

FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM EVALUATION

FRESNO POLICE DEPARTMENT

GEORGE K. HANSEN
CHIEF OF POLICE

July, 1979

63855



NCJRS

JAN - 2 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACQUISITIONS

	<u>Page</u>
History	1
Scope of Study	1
Methodology	2
Data Condensation	3
Planning	3
Program Goals and Objectives	6
Leadership	10
Coordination	11
Evaluations	18
Training	21
Field Training Officer Status	28
Responsibilities	29
Training	30
Recommendations	31
Recognition	33
Compensation	34
Non-Voluntary Status	35
Career Development	36
Selection Process	37
Time Spent on Training	38
Beat Assignments	39
Shift Utilization	40
Specific Concerns	41
Recommendations	43
Conclusion	51

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix 1 Survey Population Information	52
Appendix 2 Field Training Sergeant Evaluations	54
Appendix 3 Field Training Officer Evaluations	83
Appendix 4 Trainee Evaluations	128

PREFACE

History

The Field Training Program is an essential and critical program which exists within this Department. It was designed and implemented in 1976 in an effort to provide a structured training environment to prepare and instruct newly employed personnel on the practical elements of law enforcement. The program utilizes competent, non-probationary officers as trainers, monitors, and evaluators to provide the on-the-job training.

Since the program's inception, an evaluation has never been conducted to measure its effectiveness or efficiency. This evaluation follows three years of uninterrupted training.

Scope of Study

Pursuant to Chief Hansen's request to appraise the existing Field Training Program, a three-month study was conducted by Administrative Services Division. The purpose of this study is to provide data to those involved in the planning, organizing, and administering stages of the Field Training Program. The intent was to measure the progress and productivity of the program and its participants. Concurrently, it afforded those directly involved in the program the opportunity to express their concerns, opinions, suggestions, and insights regarding this vital program.

Too often, management has been accused of imposing or creating policy which is not necessarily compatible with existing needs and objectives of an organization or program. Feedback is an invaluable instrument which can provide a continuous information system allowing administration to make and/or amend policy to reflect changing needs and goals. In addition, feedback is a way of control; this is meant in terms of quality control.

The observations contributed by program participants serve to focus attention on deficient areas. Many of the areas of concern may seem obvious to some, but the causal effects need to be addressed. Identification of these problems and illustration of the causes, as suggested by program personnel will be presented. Finally, recommendations will be offered based on suggestions and observations.

As a prelude to the following summary of concerns, management must be aware of the underlying questions throughout this study:

1. Are all parties aware of the objectives of the Field Training Program?
2. Has it been decided and clearly stated what work needs to be done and how to go about doing it?
3. Have all resources been exhausted or made available to accomplish the task?
4. Is supervision/leadership adequate to facilitate needs and objectives?
5. Has a system been designed to check if output reflects the intent of the Field Training Program?

Methodology

Administrative Services staff prepared and administered a four-series questionnaire directed to:

- A. Fifty-two (52) trainees and former trainees.
- B. Twenty-five (25) Field Training Officers and former Field Training Officers.
- C. Fourteen (14) Field Training Sergeants and former Field Training Sergeants.
- D. One (1) Field Training Lieutenant.

Those surveyed totalled ninety-two (92) sworn personnel. (See Appendix 1 for survey population information; see Appendixes 2-4 for questionnaires.)

Survey population ranged in rank from lieutenant to police officer trainee, all of whom have either participated in or are presently participants in the Field Training Program. Questionnaires were distributed to each individual in the control group. Anonymity was guaranteed to encourage candor. Supplementing the questionnaire, participants were interviewed by a non-sworn, non-supervisory member of the Administrative Services Division. This afforded survey participants a further opportunity to openly discuss the program as they perceived it.

Data Condensation

Research clearly indicates that a number of deficient areas exist within the Field Training Program which debilitate its effectiveness. Following is a myriad of observations based on suggestions, complaints, commendations and considerations made by the survey population. The first item to be discussed is planning.

Planning

Foremost to a successful and progressive training program is long-range planning. Planning effectuates sound leadership, quality of personnel, coordination and implementation of a credible training program. A policy-making body which is cognizant of the need for providing a comprehensive and accredited training environment must attempt to first plan for and utilize every available resource needed to accomplish this goal. Effective planning is not a one-time activity. Long range projections and the means for achieving program objectives are rudimentary.

As stated in the Field Training Manual, the Field Training Program is to be directed by the concerted efforts of the Patrol Division and Administrative Services Division, with the former responsible for program execution and the latter for administrative assistance. Consequently, planning must reflect

the needs presented by the Patrol Division but should not be exclusively delegated to administration. Long-range planning by the joint efforts must mirror program, personnel, and environmental needs.

Initial planning of the Field Training Program included the development of an impressive Field Training Manual. The Manual was reflective of an attempt to provide a structured, standardized training program as mandated by state law which provided for the employment of pre-academy candidates by this Department. Concurrently, it was designed as stated in the Manual, "To provide the best possible training" to minority candidates.

Each component of the Field Training Program was discussed and directives for accomplishing specific objectives were presented in the Manual. For example, accommodations for providing on-going training, evaluations, and a mechanism for citing instructional material deficiencies was detailed. In theory, a well-planned training program has been created. However, in practice, planning ended with the implementation of the program.

