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# INTRODUCTION

The information contained in this booklet will serve as a guide for board members interviewing applicants. The interview content has been carefully prepared and the format for rating scales has been developed in conjunction with this content. When conducting interviews, board members must follow the information in this booklet, consisting primarily of a structured interview, which requires that the interview board adhere to the same general format with all applicants. The board need not limit the interview to the question areas suggested in this booklet. In many situations, it will be appropriate to ask additional, clarifying questions that are related to the applicant's qualifications. Such clarification is not only appropriate, but may be necessary to provide the most accurate rating of the applicant. However, board members should avoid asking questions that are irrelevant or not directly related to the job requirements.

Board members must become thoroughly familiar with this booklet and with the interview content before beginning the oral interviews. Any questions about this material that may arise during the course of the interviews should be thoroughly discussed with the other board members to ensure a common understanding regarding these interviews.

# INTERVIEW FORMAT

Once notified of the need for an oral review board for a Police Cadet or a Lateral Police Officer, the Chief of Police must select the board chairperson and the four board members.

Telecommunicator and Public Safety Officer Boards may deviate from this interview board format (chairperson and 4 member format) pursuant to approval by the Component’s Chief of Police. However, the DP-7 should be utilized and amended only to accommodate the actual number of board members (ex: 2 board members in lieu of 5 board members).

The board chairperson will receive the applicant files. The chairperson will then distribute the applicant files among the board members. Each board member should then utilize the information given in the preliminary background along with other sources to develop several personal questions to ask the applicant. These questions do not have to be limited to this information but shall follow the guidelines given in Section IV, "Interview Guide.” Questions should not be developed that may lead an applicant into an admission of past alcohol or drug addiction or any mental/physical disability. Although questioning may proceed into these areas if an applicant blatantly reveals information that is not solicited, the board chairperson shall exercise proper judgment and discretion before allowing such questioning. The board chairperson will be responsible for discontinuing improper questions before they are answered by the applicant.

An applicant's selection ranking will be determined by his/her total score. The applicant's total score will be the sum of each score on each dimension submitted by the four board members. 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.

# INTERVIEW DIMENSIONS

## DEPENDABILITY

The dependability of an applicant is evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* report for work on time
* refrain from taking or making excessive personal phone calls
* be accurate and thorough in handling the details of an assignment
* submit work on time
* follow through on all assignments
* not abuse sick time

## INITIATIVE

The initiative of an applicant is evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* strive to put forth his/her best effort at all times
* diligently and conscientiously carry out his/her assignments,
* care about his/her competence and want to improve his/her skills
* see himself/herself as responsible for learning the job and staying abreast of new developments in his/her occupational field
* proceed on assignments without waiting to be told what to do
* recognize his/her own deficiencies and strive to correct them

## INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

The interpersonal skills of an applicant are evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* understand the motives of people and usually be able to anticipate how people will act in a given situation
* consider individual differences when dealing with people rather than treating everyone alike
* interact with people in a wide variety of circumstances without arousing antagonism
* work effectively as a member of a team

## SITUATIONAL Reasoning ABILITY

The situational reasoning ability of an applicant is based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* demonstrate good "common sense"
* know how to analyze a situation, identify the important elements and make a logical decision
* have little difficulty deciding what to do in most situations
* uses reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation
* demonstrate officer safety consciousness

## COMMUNICATION SKILLS

The oral communication skills of an applicant are evaluated based on the extent to which the individual might be expected to:

* speak clearly and intelligibly to individuals
* communicate effectively with persons of widely divergent cultural and educational backgrounds
* communicate effectively with supervisors and other employees in relaying needed information

# INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. DEPENDABILITY

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence indicating:

1. Willingness of others to place their confidence in applicant's ability

2. Applicant's success or failure to honor obligations

3. Applicant's success or failure to perform

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Degree of responsibility |
|  | * Growth of responsibility |
|  | * Recognition by employers/supervisors |
|  | * Raises/promotions |
|  | * Attitude of co-workers |
|  | * Major accomplishments |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |
|  | * Attendance/tardiness |
|  | * Work quality |
|  | * Reasons for leaving jobs |
|  | * Employers/supervisors satisfied |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unemployment Record | * Number of jobs in recent years |
|  | * Time unemployed |
|  | * Length of unemployment |
|  | * Use of time while unemployed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Job responsibilities |
|  | * Promotions |
|  | * Medals/awards |
|  | * Specialized training |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |
|  | * Convictions |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Academic accomplishments/problems |
|  | * Awards |
|  | * School clubs or activities |
|  | * Elective office |
|  | * Positions of trust |
|  | * Disciplinary problems |

1. INITIATIVE

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of the applicant's:

1. Willingness to improve his/her own skills and knowledge

2. Desire to improve his/her own performance level

3. Motivation to do more than the minimum requirements of a situation

4. Interest in finding improved ways for doing a job or task

5. Inability to fulfill the requirements of the job

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Efforts to improve job skills |
|  | * Efforts to improve methods/procedures |
|  | * Recognition by employer/supervisor for initiative |
|  | * Doing more than the job required |
|  | * Desire to assume increased responsibilities (promotion) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Interest in training/acquiring new skills |
|  | * Desire to seek meaningful work |
|  | * Better ways to do a job or task |
|  | * Take advantage of educational opportunities while in military |
|  | * Doing more than the bare minimum |
|  | * Positive attitude about service |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Advanced training (voluntary or required) |
|  | * Educational accomplishments |
|  | * Personal sacrifice to obtain education |
|  | * Extracurricular activities |
|  | * Failure to complete courses/schooling |
|  | * Low grades due to failure to prepare properly |

1. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Ability to deal effectively and positively with others

2. Interest in working with people

3. Desire to be of service to others

4. Fairness in dealing with all segments of society

5. Ability to handle more than one project at a time

6. Ability to handle stressful situations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Relations with co‑workers |
|  | * Attitude of employers/supervisors |
|  | * Team orientation |
|  | * Responsible use of authority |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Sensitivity to other's feelings |
|  | * Problems in dealing with authority |
|  | * Reason for job changes related to people |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary actions |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Relationship with teachers and students |
|  | * Activities requiring working with others |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Sports or other team activities |
|  | * Discipline problems |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criminal Record | * Was there a victim (person)? |
|  | * Would any friend, acquaintance, or family member affect his/her ability to conduct his/her assignment in a legal and professional manner? |
|  | * Would credibility be compromised? |

1. Situational Reasoning Ability

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Judgment abilities

2. Officer Safety consciousness

3. Responsible use of authority

4. Ability to consider alternatives

5. Ability to recognize when a crime has been committed

6. Ability to handle stressful situations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * considerable difficulty in deciding what to do when facing a new situation |
|  | * stops and thinks things out when the situation requires fast action |
|  | * exercises reasonable caution when facing an unknown situation |
|  | * takes unnecessary risks |
|  | * seldom knows which way to go if faced with a difficult situation |
|  | * when time permits, they carefully consider all alternatives before acting |
|  | * ability to recognize when a situation is deteriorating |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Military Record | * Job responsibilities |
|  | * Promotions |
|  | * Medals/awards |
|  | * Specialized training |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary measures |
|  | * Convictions |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Academic accomplishments/problems |
|  | * Awards |
|  | * School clubs or activities |
|  | * Elective office |
|  | * Positions of trust |
|  | * Disciplinary problems |

1. Oral Communication Skills

This factor requires the interviewer to seek out evidence of applicant's:

1. Speech

2. Attentiveness

3. Ability to practice active listening

4. Patience

5. Confidence

6. Communication Style

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Background Factor** | **What to Look For** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work History | * Ability to relay information in a professional manner |
|  | * Ability to engage in conversation with employers/supervisors |
|  | * Consistency |
|  | * Body Language |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Speech |
|  | * Attentiveness |
|  | * Reprimands/disciplinary actions in relation to communication failures |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Educational History | * Ability to interact with teachers and students |
|  | * Activities requiring working with others and communicating desires and outcomes |
|  | * Leadership experience |
|  | * Sports or other team activities |
|  | * Discipline problems |

# 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 |