

May 21, 2024

City of Cincinnati Civil Service Commission
Civil Service Commissioners
Two Centennial Plaza
805 Central Avenue, Suite 200
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

RE: Manual Scoring of 2024 Police Department Promotional Exam

Dear Commissioners:

We have been engaged by the City of Cincinnati (“the City”) in connection with administration of a Division of Police Promotional Captains’ Examination (“Exam”) wherein you asked us to 1) manually calculate the candidate scores from the Assessors’ scoring sheets provided in accordance with the respective dimension weights and, 2) compare our independent examination scoring to the testing company, 3) review the Assessors’ feedback form (prepared by the Assessors) and compare them to the Candidate Feedback Report (provided to each candidate).

A preliminary draft, including my calculation of Exam scoring, was issued on May 6, 2024 and prior to any communication with anyone from IOS and being provided with the IOS scoring. On May 20, 2024 I participated in a telephone conference with the City of Cincinnati representatives and an IOS representative.

Our findings are summarized in this Report.

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT FACTS

The relevant facts as we understand them are as follows.

- Eighteen candidates signed up to take the Exam.
- Thirteen candidates participated in the Exam.
- IOS is the company hired by the City of Cincinnati to conduct the 2024 Captain Assessment Process
- Two Assessors scored each candidate on a scale of 4 (poor) to 10 (strong) on three Exercises of the Exam. The three Exercises assessed were: Community Meeting, Structured Oral Interview, and a Written In-Basket Exercise. In this Report, these are referred to individually (“Exercise”) or collectively (“Exercises”).
- Within each Exercise, each section had between three to four dimensions that were individually scored by the Assessors.
- The Assessor scoring sheets and Assessor Feedback Forms are internal IOS documents that are not provided to the candidate.

- For each Exercise, the two Assessors completed one Candidate Feedback Form. This form, at the Assessors' judgement, identified selected individual dimensional strengths or developmental needs. These individual areas of feedback were included in each Candidate's Feedback Report.

RECORDS RELIED UPON

An itemization of the documents furnished to us for review in conducting our engagement is listed below.

- Completed Captain Assessment Center 2024 Candidate Sign-in Sheet
- Final Assessor scoring sheet for each of the three Exercises for each candidate.
- A blank Exam worksheet that assigned weighted percentages to each dimension assessed within each Exercise of the Exam. **(Exhibit 1)**
- Captain Assessment Center 2024 – Assessors' feedback forms for each Exercise and dimension and for each candidate.
- Each candidate's IOS Feedback Report
- IOS Candidate Assessment Scoring Summary

MANUAL CALCULATION OF EACH CANDIDATE'S EXAM SCORE

PROCEDURES

From a paper copy of the IOS scoring template, from scratch I created my own formula driven Excel template to use in independently scoring the Exams.

The IOS testing was comprised of three Exercises: Community Meeting Exercise, Structured Oral Interview Exercise, and a Written In-Basket Exercise. The three Exercises were broken down into a total of ten dimensions with each Exercise comprised of three to four weighted dimensions. The Exercises and corresponding weighted dimensions were as follows:

1. Community Meeting Exercise

Dimensions Assessed

- Critical Thinking – 50%
- Community Relations – 40%
- Oral Communications – 10%

2. Structured Oral Interview Exercise

Dimensions Assessed

- Background Qualifications Presentation – 30%
- Staffing and Morale Challenge – 30%
- Follow up to Staffing and Morale Challenge – 30%
- Oral Communication – 10%

3. Written In-Basket Exercise

Dimensions Assessed

- Critical Thinking – 65%
- Administrative Management – 25%
- Written Communication – 10%

Each Assessor scored the candidate on a scale of 4 to 10. These individual scores were then added together and divided by two to arrive at an “Overall Dimension Score.” The Overall Dimension Score was then multiplied by the respective Exercise dimension weight. The weighted dimension scores per Exercise were totaled and then multiplied by ten to arrive at the respective Exercise score.

Each Exercise score was then multiplied by the following weights:

- Community Meeting Exercise – 40%
- Structured Oral Interview Exercise – 40%
- Written In-Basket Exercise – 20%

The candidates' final Exam score was determined by totaling the above three individual weighted Exercise scores.

ANALYSIS

For purposes of this Report, we refer to the candidates' Exam assigned numbers (C1 – C18) as opposed to using their respective names.

We calculated each candidate's Exam score. These have been reflected on **Exhibit 2**.

The thirteen candidates Exercise scores, weighted calculations, and final Exam scores, as calculated by us, have been reflected on **Exhibit 3**.

Final Exam scores ranged from a high of 86.35 to a low of 63.30.

The three highest rated candidates, based on our independent calculation, with their corresponding Exam score were:

1. Candidate C 2 (86.35)
2. Candidate C 5 (82.50)
3. Candidate C14 (79.90)

COMPARISON OF IOS CANDIDATE SCORES TO MARCUM'S INDEPENDENT SCORING

After we manually calculated each candidate's Exam score, we were requested to compare them to the candidate's Exam scores calculated by IOS.

PROCEDURES

On May 13, 2024, and after we had manually scored the candidates' Exams, we were provided with the candidate Exam scoring performed by IOS. We compared the IOS candidate Exam scoring to our Exam calculation on **Exhibit 4**.

ANALYSIS

The Exam scoring performed by IOS was identical to our Exam scoring without exception.

COMPARISON OF ASSESSOR CANDIDATE FEEDBACK FORMS TO THE CANDIDATE FEEDBACK REPORTS

We were requested to review the Assessors' feedback form (jointly prepared by the Assessors) and compare them to the respective Candidate Feedback Report (provided to each candidate).

PROCEDURES

At the conclusion of the Exercise, the Assessors jointly prepared a Feedback Form for recently completed Exercise. There were three Feedback Forms per candidate. The Feedback Form consisted of three to four areas where the Assessors had the ability to jointly identify a candidate's strength or developmental need. Assessors had the ability, but were not required, to identify each item on their Feedback Form as an area of strength or developmental need.

Each candidate was provided with a Candidate Feedback Report which consisted of a description of the Exercises, Performance Dimensions, rating criteria, general scoring overview, the candidate's actual scoring per Exercise and Per Dimension along with a comparison to the average candidate testing score.

In addition, the candidates were provided with a general overview of the purpose of the Assessors' feedback as well as the Assessor feedback which consisted of areas of strength or developmental need.

ANALYSIS

We were provided with each Candidates' Feedback Report. For each candidate, we compared the Assessor Feedback Form strengths and developmental needs to those reflected on the Candidate Feedback Report.

The feedback comments reflected on the Assessors' Feedback Form, completed at the time of testing, were identical to the feedback comments reflected on the Candidates Feedback Report.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Based on our independent calculation, candidate C2 scored the highest of the thirteen candidates on the Exam.
2. Our independent Exam scoring was identical to IOS's Exam scoring without exception.
3. The Assessors Feedback Form strengths and weaknesses were accurately reflected on the Candidate Feedback Report without exception.

We have no present financial interest in this Exam or the results thereof. Our fees charged for this manual scoring are in no way contingent upon the results.

We have no responsibility to update our scoring for events or circumstances occurring after the date of this Report, but we reserve the right to do so if new or additional facts are provided.

Very truly yours,

MARCUM LLP



Frank A. Suponcic, CPA, CFE, CFF
Partner

FAS/tvb