The provision of a structured training program is not an end in itself. This becomes clear by understanding participants' comments and observations that program assessments must be made continuously to enable the Patrol Division and Administrative

Services Division to amend or create policy to accommodate environmental changes. The proposed relationship between Administrative Services and the Patrol Division is less than conducive to a joint planning effort. This is evident with the fact that informal planning has occurred within the Field Training Program but not at the level where policy changes can be authorized and reinforced. Program personnel stressed that planning must originate between the units which are directly responsible for the administration and execution of the program and where the "clout" is available to facilitate the enforcement of new or amended policies, program-wide.

An example of ineffective planning has been cited by members of the 11 - 7 a.m. shift. This unit has worked diligently toward the improvement of the Field Training Program. Every attempt to streamline paper work, upgrade the quality of personnel, initiate meetings, maintain training records, etc., has been made. The problem of fragmented program implementation exists; consequently, program-wide implementation is minimal. One shift cannot plan for nor provide for program changes if it is done informally and unrecognized by management, especially if its adjustors do not have enforcement powers. Without support and assistance from all participants involved in the planning stage (which should be a continuous process throughout the life of the program), problem areas will not be as effectively and efficiently addressed as possible.

What presently exists instead of the intended structured training program is a makeshift training environment aimed at instructing new officers with what appears to be experienced, qualified officers in a ride-along program. The presumption is that adequate training occurs in this type of environment. Respondents admitted that often it does not. Instead, the evaluation and monitoring of trainees' performances frequently precedes training. Trainees, for example, have stated that often when they are evaluated, they are not given the training needed to rectify errors, etc. They perceive this activity as defeating the purpose of the Field Training Program.

Had the Patrol Division complied with the plans and schedules that had been developed, delegated responsibilities effectively, monitored and evaluated performances, and recommended corrective action; and had administration followed up on the suggestions and assisted the Patrol Division with effecting changes, a well-defined, operative training program would now be in effect. In the opinion of those interviewed, this has not occurred.

Program Goals and Objectives

Program-personnel at every level requested the provision of an updated, definitive statement of the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program upon which they can base their performance and decision-making. Confusion, ambiguity, and

uncertainty of the program's philosophy are directly attributed to the interpretation of the newly defined program objectives vis-a-vis former program objectives. A direct conflict between the two sets of objectives has resulted.

It is stated in the Field Training Program Manual the goals and objectives of the program are:

1. To produce competent solo beat officers through standardized training and evaluation.
2. Allow for valid termination of those officers who cannot perform satisfactorily after all available assistance has been given.

These guidelines have led individuals to perceive that the program was designed to produce competent police officer personnel in a set time frame. Three months of academy training coupled with three months of in-house training is viewed to be the suitable amount of time expended for training. Little regard is given to the first full year of service much less to an entire career as a training environment. Training has been viewed as a length of time and not a body of instruction.

Another example of the perceived goals and objectives is that the training program is a tool utilized to determine whether or

not an individual will be retained or separated from this Department based on his/her level of performance during the training (12-week) period. The training program is considered apart from the selection process.

By reinforcing the concept that the training program is complementary to the selection process, in-house remedial training can offset candidates' deficiencies overlooked in initial selection. Consequently, resentment toward those candidates from diverse social backgrounds who display shortcomings which appear to be incompatible with an anglo-saxon, middle-American orientation may be minimized.

Program emphasis has been placed on attempting to successfully train an individual in a given time frame instead of providing an individual with a training environment conducive to learning basic law enforcement skills.

It should be clearly expressed to all Department personnel that the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program are defined in the following:

The Field Training and Evaluation Program is a police selection process that combines pre-field training with objective evaluations to insure that the standards of a competent solo beat officer are met.

These objectives will be accomplished by the following means:

1. Closely aligning Departmental field training efforts with the regional training academies;
2. Providing documentation of field training received by each trainee necessary for both complete training records and for support relative to state-mandated requirements;
3. Providing a well-structured and formalized program permitting all recruits to be trained similarly and for management to know what field training has occurred, rather than a fragmented approach;
4. Providing each recruit with a trained and competent Field Training Officer--not just an experienced officer to observe in a "ride-along" environment; and
5. Providing a recruit with a learning environment conducive to his/her becoming a competent police officer.

Once goals and objectives have been defined and discussed, all supervisory personnel should be instructed to enforce these philosophies.

Leadership

Essential to a successful and progressive training program is leadership. The definitive delineation of a central authority is an area which is in need of immediate attention.

Program-personnel at every level stated that a cohesive administering unit is non-existent. Their comments identified the Patrol Division as having responsibility for the Field Training Program and that a lieutenant serves in the capacity as its central program administrator. However, observation of the program's activities contradicts any hypothesis that an individual or unit administers the program independent of the Patrol Captain or of the limitations set by the administration.

If the presumption that a lieutenant is responsible for the execution and coordination of the Field Training Program is accurate, then his position and authority are too restricted. This observation is supported by his illustrated parsimonious endeavors to coordinate, evaluate, direct, and regulate the Field Training Program and the activities of its participants.

A restrained central authority who is given the responsibility of providing this Department with an adequate Field Training Program cannot and should not be expected to excel in his/ her performance. Given a lack of resources, autonomy, and support from management, an ineffective effort to accomplish this task will result.

Secondary to leadership is the identification of training roles and the delegation of resources to accomplish program goals. For example, personnel admitted to the omnipresence of role uncertainty and role ambiguity which debilitates their performances as trainers. Understanding one's position and how his/her performance will assist in achieving program goals is rudimentary before progress will occur.

