

### B. *Examinations by Other Experts:*

It is the long-established policy of the FBI Laboratory not to make examinations if any evidence in the case has been or will be subjected to the same type of technical examination by other experts. This policy has been found desirable not only to eliminate duplication of effort but also to insure the examination of evidence in its condition at the time of recovery, enabling the proper interpretation to be placed on the examiner's findings and the proper subsequent court presentation and testimony.

### C. *Expert Testimony:*

When expert testimony is desired for a trial, the court appearance of the FBI Laboratory examiner should be requested for the actual date on which it is anticipated that his testimony will be needed, rather than for the date on which the trial is to begin. It is realized that the exact date on which the examiner's testimony may be required cannot always be predetermined. However, if it can be expected that such testimony will not be needed on the first day of the trial, but rather on some subsequent day, the FBI Laboratory should be so advised in order that every effort may be made to insure that the examiner's absence from headquarters is held to a minimum.

### D. *Submitting Evidence:*

Since in making examinations it is necessary to know that the policies are being followed, it will facilitate the making of examinations and eliminate the necessity for inquiry if the following is complied with:

1. Mark the communication and evidence for the attention of the FBI Laboratory.
2. Set forth the name of the suspect where known.
3. Set forth the type of criminal violation involved, listing the evidence and method of transmittal. State the types of examinations desired.
4. State whether any evidence in this case has been subjected to the same type of technical examination as that requested; also furnish any information that would be of assistance to the examiner or pertinent to the making of such examination, such as any other examinations made or to be made.
5. Make reference to any previous correspondence or reports, if there have been any.
6. Submit the letter in duplicate in addition to the copy accompanying any evidence sent under separate cover.

## OUTSTANDING OFFICER SELECTION

By DAVID SWINDELL

*Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission*

As a preface to this paper, I would like to state that the information which is presented as to the methods used by the various states of the Region in the selection of an Outstanding Officer delegate was secured by a mail questionnaire sent out in September. Due to this fact, I may have inadvertently misinterpreted the details of the selective procedures employed in some cases.

Since this is the first year of the operation of our "Outstanding Officer" program, I am sure that many of the other states were, like Florida, faced with the problem of arriving at a method for selecting the individual to attend this conference. When the plan was adopted last Fall, it seemed to us that we had ample time to work out our procedure, but it turned out that our Secretary-Treasurer was asking for the name of our representative long before he had been selected. The result was that we had to base our selection upon a modification of another selective program.

Of the states which submitted information on their selective processes, seven considered both supervisory and non-supervisory officers in making their selections, three considered only non-supervisory personnel, and one selection was

made from the ranks of supervisors only. Six of the states indicated that selection was entirely by appointment by the director or chief of enforcement or by both. Of the remaining states, four used efficiency rating forms upon which to base their selections; and one used activity reports to narrow the field and made final selection by drawing for a lucky number.

In answer to a question as to whether the method used was satisfactory or whether they preferred a standard method of selection for use by all states, seven indicated that a standard method was preferred and four stated that they were satisfied with the method used.

Upon inquiry as to what items should be included in a standardized selective procedure, the replies were as follows:

WRITTEN TEST OF KNOWLEDGE OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES		
	3 FAVORED	2 OPPOSED
Efficiency Rating .....		9 Favored
Interview .....	3 Favored	2 Opposed
Arrest Record .....	4 Favored	2 Opposed
Supervisor Review and Appointment .....		7 Favored

From the above results it is readily apparent that there was a variety of methods employed in this selection as well as a variance as to what groups of personnel were considered for the award. A significant majority of the states indicate a desire for a standard method of selection to be used throughout the Region. Items recommended to be included in such a method were efficiency ratings and supervisory review and appointment, with others receiving minor support.

For the sake of discussion, I would like to briefly outline the selective processes we used in Florida. For the past two years we have had a "first class" rating which is awarded each year to the top twenty percent of the officers in each region. This rating is for one year only, and the holder of this rating must re-qualify annually in order to retain his first class status. Since this rating is designed to recognize top performance among our personnel, it serves as a satisfactory selective procedure for an outstanding officer. We simply choose from the top men qualifying for first class ratings.

