10-503-130
<i>Credits</i>	2
<i>Potential Hours</i>	Approximately 836. The hours will vary depending on shift schedule and academic commitments.
<i>Instructional Area</i>	Fire Protection Technician
<i>Instructional Level</i>	Associate Degree
<i>Organization</i>	Fox Valley Technical College
<i>Division</i>	Business, Health & Services
<i>Department</i>	Fire Protection
<i>Developers</i>	Jeremy Hansen (updated) Gary Coley (1991)
<i>Development Date</i>	06/05, 03/10 (updated) 04/19/1991 (Gary Coley)

Types of Instruction

<i>Type of Instruction</i>	<i>Contact Hours</i>	<i>Outside Hours</i>	<i>Credits</i>
Classroom Presentation	4	836	2
Totals	4	836	2

Target Population

Third and fourth semester students enrolled in the Fire Protection Technician Program.

Description

Students will have the opportunity to perform the duties of a municipal firefighter while serving as a member of a local fire department. The students will be expected to participate in the normal 24-hour shift rotation schedule, excluding FVTC class periods, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Thursday-Sunday, one week in March referred to as Spring Break, and the July 4th recess. The student will be evaluated by fire department officers.

Prerequisite

Successful completion of Firefighting Principles (503-142), student must hold a current State of Wisconsin Firefighter I Certification, successful completion of a physical exam, physical fitness test offered by FVTC, and criminal background investigation.

Textbook

None

Core Abilities

- o Demonstrate professional conduct by displaying personal code of ethics, positive work ethics, flexibility, teamwork skills, physical fitness, safe procedures, and sensitivity to diverse cultures and individuals.
- o Perform fire prevention activities including preplanning, public education, inspections, and investigations.
- o Apply management skills to emergency incidents.
- o Meet professional fire and emergency medical credentialing standards.
- o Apply critical thinking skills to both emergency and non-emergency situations.
- o Communicate clearly and effectively both verbally and through written documentation with clients, coworkers, other agencies, and supervisors.

Competencies and Performance Standards

1. Formulate a personal conduct plan.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Practices personal hygiene methods that are considered acceptable by the evaluating fire department.
- Demonstrates behavior that is appropriate for each of the many situations encountered during the internship.
- Recognize behavior which is not acceptable and takes actions to correct the behavioral issues.
- Demonstrates personal motivation and initiative.
- Identify and lists strengths and weaknesses of their firefighting skill.
- Constructs a plan for addressing the weaknesses of their firefighting skills.
- Develops interpersonal relationships with fellow firefighters and staff members.

2. Demonstrates acceptable attendance and promptness.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Demonstrates promptness by arriving on-time to shift change.
- Completes all tasks in a reasonable time frame.
- Performs personal restraint by limiting the number of absences.

3. Determine the roles and functions of a firefighter during emergency incidents.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Analyzes the incident and explains safety issues and relay them to the appropriate person.
- Performs operations which are appropriate for the apparatus they are assigned to.
- Demonstrated knowledge of equipment location and operation.
- Practices all department safety procedures.
- Administers medical care to patients in need.
- Carries out orders given by superiors.

4. Determine the roles and functions of a firefighter during non-emergency activities.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Checks apparatus to ensure readiness.
- Performs public education for all age groups satisfactorily.
- Demonstrates knowledge of daily station activities without prompting from others.
- Recognizes the need for constant training and refreshing of firefighting skills.
- Recites activities performed by firefighters during duty day.

5. Determine rules, procedures, and major factors required for firefighter safety.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Demonstrates the ability to perform tasks safely.
- Lists ways firefighters can be injured and killed on the fireground.
- Recite departmental standard operating procedures for a given situation.

6. Demonstrate the ability to work within the incident command management during incidents.

Performance Standards

Criteria - Performance will be satisfactory when the student:

- Demonstrates the ability to maintain company intactness.
- Demonstrates the ability to honor members of the fire department and their respective rank within the fire department during emergency and non-emergency situations.
- Differentiates between orders and directives.