Identification and publication of central leadership, role definition, and the delegation of responsibilities is urgently requested by personnel prior to program continuation.

A strong and supportive central authority will be able to curtail the potpourri of information based on presumption, personal sentiment and sometimes rumor. The coordination of resources and manpower can be maximally effective when controlled from one central point.

Coordination

Linearly, once goals and objectives, leadership and role delineation have been planned for and stated, then coordination of resources is mandatory. Program-personnel identified a number of inconsistencies within the Field Training Program which have prevented coordination from occurring. This has caused tremendous frustration among the respondents. The promotion of effective coordination through uniformity is a

major request made by respondents. They perceive that the lack of uniformity exists due to a diversity of causes.

First is the outdated Department Manual. Program-personnel resent having to utilize this invalid and unreliable document as a tool for instruction. Provision of an updated Manual is encouraged to minimize inconsistencies between sub-units. This is accomplished by establishing a foundation upon which program personnel can base their performances and decision-making.

It is recognized that the practice of Field Training Officers utilizing their own discretion in the field creates problems for the trainee who has not yet learned policies.

Decision-making by Field Training Officers which reflects personal convictions and sentiment does not effect a positive perspective on the training environment for trainees, when it is in direct conflict with written policies. The development of skills, and the learning of policies and procedures has priority during training; therefore, minimizing discretion during this stage is critical. Program-personnel contend that once these two objectives have been adequately fulfilled, then flexible decision-making will be indicative of documented policies and procedures.

Likewise, other documentation needs revision in order for it to be operative according to the respondents. Program-personnel recognize this deficiency as detrimental to training and

learning. Specifically, the Field Training Manual, Field Training Guide, and weekly exams require immediate attention. Trainees expressed frustrations and disbeliefs with having to study outdated material and having to take outdated tests--neither of which reflects current policies and procedures. One trainee commented, "Legal interpretations have every officer, including those educated, in a myriad of confusion. Even criminal attorneys experience difficulty in this area. The Municipal Code sections are taught to the recruit in the weekly training material. The Fresno Police Manual is outdated and is creating confusion for all new recruits. Many Fresno Police Manual sections have been added and deleted without updates being placed in the new policy manuals given to the new recruit. General Orders, Special Orders, Roll Call Training Bulletins, memoranda in the recruit's training manual are outdated and simply useless."

Another Field Training Officer added, "The strongest point the program has is the training guide. This is an organized guide that teaches the recruit week-by-week information that will help him when he makes a solo beat. Even though this is the strongest point, I feel it could use some improvement. It should be kept up-to-date."

Next, according to a Field Training Supervisor, in addition to the differences among Field Training Officers with regard to instruction and interpretation or information, each patrol

shift has different operating procedures which often conflict. Consequently, trainees get conflicting instruction on different shifts.

One Field Training Officer commented, "First it (program) is fragmented. There are Field Training Officers or Field Training Officer Alternates; either you are a training officer or you aren't. Second, it seems no one knows what the hell the last Field Training Officer did with the trainee." Another Field Training Officer supports this observation by saying, "The biggest problem with the program is its lack of uniformity. I feel the program should be conducted on one shift with time set aside for formal instruction. Recruits come from other shifts or from inadequate Field Training Officers and suffer because they haven't been given the instruction for the period of training."

The trainee who must learn from a collage of training perspectives and who has the implicit understanding of having "to make it" has been placed in a highly stressful learning environment. Environmental variables need to be controlled in order to minimize the natural stress experienced by trainees.

Field Training Officers also recognize this deficiency but feel that the lack of standardization among trainers is something they cannot control. A comment made by a Field Training Supervisor reinforces this observation. "Field Training

Officers have no current guidelines in many areas due to the lack of an up-to-date Department Manual. Consequently, Field Training Officers teach how they feel is the best way to do things. Another Field Training Officer may feel differently and will teach differently. Many trainees have brought this to my attention and have pointed out that both Field Training Officers were in conflict with our existing Manual."

Both trainees and trainers encourage rotation of personnel if the instruction between Field Training Officers is synchronized. The purpose of the training program, it is felt, is defeated if Field Training Officers continue instruction by repeating or omitting items which should have been taught in a logical order, prior to or after they have met with the new trainee. Program personnel contend that effective coordination of resources, manpower, and efforts is missing and should be the responsibility of supervisors. It is felt that supervisors should schedule meetings to keep personnel abreast of the program. Presently, formal or informal meetings, whether one-on-one or in a group setting, are rare. In several instances, it was stated that to take time away from the field to meet and discuss Field Training Program-related problems and observations would be criticized by some supervisors and staff.

Training Officers through the rank of lieutenant recognized the utility of meetings. It is their belief that periodic meetings are extremely effective for achieving a high degree of

coordination. Confusion and ignorance among personnel regarding program activities, decision-making, problems, and changes could be minimized if meetings were conducted regularly by program leaders.

Written documentation was recognized as being essential for reference and retention, however, verbal communication is quicker, simpler and easier to interpret. Periodic discussions of areas which bottleneck the effectiveness of the program are strongly urged. Consequently, proactive rather than reactive corrective measures should be employed.

Individuals understand that it is impractical to request every Field Training Officer/Field Training Supervisor and Field Training Lieutenant to be available to attend program meetings. However, the effective dissemination of information gathered at the meetings is important so that all program participants will be aware of what had transpired. It was suggested, for example, that as many representatives as possible from each shift should attend meetings and offer input from their respective shifts. Meeting sites and times, additionally, should be rotated among shifts to reinforce involvement by all supervisors and personnel.

