# UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM POLICE

# INTERVIEW COMPUTATION SHEET

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| APPLICANT: |  | | |
| CHAIRPERSON: |  | DATE: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DIMENSION | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | TOTAL |
| 1. Dependability |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Situational Reasoning Ability |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Communication Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Overall Suitability for Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TOTAL AVERAGE SCORE |  |

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Refer to Policy 401 and 401A, IX Phase 5 – Oral Interview Board for procedures relating to interviewing a new cadet or lateral police officer.

Refer to Policy 401B, VIII Phase 4 – Oral Interview Board for procedures relating to hiring a new Telecommunicator.

Each applicant is rated on a scale of “1” (lowest) to “5” (highest). Use the five-point behaviorally-anchored rating scales (Section VI. pgs.15-19) provided in the DP-7 Pre-Employment Interview Booklet as a guide. For each dimension scale, write the number that is closest to describing the predicted behavior/performance of the applicant if hired as a Police Officer/Telecommunicator.

The Dependability, Initiative, and Interpersonal Skills dimensions are to be based on the applicant’s personal history statement and background investigation, the board members’ written questions (which should be written or attached to the back of this form), and the standardized questions.

The Situational Reasoning dimension is to be based on the applicant’s answers to the questions on that topic.

The Oral Communication Skill dimension is to be based on the overall interview.

The Overall Suitability for Employment should be uniformly collected, evaluated and protected in accordance with institutional policy, and federal, state and local laws. A “whole person” assessment for each individual should consider both favorable and unfavorable information, along with mitigating circumstances, and overall qualities of credibility to determine suitability. Entities may also choose to assess the person’s honesty and truthfulness in answering relevant questions.

As a principle of rating, a “3” is given to an average applicant or when there is little or no significant evidence available about the dimension. The extreme ratings of “1” or “5” should be given only when strong positive or negative evidence of the applicant’s ability has been obtained.

The chairperson of the interview board must compute the average rating. To do so, total the scores of all board members on each individual dimension using a grading system in which 1 equals the lowest score and 5 equals the highest score. Add the “**Total Numbers**” together and write this number in the space marked “**Grand Total**”. Divide the “**Grand Total**” by the number of board members. Take that result and divide by 6 (Dimensions). Record this number in the space marked “**Total Average Score**.” The result should be a number between 1 and 5.

Although the board chairperson will evaluate and score an applicant, the chairperson’s score must not be utilized to determine the applicant cumulative score unless two or more applicants tie. In this case, the board chairperson’s score must be utilized to break the tie.

Example with Four Board Members

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DIMENSION | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | TOTAL |
| 1. Dependability | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | N/A | 14 |
| 2. Initiative | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | N/A | 11 |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | N/A | 13 |
| 4. Situational Reasoning Ability | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | N/A | 17 |
| 5. Communication Skills | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | N/A | 13 |
| 6. Overall Suitability for Employment | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | N/A | 14 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 82 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL AVERAGE SCORE** | 82/4(board members)=20.5 20.5/6(dimensions)=3.4 |

Example if Chairman’s Score Is Included to Break Tie

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DIMENSION | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | TOTAL |
| 1. Dependability | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 18 |
| 2. Initiative | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 |
| 3. Interpersonal Skills | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 18 |
| 4. Situational Reasoning Ability | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 20 |
| 5. Communication Skills | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
| 6. Overall Suitability for Employment | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 101 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL AVERAGE SCORE** | 101/5(board members)=20.2 20.2/6(dimensions)=3.3 |

