

Chapter5. Conclusion

5.1. Finding and Suggestion

5.1.1. The Taipei City Police Department Side:

1. Efforts to improve public service, lessen taxpayer's burdens and increase the country's competitive profile in the face of growing globalization have fueled a wave of comprehensive evaluation system reform in advanced nations. The aim of the research was to understand what should be improved in the evaluation system and the reward-punishment system, what should be understood from response of the low level of satisfaction in above mentioned systems. The first task was to improve the standard of the reward-punishment system, which scored the lowest satisfaction level. The reward-punishment evaluation system is a way to objectively encourage morale in the ordinary time. There are different ways in evaluating, but due to the fact that different jobs have different kinds or quantities of rewards. It causes an imbalance in different units.
2. For an "A" assessment the evaluation system should not restrict the proportion of employees to be assessed on this level to 75%, even though it exceeds both the 15% "A" assessment proportion in Hong Kong and the 15% "excellent" assessment proportion in Shanghai. Despite the fact that the proportion in Taipei is much higher than the other two cities, there is, however, still a low satisfaction rate with the evaluation system, the structure of grade seemly should be change for an "A" assessment to be assessed on this level 15% as well as Hong Kong and Shanghai sides.
3. There are many colleagues who put in a lot of effort during ordinary time, but who

are unable to get an A assessment, because the proportion is limited. So, to avoid discouraging morale, the current evaluation system should be in accordance with a fair reward-punishment system and an A assessment should contain a real performance record in for reward-punishment to ensure efficiency and reality.

4. In the dimension 「 **implementation of reward-punishment system** 」, according to the statistical analysis, the level of satisfaction among police officers who serve in the Taipei City Police Department with the implementation of the standards of the reward-punishment systems is only 22.5%, the main reason for this is that different positions, even for officers on the same level, have different rewards, for instance a director in the investigating unit have more opportunities to gain rewards. So in the light of the fact that the current reward-punishment imbalance is due to different positions and functions, there should be a limitation of reward as well as overtime pay.
5. Police work is different from other general civil service work, because it is riskier and tougher. Comparing with no “A” assessment proportion evaluation system of other civil servants including teachers, prosecutors, and judges, the “A” assessment proportion system makes staff feel bullied and unappreciated, and should be concealed as well as above mentioned job.
6. The evaluation system is used to evaluate one year of work performance. However, this could jeopardize a person when he/she changes his/her units or get a promotion during that year. In other words, his/her performance might be negatively influenced due to the proportion system. The greatest shortcoming of the system is that the proportion of the evaluation system exercises restraint and is unfair. There are many colleagues who put in a lot of effort but are unable to obtain an A assessment, because of the limited proportion. This discourages morale and has a deeply negative influence. At this point, we should try to improve any unfair

influences in the performance evaluation of staff.

5.1.2. The Hong Kong City Police Department Side

1. Having regard for the responsibilities and workload of the disciplined services, and the factors of the disciplined services, such as danger, stress, and restraint on personal freedom, the performance-based reward should be increased through independent review of the pay and conditions of service of the disciplined services.
2. Some issues, in evaluation system, are too abstract to be useful for our team or unit, and the opinions of evaluation should be assessed according to or refer to some incident and should not be based on the evaluator's personal and subjective impressions. Evaluators should add a reference of an incident and draw a column for employee's responses while assessing. However, there is still space for improvement in the evaluation system.
3. Every work position needs someone to work in it, but some positions are more difficult to be rewarded, and it does not therefore mean that one's work performance is bad. The records of rewards should be a reference of personal merit reports with a personal contribution or response of superior and a file to be covered and examined from the next higher level superior. Every stage and process of appeal must be investigated and judged, before a final decision can be made. In terms of procedure, there should be a detailed record. Except for rewards given to the first line of staffs (directly with people), proper awards also should be given to support and logistic employees.
4. Because the result of the annual evaluation has a direct influence on employee's promotion, there are some abstracts items which should be improved. For example (those kinds of whole impressions are mostly personal impressions). As long as

there are some items which can't be calculated in the course of assessing quantity, there will still be reported which are assessed in accordance with an evaluator's personal views, and which would not be just fair and objective. We suggest some items that can be measured and assessed in the course of quantity to be added in the report.

5. Most evaluators have their own personal and subjective impressions while assessing, failing to observe the staff's behavior and real work performance in an all-round way. These evaluators should avoid the influence their own impressions from playing a role in front of subordinates. A mechanism of scores that can be added and deducted during evaluation should be implemented to encourage the staff and examine personal work performance.
6. The majority of respondents think that the current evaluation system is fair, so the whole evaluation process satisfies them, and the current system of rewards and punishments is just and fair.