A consensus among program personnel indicates that the 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. shift seems to be the best informed unit regarding the Field Training Program. Trainees, trainers, as well as

supervisors, attribute this to the fact that the Field Training Lieutenant is stationed on this shift. During this period, he is assisted by several sergeants interested in attempting to improve and upgrade the quality of the Field Training Program. A number of meetings are conducted on this shift aimed at directly discussing and standardizing training and evaluation. Discussion with personnel from the other shifts indicates that meetings and other efforts to synchronize and improve the various components of the program are almost nonexistent. This is attributed to the limited mobility of the Field Training Lieutenant. Admittedly, his efforts to coordinate Field Training Program activities are limited as a result of his assignment to one shift and that assignment having priority over his responsibilities as the Field Training Lieutenant.

Program-personnel indicated concern regarding the flow of information, resources, and efforts which presently tend to collect on the midnight shift. They contend information is not disseminated efficiently and effectively. Individuals commented that attention must be given to the actual communication network within the Field Training Program once the facilitators and types of information to be communicated have been defined.

Effective coordination, it was determined, is impossible to achieve if information is outdated, leadership is absent, and a consistent communication network accommodating information flow is non-existent.

Evaluations

Program-personnel have indicated they are frustrated with the existing methods by which the Field Training Program and the performances of personnel are monitored and evaluated. This thesis is based on the premise that management has not made an affirmative commitment to develop valid ongoing evaluation systems. Further, they perceive that the importance and the effective use of a feedback mechanism have been ignored by program administrators.

Numerous complaints regarding the irregularity of evaluations, lack of standardization, and the absence of an effective administering agent illustrate the dissatisfaction with existing evaluations.

Respondents admitted to being skeptical regarding the current Field Training Program evaluation because in the past their concerns, generally, have not been solicited nor heeded. Traditionally, problem areas were presented by complainants through informal discussions between program personnel at various levels. Consequently, remediation of debilitating areas was not appropriately provided for due to the absence of a viable monitoring channel. This observation disregards the impromptu employment of corrective measures when crises occur.

A definitive mechanism for recording activities and performances is unavailable at present. Consequently, initially, minor problem areas have evolved into major programmatic concerns according to program-personnel. Deviations, malfunctions, or misconduct have not been routinely isolated, therefore, corrective or preventative measures have not been undertaken. This has led to frustration, an anti-administration orientation, and low morale among Field Training personnel.

Respondents expressed an appreciation for the opportunity to discuss program deficiencies and program strengths, as well. They indicated that, traditionally, administration and program supervisors seemed to be disinterested in assessing the progress of the program. It is perceived that these two units believe the program to be functioning adequately when in fact bottlenecks are present.

In addition to the lack of a continuous program evaluation, an effective means for evaluating personnel is almost non-existent. The performances of the Field Training Lieutenants/ Field Training Sergeants and Field Training Officers are rarely monitored, much less evaluated, according to respondents. Trainees, for example, are not all aware of the evaluation process by which they can assess their instructors' performances. However, many trainees aware of the process stated that they were reluctant to complete a Field Training

Officer evaluation because of possible identification of the writer and ensuing repercussions. Trainees expressed their already precarious positions and did not want to aggravate their chances of failing the Field Training Program by discussing inadequate trainers.

Field Training Officers, concurrently, expressed the desire for evaluations to be conducted by their supervisors as well as by the trainees in order to assess individual progress. Apathy toward improving one's performance has resulted since a measurement standard has not been determined. Generally speaking, personnel stated the evaluations of individuals' performances are compared to performances of senior personnel. Consequently, their validity cannot be assured. Personnel would like to see the provision of a practical and uniform measuring device which would encourage objectivity. Instead, an arbitrary system for determining levels of performances is presently employed by each evaluator.

Trainees have requested a workable system providing for in depth discussions with Field Training Officers and sergeants regarding the way they have been evaluated. Often they simply initial their evaluations without discussing problem areas. The citation of shortcomings does not guarantee remediation of weaknesses unless trainees are instructed and assisted on how to modify performances. This often requires verbal interaction between the trainee and the Field Training Officers.

Communication between the transferring and receiving Field Training Officers would discourage duplication of instruction and would permit timely identification of problem areas. Trainees' request that the Field Training Officers discuss the trainees' shortcomings with one another as long as it is done constructively and assistance will result. Frequently, the trainees identified the existing discussion of their progress among Field Training Officers as humiliating and degrading rather than for constructive purposes.

Training

Training within this Department has been described as inadequate by program personnel. Supervisors and Field Training Officers are unhappy with the way they have been instructed to train and supervise; likewise, trainees are discontent with how they are being taught. The following observations support these sentiments.

The Field Training lieutenants and sergeants who have the least experience as supervisors in terms of length of time in grade are often given their first supervisory assignments managing field training personnel. Respondents indicated that this practice is unfair both to themselves as well as to those they must supervise and assist with training. This problem could be minimized if individuals were trained to be supervisors and trainers first, given some time to function in these capacities

away from the program, and then permitted to apply what was learned to the Field Training Program. In addition, supervisors requested an in-depth orientation of the Field Training Program and how they fit into the overall picture. They perceive their current roles as Field Training supervisors as being the ones to finalize paperwork and to act as the link between Field Training personnel, the Patrol Captain, and the administration.