Our selection of "first class" officers is based upon a three-phase procedure. First, all officers are permitted to take a written test of knowledge of their duties. This test is open to all who desire to qualify, and officers making passing scores are scheduled for the second phase. This first phase test serves to determine the extent of the actual knowledge and the ability to apply this knowledge to working situations. Since each officer may take the test if he so desires, it prevents the possible feeling that particular individuals are not considered.

The second phase, the oral interview, evaluates the individual further in his grasp of Commission policies, operations, and procedures; and it permits the sampling of reasoning and attitudes—a difficult thing for a written test. The board of interviewers is composed of the director, assistant director, and the managers of the five administrative regions.

The third phase is based upon the semi-annual efficiency reports which are filed for each employee of the Commission. Failure to average in the upper third of the group during the previous year will render a candidate ineligible for further consideration.

The scores from each phase are averaged after being weighted so as to place special emphasis upon the interview and efficiency reports. Appointments to "first class" are made upon the basis of the highest scores within each region. We feel that this three-phase program serves to compensate for any inequities which may occur in any one phase.

Our selection of an outstanding officer was made after review of the first class selective scores by the assistant director and myself.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

I would like to suggest the following for adoption for the future selection of outstanding officers from each state:

1. Limit choices to regular officers only—do not consider supervisory personnel. This should be done for two reasons—the difficulty of judging men with different duties and responsibilities and because much more can be realized by selecting from the ranks for attendance at the conference. If both officers and supervisors are considered, the officer will probably lose out to the supervisor.
2. Do not make appointments based upon a single outstanding arrest or deed of valor since a mediocre officer can register in this respect. Over the years we have seen this on several occasions in Florida, but in each case the officer involved was not outstanding.
3. Do not make the appointment solely on the basis of the highest number of arrests. We have all come to realize that there is much more to performing the duties of a wildlife enforcement officer than making arrests. When you emphasize arrests, the quality of cases is sure to deteriorate.
4. Do not base the selection on appointment by the director or top level supervisor. It is very doubtful that top administrators have a sufficiently accurate picture of the performance of all their personnel to give proper evaluation.
5. Do not make the award on the basis of length of service unless it be only a minimum service for eligibility. The man with the longest service is not necessarily the best man.
6. Adopt a standard form of efficiency reports for universal use in the selection. These might be supplemented by testing and interview if they can be fitted into the states' programs.

I would very much like to see the completion of the program as originally planned in that next year we will designate an outstanding officer for the Southeast Region. This selection could be done by an Awards Committee during the conference through the use of the efficiency reports, career record, and possibly through interview. This selection should be carefully done, however, so as to designate the truly outstanding man rather than on a rotation basis between states.

Perhaps the foregoing has served to stimulate a discussion in which we can adopt an efficient and adequate selective process for use in the very worthwhile program of designating outstanding officers.

Citations were presented to game law enforcement officers for each of the twelve Southeastern states by Walter A. Gresh, Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, during the meeting. In addition to the citations, the following individuals received a check in the amount of \$50.00 from the Law Enforcement Section for outstanding performance in the field of wildlife conservation for the previous fiscal year:

E. C. Suttle, Centreville, Ala.  
Homer C. Morris, Wynne, Ark.  
Ernest G. Pierce, Clermont, Fla.  
Mallory Hatchett, Waycross, Ga.  
L. M. Thurman, Jr., Shelbyville, Ky.  
Capt. Leonard New, Kentwood, La.  
David A. Gross, Sharpsburg, Md.  
Noel T. Clarkson, Marks, Miss.  
John D. Savage, Oxford, N. C.  
C. M. Rye, Columbia, S. C.  
E. O. Gammon, Memphis, Tenn.  
Fred Brown, Fairfax, Va.

The Law Enforcement Section has 1,109 members.

—WILLIAM T. DAVIS.