Appendix O
DRAFT - Fire Protection Internship Performance Evaluation

Internship Performance Evaluation

Fire Protection Technician



Supervisor's Evaluation

Intern Name: _____ Supervisor Name: _____
Agency Name: _____ Internship Dates: _____

Instructions to supervisor: Evaluate each intern under your supervision using the following performance evaluation tool; give the self-evaluation tool to each intern and ask the intern to complete it prior to meeting. Meet and discuss both evaluations with the intern, then forward originals to the FVTC Intern Coordinator, retaining one copy for department files and one copy to the intern for personal record.

The rubric scale uses the term Standard for measuring performance. For the purpose of this performance evaluation tool, standard performance is what is expected or what is normal. Ratings above or below standard performance must be justified with a comment.

Check one:

- ☐ - Mid-Term Evaluation
☐ - Final Evaluation

Rubric Rating Scale:

- 5 = Exceptional
4 = Above standard
3 = Standard
2 = Below standard
1 = Needs serious improvement
NA = Not applicable

Criteria		Rating					
Personal	1. Demonstrates acceptable personal appearance and hygiene (FPT PO 1)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div>					
	2. Shows personal integrity through ethical/responsible behavior (FPT PO 1)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div>					
	3. Sustains acceptable shift attendance record (FPT PO 1, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div>					
	4. Displays a positive work ethic and attitude (FPT PO 1, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 1.2em; width: 100%;"></div>					

	Supervisor's Evaluation (continued)		Internship Evaluation					
	Criteria		Rating					
Personal	5. Shows respect and honors diversity in the workplace/community (FPT PO 1)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	6. Demonstrates interpersonal dynamics (FPT PO 1, 2, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	7. Displays self-motivation and takes initiative to complete tasks (FPT PO 1)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	8. Exhibits adaptation to change and flexibility (FPT PO 1, 2, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	9. Explains and follows the chain of command (FPT PO 1, 3)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	10. Applies critical thinking and problem solving skills to make decisions and complete tasks (FPT PO 2, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	11. Demonstrates a level of physical fitness and personal health required to perform the duties of a firefighter (FPT PO 1, 4)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	12. Communicates clearly and effectively both verbally and through written documents (FPT PO 1, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							

	Supervisor's Evaluation (continued)	Internship Evaluation
	Criteria	Rating
Duties	1. Performs required station duties (FPT PO 1, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	2. Completes daily apparatus and equipment checks (FPT PO 1)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	3. Identifies the location of equipment on station apparatus (FPT PO 1, 4, 5, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	4. Actively participates in department training activities (FPT PO 1, 5)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	5. Performs fire ground activities safely and efficiently (FPT PO 1, 3, 5, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	6. Performs EMS activities safely and efficiently (FPT PO 1, 3, 4, 5)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	7. Completes orders and directives as assigned (FPT PO 1, 5, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	8. Follows all safety procedures (FPT PO 1, 3, 4, 5)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	
	9. Works cooperatively in a team environment (FPT PO 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment:	

Supervisor's Evaluation (continued)		Internship Evaluation					
Criteria		Rating					
Duties	10. Participates in fire preventions activities including fire inspections, pre-planning and public education (FPT PO 1, 2, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<hr/> <hr/>					
	11. Applies management skills to the emergency incident (i.e. follows the incident management system) (FPT PO 1, 3, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<hr/> <hr/>					
	12. Completes the assigned internship project (FPT PO 1, 2, 5, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:	<hr/> <hr/>					

What are the greatest strengths displayed by the intern candidate?

In what area(s) does the intern candidate need to make the most improvement?

Supervisor's Evaluation (continued)**Internship Evaluation**

Please check the letter grade the intern earned based on his/her overall performance:				
Excellent	Above Average	Average	Needs Improvement	Does not meet performance expectations
<input type="checkbox"/> A+	<input type="checkbox"/> B+	<input type="checkbox"/> C+	<input type="checkbox"/> D+	
<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	
<input type="checkbox"/> A-	<input type="checkbox"/> B-	<input type="checkbox"/> C-		<input type="checkbox"/> F

Signature of Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Has the evaluator discussed this evaluation with the intern? ☐ - Yes ☐ - No

Intern's comments:

Signature of Intern: _____ Date: _____

Internship Performance Evaluation

Fire Protection Technician



Intern Candidate's Self-Evaluation

Intern Name: _____ Supervisor Name: _____

Agency Name: _____ Internship Dates: _____

Instructions to the intern candidate: Evaluate your own performance using the provided performance evaluation tool. Meet and discuss both your supervisor's evaluation and your self-evaluation, then submit both forms to your supervisor. You will be provided a copy of both forms for your records.