Field Training Officers admit that they have been trained to evaluate and monitor trainees performances and not to instruct. They recognize their weaknesses in providing training, and believe it is because they themselves have been poorly trained in this area. Trainees concur with this observation. They would appreciate it if Field Training Officers de-emphasized monitoring and evaluating and spent more time training. As one trainee relayed, "Training efforts culminate a critique of the trainee's actions and the ability of the officer to justify his actions. Training ends up with a list of things done wrong after the fact rather than providing basic guidelines to be adhered to before the situation arises." They realize that often training time is limited due to uncontrollable factors, i.e., beat assignment, nature of calls, etc., but conversely there is time for training. Maximum effort to expend what little time there is to teach is critical to trainees.

Personnel are displeased with the limited training opportunities this Department provides and would like to be involved in substantive courses which prepare them for Field Training Officer status. A particular course recently presented at the Convention Center, for example, was viewed as a waste of time and money and had little effect on enhancing performances. In general, in their estimations, courses of this quality discourage productivity. Instead, substantive courses in the following areas have been suggested: how to train, how to recognize recruit weaknesses--what to prescribe for remedial training; interpersonal communications, community relations, how to deal with trainees who are undergoing stress, male/female and minority relations in a law enforcement setting, etc. These courses, it is anticipated, will enhance the effectiveness of the trainer.

Additionally, on-going refresher classes were requested by a significant representation of program personnel to further enhance their performances as police officers in general. They did not want to simply pass their probationary period and forego training. The need to continually improve is important to program personnel especially as it relates to the Field Training Program. Current films, books, periodicals, are strongly requested to assist in improving performances.

Trainees specifically requested courses in areas of officer safety, drug detection, effective use of baton and mace to

deter use of weapons, etc. Women would like to be trained to maximize their physical shortcomings. They admitted they try to avoid physical confrontations out in the field, but they recognized the need to be prepared for bodily contact. The use of the gym is important to women and they would like to feel comfortable about using it without getting "flack" from the male officers.

Simulated field situations have been suggested to alleviate problems encountered by trainees who have not had the opportunity to respond to every kind of call. Many Field Training Officers discuss hypothetical situations with trainees but discussion and practice are two different activities.

Simulation was recognized as serving two purposes:

1. Keeping the trainer up-to-date on unusual type calls infrequently received, and
2. Exposing the trainee to diverse emergency situations.

The efficient utilization of training time is urgently requested by personnel. It was suggested that the two-week "limbo period" could be utilized to cover a wide range of information and activity. Respondents stated that generally during this period they rode along with their partner and merely observed. It was suggested that after the first week of exposure to the new environment in a patrol car the second week

would be the opportune time to expose the trainee to the different divisions within the Department. It was suggested that this practice could be used as a tool to improve camaraderie and morale among personnel and among the divisions. In addition, understanding the operations of the Department as a whole makes each individual's understanding of his/her own job clearer. One trainee stated, "My first two weeks I was told to just observe. The program really was never explained to me. When I was switched to another shift and started getting evaluated on what I should have learned, I got very negative marks." Another adds, "More Department observation is needed. I don't feel Department policy is covered enough. Like the radio room--I don't even know what it looks like." Ingenuity and creativity could govern further use of this two-week period by a qualified trainer.

Uniformity is important to trainees. They emphatically requested the synchronization of training material among Field Training Officers. Trainees stated that adjusting to the new law enforcement environment is a task in itself and coordinated curriculum, effort, and lesson plans would minimize unnecessary confusion and uncertainty. Trainers, trainees, and supervisors would, therefore, be able to clearly follow the progress of a trainee and, consequently, provide remedial training when necessary.

Finally, the most important aspect of training is the environment in which trainees are placed. A consensus among trainees is that the Field Training Officers should recognize the trainee's anxieties with the stress of new responsibilities and the work atmosphere. Foremost to learning is the provision of an environment conducive to this objective. Trainees would like Field Training Officers to relax the learning relationship. Some trainees, for example, have been made to feel inferior to the Field Training Officer, irrespective of the quality of training provided by the latter.

In the opinion of the respondents, some of the so-called "personality conflicts" between trainer and trainee were caused by the inferior-superior syndrome imposed upon the trainee by the trainer. One trainee sums up this observation by saying, "The Field Training Officer/Trainee relationship does not allow for that much freedom of intercourse as the trainee is always subservient to the Field Training Officer who may or may not be on a power trip by his position."

The opportunity to ask questions during the training period is critical to trainees. After one or two questions, trainees stated they soon learned not to ask questions for "fear of being marked down in certain areas of the evaluation."

Trainees would like for Field Training Officers to review the purpose of the Field Training Program.

To conclude the section on training as perceived by respondents, trainees were asked to cite areas which negatively and positively affected them in training. A brief summation of the general comments follows.

Positive

Generally, trainees were appreciative and proud of the Field Training Program as it afforded them the opportunity to work with and learn from experienced officers. The program enabled trainees to gain self-confidence through association with their Field Training Officers; Field Training Officers relieved some uncertainty by guiding trainees through unfamiliar territory. This helped trainees become comfortable with the new surroundings and encouraged self-initiated activities.

Trainees enjoyed working with at least three different Field Training Officers on at least three of the shifts. This broadened their perspective of their roles and permitted them to work with a diversity of qualified trainers.