5.1.3. The Shanghai City Police Department Side:

1. As we know, although the reward-punishment evaluation system exists in this evaluation system, it can't be used for the function of removing a staff member who performs very badly. The main reason is that in China personal relationships in traditional society are beyond any similar system, which evaluated based on managerial power.
2. The result of annual evaluation is divided into three grades of "excellent", "competent" and "not competent" grades. According to regulations of evaluation, the proportion of "excellent" grades where employee are to be assessed in their own department or unit should be limited on this level 10%, and can not exceed at

most 15 %. To accommodate big and small different departments, the ordinary way of implementation of evaluation is that numbers of “excellent” grades is multiplied 15% according to each department actual people, and distribute quota to every department and unit. The phenomenon has produced two problems as a result. First, no matter if employees work performance is good or bad, they are forced to accept this quota; and actually have hurt those who work with enthusiasm.

3. Basically, any unit in an organization must be unique and professional and can't be replaced. It is sure that different units must be evaluated in different ways. If the merit-based performance evaluation system will achieve the goal to objectively encourage morale, it will be a good system. Formulate and perfect an incentive mechanism for the evaluation system, and research corresponding coordinative systems to offer systematic support for the merit system in public service sector.
4. If the annual bonus evaluation is applicable to all employees, it must ensure that the ordinary evaluation will not become a mere formality. Perfecting an incentive mechanism for an ordinary evaluation system is an important task in for the public sector.
5. Generally speaking, both the Taipei and Hong Kong sides agree that the “excellent” assessment proportion system relating to police members is unfair compared to other general civil staff because of the riskier and tougher work. But police are also part of the government, so if the “excellent” assessment proportion system is not sufficient, maybe police should be evaluated by means of other ways, for example to promote them according to risk pay and so on. The more the police are appreciated in the system, the more they will benefit to the society.
6. Greater efforts should be made to translate "moral integrity, ability, attendance and achievements, and concentration on actual work performance"(five key factors) in performance evaluation into objective and measurable performance indicators.

This requires:

- 6.1. Adhering to the policy “with special focus on achievements” among the five key factors and promoting the new principle of results oriented performance focus.
 - 6.2. Encouraging regional and local governments to test and experiment with new ideas and new ways to operate the five key factors in accordance with local circumstances and needs.
 - 6.3. Making full utilization of the existing channels to facilitate exchanges and communication among governments at various levels with regard to innovation and experiences.
7. That the performance evaluation system be further strengthened in a systematic manner. This implies:
- 7.1. The need to strengthening link between individual performance evaluations and other HRD dimensions as well as other aspects of management of public organizations.
 - 7.2. The need to operate the five factors (as discussed above) in accordance to organization objectives and improving individual civil servants, job descriptions so as to strengthen the link between performance evaluation and job descriptions.
 - 7.3. The need to improve the performance evaluation process with special focus on transparency, and objectivity.
 - 7.4. The need to strengthen utilization of performance evaluation information for HRD decisions with special focus on improvement of motivating mechanism and assessment of civil servants’ training needs.

5.2 Research Limitations and suggestion of further research

It is primary to consider the limitation of the study. The limitations of the research were discussed in order to focus some attention when applying research results. The study has some limitations and will be discussed below:

Firstly, the data showed margin of errors. It is hardly possible to conduct a study which has no errors or an element bias. Because of time constraints, budget and relationship difficulty across the Taiwan Strait, this study utilized few samples in the Hong City Police Department. The sample size may not be sufficient to represent the police force simply because it does not include every individual or unit and also there may be selection bias due to small sample. The margin of errors can be minimized by taking a random sample.

Secondly, the questionnaire was not permitted in the Shanghai City Police Department by Ministry of Police in PRC, which made conducting the survey very difficult, and it's a comparison with both the Taipei City Police Department and the Hong Kong City Police Department was not possible.

Thirdly, the questionnaire was designed in Chinese without any translation since, from the author's view, Chinese is the common language for all respondents. It is possible that my expressions may have been interpreted improperly due to the language barriers for some of the respondents. Therefore, the actual meaning of the questions between Chinese and English could have been understood differently. The questionnaires asked the respondents' perception on the three dimensions:

「implementation of the police evaluation system」, 「implementation of the police reward-punishment system」, and 「as a motivational concept to measure」 which are attributed according to perceived systematical experience, perceived value and satisfaction. However, the questionnaires were created by the author on three different

police system and studies, although a pilot test was conducted in Taipei, the attributes might not have captured all main and core questions in both Hong Kong and Shanghai.