The rubric scale uses the term Standard for measuring performance. For the purpose of this performance evaluation tool, standard performance is what is expected or what is normal. Ratings above or below standard performance must be justified with a comment.

Check one:

☐ - Mid-Term Evaluation

☐ - Final Evaluation

Rubric Rating Scale:

5 = Exceptional

4 = Above standard

3 = Standard

2 = Below standard

1 = Needs serious improvement

NA = Not applicable

Criteria		Rating
Personal	1. Demonstrates acceptable personal appearance and hygiene (FPT PO 1)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment: _____	

Personal	2. Shows personal integrity through ethical/responsible behavior (FPT PO 1)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment: _____	

Personal	3. Sustains acceptable shift attendance record (FPT PO 1, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment: _____	

Personal	4. Displays a positive work ethic and attitude (FPT PO 1, 6)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
	Comment: _____	

	Intern Candidate's Self-evaluation (continued)		Internship Evaluation					
	Criteria		Rating					
Personal	5. Shows respect and honors diversity in the workplace/community (FPT PO 1)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	6. Demonstrates interpersonal dynamics (FPT PO 1, 2, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	7. Displays self-motivation and takes initiative to complete tasks (FPT PO 1)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	8. Exhibits adaptation to change and flexibility (FPT PO 1, 2, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	9. Explains and follows the chain of command (FPT PO 1, 3)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	10. Applies critical thinking and problem solving skills to make decisions and complete tasks (FPT PO 2, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	11. Demonstrates a level of physical fitness and personal health required to perform the duties of a firefighter (FPT PO 1, 4)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	12. Communicates clearly and effectively both verbally and through written documents (FPT PO 1, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							

	Intern Candidate's Self-evaluation (continued)		Internship Evaluation					
	Criteria		Rating					
Duties	1. Performs required station duties (FPT PO 1, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	2. Completes daily apparatus and equipment checks (FPT PO 1)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	3. Identifies the location of equipment on station apparatus (FPT PO 1, 4, 5, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	4. Actively participates in department training activities (FPT PO 1, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	5. Performs fire ground activities safely and efficiently (FPT PO 1, 3, 5, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	6. Performs EMS activities safely and efficiently (FPT PO 1, 3, 4, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	7. Completes orders and directives as assigned (FPT PO 1, 5, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	8. Follows all safety procedures (FPT PO 1, 3, 4, 5)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							
	9. Works cooperatively in a team environment (FPT PO 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)		5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:							

Intern candidate's Self-evaluation (continued)		Internship Evaluation					
Criteria		Rating					
Duties	10. Participates in fire preventions activities including fire inspections, pre-planning and public education (FPT PO 1, 2, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:						
	11. Applies management skills to the emergency incident (i.e. follows the incident management system) (FPT PO 1, 3, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
	Comment:						
12. Completes the assigned internship project (FPT PO 1, 2, 5, 6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Comment:							

What do you think are your greatest strengths as an intern?

In what area(s) do you believe you need the most improvement?

Intern Candidate's Self-evaluation (continued)**Internship Evaluation**

Please check the letter grade the intern earned based on his/her overall performance:				
Excellent	Above Average	Average	Needs Improvement	Does not meet performance expectations
<input type="checkbox"/> A+	<input type="checkbox"/> B+	<input type="checkbox"/> C+	<input type="checkbox"/> D+	<input type="checkbox"/> F
<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> B	<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> D	
<input type="checkbox"/> A-	<input type="checkbox"/> B-	<input type="checkbox"/> C-		

Signature of Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Intern: _____ Date: _____