Negative

Trainees resent being discussed informally and for what appears to be for few constructive reasons among program

personnel. They suspect prejudgment and labeling by personnel who have not trained them and who are unaware of their performances or full potential. They felt this could accelerate the "make-it-or-break-it" practice. Additionally, trainees do not favor the set 12-week time frame in which they must learn all that is possible. Participants at all levels highly recommended the training period be extended for two weeks or more when necessary to conclude the initial training stage.

They dislike being compared to journeyman officers when it comes to expectations and evaluations. The arbitrary grading system and inconsistent interpretations among Field Training Officers contributes to the discontentment among trainees.

The obvious disinterest, lack of understanding and patience, low morale, poor attitudes, and poor quality found in some Field Training Officers compounded with trainees having to humor and please each instructor has had a negative affect on trainees, in general, at some point during training.

Field Training Officer Status

A major constraint which limits the effectiveness of the Field Training Program is with the field trainer himself. Initially, this constraint is not self-imposed but rather it is inflicted upon the individual by the administration, first-line

supervisors and other managers who do not provide him with the commensurate recognition and compensation for his efforts and achievements of being a Field Training Officer.

Field Training Officers are the facilitators of the Field Training Program. They are the ones who must be the most knowledgeable in Departmental policy and procedures, municipal, state, and federal laws. They must be up-to-date on current policy changes, and at the same time, they must be physically capable of performing their functions as police officers.

Compounding their primary duties as patrol officers, they must be qualified trainers, able to instruct unskilled and inexperienced personnel in the area of law enforcement. Field Training Officers were supported by some of the supervisors in their complaints regarding inequities and oversights experienced with being trainers.

Following is a discussion of the specific concerns presented by program-personnel regarding the status of a Field Training Officer.

Responsibilities

Field Training Officers have complained of the quality and quantity of responsibilities beseiged upon them to produce competent police officers from candidates who seem to lack the

qualifications and motivation to learn and progress. The responsibility of training, monitoring and evaluating as objectively as possible in a limited time frame frustrates the trainer. Field Training Officers share the complaint that they have not been appropriately trained to fulfill their responsibilities as trainers.

Training

The training of regular police officers prior to becoming Field Training Officers has been presented in the section on training. Discussion at this point is on specific field training techniques as requested by Field Training Officers which will enhance their effectiveness as trainers.

Training presently is directed toward how the program is run and how to evaluate recruits. Field Training Officers want to get away from this kind of so-called, useless "pre-training" instruction and actually develop teaching skills. A formal training session for Field Training Officers led by professionals who know how to teach others to instruct, and how to train personnel to motivate and appreciate the problems of recruits is requested. Courses on how to train in a vocational/field setting, how to listen effectively, how to objectively evaluate field performance, and how to relate to recruits have been suggested.

Recommendations Made by Field Training Officers

Field Training Officers perceive that not enough weight is given to their recommendations regarding trainees' performances. Trainers believe that next to training, the completion of evaluations and regularly monitoring individuals is mandatory. The responsibility of evaluations was placed in the hands of the most accurate observers (Field Training Officers) and away from the casual observers (sergeants and lieutenants); this proximity between trainer and trainee was believed to warrant accurate assessments of performances.

Yet, when, for example, a Field Training Officer recommends the termination of a trainee who is doing poorly and is showing little progress, the Field Training Officer's authority is reversed by those who have not experienced the recruit's inability to function. Instead of terminating the employee, he/she is released to solo status and the responsibility of extensive training, monitoring, and evaluating is then placed on the Field Training Supervisor who is not as closely associated with the trainee as the Field Training Officer has been.

A supervisor discussed the effects of releasing trainees at the end of the 12-week training period irrespective of recommendations made by Field Training Officers.

1. Puts the burden on the sergeant who inherits the not-fully-trained officer, to supply necessary training.
2. The trainee goes out solo knowing that he/she is not ready. This creates a psychological stumbling block for the trainee which inhibits training and performance during the probationary period.
3. Some regular officers view trainees who are released from the training program, whether ready or not, as incompetent to perform. Consequently, there are officers who are skeptical about trainees' performances and are uncomfortable in working with them.

Trainees have the added stress of having to prove themselves to these officers before they can be fully accepted as competent peers.

4. The automatic release after 12 weeks of training has created a serious morale problem among Field Training Officers. This has led Field Training Officers to do a less than acceptable job of training, evaluating and monitoring.

Field Training Officers perceive completion of extensive evaluations as pointless because no matter how poorly a trainee does, he will still be released to solo status. Documentation of deficient performances is difficult for Field Training Officers to do because of the psychological strains in completing evaluations and also the amount of time and effort needed to adequately document poor performances.

Field Training Officers, additionally, feel peer group pressure is tremendous at this stage; successful trainees generally mean competent and successful trainers.

5. Finally, program-personnel have suggested that perhaps trainees will not utilize their maximum resources and efforts knowing that automatic release awaits them in 12 weeks. It is anticipated, however, by trainees that their performances will improve once they are on solo status and can relax.

Recognition

Field Training Officers believe they are unrecognized for the services they render as Field Training Officers. Many have expressed the need for at least some form of visible

recognition for being a Field Training Officer, i.e., corporal status to designate their possession of special training skills. It is anticipated that this would provide an incentive for Field Training Officers to continue to successfully train; concurrently, it would attract others who have a remote interest in teaching. Field Training Officers would like to be commended in some form other than monetarily for their efforts. Presently, they feel they are being taken for granted.