# RATING SCALES

DIMENSION 1 – DEPENDABILITY

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| “**1**” | | * could be expected to not respond to a call for assistance on a crime in progress | |
|  | | * could be expected to ignore the police radio or telephone for a while because he/she is tired of one minor complaint after another | |
|  | | * could be expected to be suspended at least once in his/her first year because he/she consistently would not follow procedures | |
|  | | * could be expected to occasionally fail to make court appearances when he/she is a key witness | |
|  | | * could be expected to consistently miss important details in an assignment | |
| “**2**” | | * could be expected to be late for work about half the time | |
|  | | * could be expected to make excuses when faced with an unpleasant assignment | |
|  | | * could be expected to call in sick along with other employees to protest some working conditions | |
|  | | * could be expected to be unpredictable in his/her court appearances | |
|  | | * could be expected to be late in submitting about half of his/her reports | |
| “**3**” | | * could be expected to need disciplinary action before reducing his/her lateness for assignments | |
|  | | * could be expected to take longer than necessary on routine assignments | |
|  | | * could be expected to get his/her work in on time even if incomplete | |
| “**4**” | | * could be expected to do his/her share of the paper work even though he/she thinks it's boring stuff | |
|  | | * could be expected to read a suspect his/her rights at the appropriate time | |
|  | | * could be expected to turn in required paper work without being reminded | |
|  | | * could be expected to have his/her weapon serviceable at all times | |
| “**5**” | * could be expected to quickly finish a regular assignment | |
|  | * could be expected to remain awake and alert throughout an entire shift where there is no activity | |
|  | * could be expected to always be present and on time for scheduled appointments | |
|  | * could be expected to be an employee who can always be counted on | |

DIMENSION 2 -- INITIATIVE

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

DIMENSION 3 -- INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Interpersonal Skills** |
| “**1**” | * could be expected to laugh at the parents of a child who is missing |
|  | * could be expected to ignore information received from fellow employee because that employee is a different race |
|  | * could be expected to be discourteous and insulting to other employees |
|  | * could be expected to verbally insult and/or strike at someone who calls him names |
| “**2**” | * could be expected to be considered by other employees as a “real loser” |
|  | * could be expected to be indifferent to other people’s problems |
|  | * could be expected to appear as a mean, tough person to a group of school-age children |
| “**3**” | * could be expected to permanently end his/her friendship with a neighbor who accidentally blows his/her cover while on a stakeout |
|  | * could be expected to tell participants in a neighborhood dispute that he/she would arrest them all if he/she was called back again |
|  | * could be expected to work better as a “loner” rather than with a partner |
|  | * could be expected to ignore an angry citizen complaining about a speeding ticket that the officer issued two years ago |
| “**4**” | * could be expected to ignore someone who insults him |
|  | * could be expected to convince a hardened criminal that a police officer is really his/her friend |
|  | * could be expected to change his/her behavior as appropriate when dealing with individuals of a different ethnic background |
|  | * could be expected to satisfy a complaining citizen that the police department is doing a good job |
| “**5**” | * could be expected to be considered by other employees as a “really fine person” |
|  | * could be expected to issue a citation in a manner such that the violator would actually be grateful for receiving the ticket |
|  | * could be expected to always be friendly and helpful |
|  | * could be expected to cooperate fully with other in working on a team project |

DIMENSION 4 -- SITUATIONAL REASONING ABILITY

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

DIMENSION 5 -- ORAL COMMUNICATION SKILL

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale Value** | **Examples of Oral Communication Skill** |
| “**1**” | * uses obscene language in conversation |
|  | * speech is rambling or confused |
|  | * does not pay attention to others when they are speaking |
|  | * appears to have difficulty understanding and/or comprehending |
| “**2**” | * speech is muffled or difficult to understand |
|  | * speaks too rapidly to be understood |
|  | * stares at one place while speaking |
|  | * volume of speech is so low that it is difficult to hear |
|  | * speaks in voice that is abnormally loud; appears to be shouting |
| “**3**” | * appears to respond to some questions with a “canned” or memorized speech |
|  | * nasal voice; talks through nose |
|  | * uses colorful or flowery language |
|  | * uses lots of “big” words in speaking to others |
| “**4**” | * does not struggle to make self-understood |
|  | * is very familiar with “street lingo” |
|  | * has a pleasant voice |
| “**5**” | * waits for others to finish before starting to talk |
|  | * speaks slowly and distinctly |
|  | * has clear, strong voice |
|  | * verbal presentation is logical |
|  | * answers to questions are brief but thorough |
|  | * maintains good eye contact when speaking or listening |