Compensation

Field Training Officers feel they have not been adequately compensated for training new, inexperienced personnel. Their supervisors are in agreement with this contention. According to Resolution No. 76-46, paragraph 6 has been amended to read, "For the purposes of this paragraph, a member of the unit shall receive the 5% premium pay for a whole pay period provided he performs the duties of a Field Training Officer for a majority of the pay period." If there are 11 working days in a pay period, the individual must work the sixth day with a trainee to qualify for the differential. Should an individual work one day less than the majority of the pay period, he is not compensated irrespective of whether or not he prepared himself to train, i.e., completed lesson plans and evaluations, met with Field Training Program personnel to discuss problem areas, etc.

Non-Voluntary Status

Many Field Training Officers are tired and bored with having to constantly instruct. Prior to becoming Field Training Officers they were told they would be allowed to break from training periodically. This is illustrated by a Field Training Officer who stated, "When I was appointed as a Field Training Officer, we were told the work would be six months on then a break in activity. I have yet to see the break and it has been 1½ years." He continues, "The recent policy in which a Field Training Officer is discouraged from taking a day off during a training period is a source of irritation to me. I do not feel I am married to this program and the restriction as to extra time off occasionally should be changed. It is very detrimental to morale and a source of discouragement and in some cases, anger."

Another Field Training Officer commented, "If they are given a break, it is normally only for a week or two. Some Field Training Officers have compared the program to the 'mafia,' that is, you have to die to get out of it. I feel this disenchantment is mainly due to the fact the program cannot recruit enough qualified officers to become Field Training Officers. Therefore, the present qualified Field Training Officers are called upon to do most of the training." One final comment from a Field Training Officer regarding time away from the Field Training Program supports this

observation--"Working as a Field Training Officer month-after-month burned me out. I found myself with a less than enthusiastic attitude in the last weeks before I requested to be made an alternate."

To do an effective job of training, Field Training Officers stated they must first want to serve in that capacity.

Field Training Officers commented that if they continue to function in positions which they resent, their performances will appear to be, and often are, less than ideal to the trainee who is at an impressionable stage of his career. In some cases, as pointed out by a Field Training Sergeant, "Some of our Field Training Officers provide a bad role model by being lazy, anti-administration, or poor public-relations models. Some of our Field Training Officers are poor teachers, frustrating the trainee, or poor 'supervisors,' intimidating the trainee."

Career Development

Field Training Officers have sought to fill training positions for a myriad of reasons. One is to enhance and further their careers by accepting additional challenging responsibilities. Field Training Officers stated that by doing so they were under the assumption that they would be indirectly preparing themselves for career development within this Department in exchange for their expertise.

Now, however, after having been Field Training Officers for some time and after having received little or no recognition for their achievements, the consensus is that career development within patrol is non-existent below the rank of sergeant.

Field Training Officers contend an individual who becomes a Field Training Officer in order to enhance and accelerate his career is normally preparing for an assignment outside of the Patrol Division. Should an individual lack the experience, education, longevity, and expertise necessary to qualify and pass an examination for sergeant, that individual's promotability is limited to that of a specialist. This means assignment outside of patrol.

Field Training Officers feel they are as qualified or more so than some specialists in other divisions to do specific duties. Field Training Officers perceive their capabilities as encompassing a wider spectrum and vitally important to this Department.

Selection Process

The method for selecting Field Training Officers has discouraged many prospective applicants from seeking vacant positions. This is indicative with the single application received during the last recruitment effort.

There are complaints that the poor quality of Field Training Officers is directly attributed to the lowering of the minimum length of service requirement. Some program-personnel feel two years of experience as an officer is not adequate experience to be considered eligible for the position of Field Training Officer. This criterion has enabled those with less experience and not necessarily the ones with the best qualifications the opportunity to train. Consequently, the poor quality of some training officers who presently train have deterred others from wanting to fill Field Training Officer positions. Few police officers want to belong to a fraternity which accepts the least qualified. The practice of preferring to, or resorting to, assigning newer officers also ignores a wealth of experience and knowledge to be found in the senior officer. Officers suggested the selection process should be designed to attract the qualified senior officer as well as the qualified newer officer, with ability to train the primary criterion.

Finally, checking an applicant's past performance, education, and compatibility by a selection panel is urged by program-personnel, to ensure the selection of the most qualified.

Time Spent on Training

Much on and off-duty time is spent by Field Training Officers in assisting trainees in improving deficient areas such as

English grammar, sentence structure, organization, and other areas individuals should have learned in grammar and high school. The more time spent on these activities the less time spent on field training. Personnel have suggested that the pre-employment screening processes should tap writing deficiencies prior to the selection of candidates.

Beat Assignments

Provision of ample on-the-job training time is also constrained because of beat assignments. For example, instead of isolating trainer and trainee from the normal activity that exists within Patrol, this duo is often placed in a double-unit capacity to insure that available manpower is appropriately being utilized. The affect of this practice does two things: first of all, the double-unit assignment typically means more activity in the area where a two-man unit is required.

The presumption is that both individuals are fully qualified and competent to handle a two-man unit. Given normal conditions both individuals are usually fully qualified; however, given the training setting, one individual is in anywhere from his first to his twelfth week of training and the other individual has had at least two years experience on-the-job. The experienced officer is immediately handicapped. He must protect himself as well as the trainee and the public. The second problem is that if the Training

Officer is to address his primary function of being a police officer in an area that is particularly active, he will then be forced to ignore the needs of his trainee; consequently, he will be unable to train effectively.

Program personnel have recommended beat assignments should reflect a training environment and not simply a convenience to management where two people can fill two required slots.

Shift Utilization

Originally, it was proposed to provide 12 weeks of training equitably divided between the four shifts to encourage a complementary training environment. Practice contradicts this proposal. Program-personnel have stated that the day shift is available only for two-week increments for training as compared to longer training periods on the other shifts. The limbo period is reserved for the day shift. Their comments indicate that it has been explicitly stated that trainees should be kept from day patrol to prevent exposure to a less than active and productive environment. This indicates that not all resources are being utilized for training, and that a lack of confidence prevails with respect to the day shift. This isolation complicates the scheduling of trainees with trainers, not to mention the trainee's understanding that the day shift is less productive.

Specific Concerns

Minority and female trainees have cited specific problem areas which they feel unnecessarily aggravate the learning environment. Both have discussed the existing pressures of just being trainees, having to daily learn new material, having to conform to each Field Training Officer's manner of instruction and being exposed to stressful situations, etc. Compounding these pressures are the ethnic and sexual innuendos subtly made by their peers and superiors in a "joking" manner. Trainees admitted it is generally done in fun but at times the jokes get old.

Individuals have suggested that one reason for the ethnic and sexual jokes is that it helps to "relax" the trainees. This technique for "relaxing" the training environment should be avoided if it tends to intimidate an individual and is insulting at times.

Females have complained about the extra friendly behavior displayed by some individuals in various positions, i.e., trainers, peers, supervisors, etc. Women feel they often have to cautiously turn down offers for dates, etc. for fear of receiving low marks on evaluations. It should be understood, not all Field Training Officers, supervisors, or police officers make advances toward female officers, whether complimentary or not. However, some do and mention should be made of this activity.

Women have discussed that their primary objective during training is to successfully complete the program. They realize it is twice as difficult for women to become police officers because of the belief that women are the weaker sex. Disproving this stereotype in itself is a constraint. Therefore, avoiding additional pressures which affect their personal lives greatly simplifies their professional lives.

The ethnic and sexual joking which takes place results for reasons which can be identified through comments made by respondents. First, every individual has his/her own personal sentiment toward minorities and women which was formulated prior to employment with this Department. Varying sentiment may or may not be favorable toward these groups of individuals. Secondly, the Field Training Program Manual specifically states the program was designed to instruct minorities. This orientation has been identified by personnel as having a negative affect on training. Trainers are presently frustrated; they admit that they attribute sources of aggravation to numerous causes. For example, they state that it irritates them to have to train, in general; and to train minorities, at times, who appear to be below educational standards of educated anglo-saxons is even more frustrating. Assisting personnel in activities indirectly related to the field of law enforcement displeases trainers. Thirdly, the day-to-day contact with the criminal element often exposes individuals who have little association with minorities,

outside of work, to the most depraved and deprived groups of people. This perspective narrows one's understanding of ethnic groups.

One way of minimizing the joking problem, as suggested by supervisors, would be to change the description in the Field Training Program Manual to include trainees of all backgrounds, regardless of ethnic, sexual, or religious orientations. After all, it was indicated that every recruit must participate in the Field Training Program prior to full accreditation, irrespective of race, religion, or sex.

In addition to modifying printed material, supervisors should verbally discourage employees from further negative activity. Finally, community relations courses could introduce different cultures to individuals who have primarily interacted with caucasians.

Recommendations

The multitude of problem areas presented thus far has had a significant effect on the success and progress of the Field Training Program. The information compiled by this assessment indicates that the immediate and foremost area to be addressed is the definition and publication of the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program. Next, management must decide precisely who will have jurisdiction over the Field Training

Program. Once these two tasks have been completed, it is management's responsibility to openly commit itself and offer support to those executing the program.

The statement of the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program will provide a framework by which program personnel can base their understanding of the processes in which they are involved. All Patrol Division personnel, whether involved in the program or not, must know and understand the principles of the Field Training Program. This will permit all officers to support and encourage the training officers and trainees to progress. A definite and positive orientation of the Field Training Program would certainly reduce hostility, resentment, and apathy toward the Field Training Program. Trainees must be instilled with the goals and objectives prior to actual field work.

The statement of goals and objectives is a guideline by which management can provide the policies to accomplish the desired results. This additionally provides management with a measuring device for future evaluations.

Flowcharting the sequence of events trainees will undergo while in the Field Training Program will alleviate their uncertainty regarding their status as trainees. This tool also assists trainers in coordinating information and instruction among personnel.

A Departmental-wide orientation is rudimentary for the newly employed. Exposure to the various divisions and a brief discussion of the functions of each would enable the trainee to understand why he/she performs in a specific manner in the field. A positive affect of this practice would be to strengthen camaraderie among all personnel whether in Detectives, Patrol, Vice and Narcotics, Administration, etc. Ultimately, morale will increase.

It is recommended that one week during the limbo period, all trainees be placed in a classroom situation at one time in order to begin training from one perspective. To be included are Departmental and program orientation, goals and objectives, presentation of instructional materials, outline of curriculum, tour of Department, and finally this session allows the trainee to become familiar and comfortable with his personal equipment and Department vehicle. A by-product of the one-week session enables Field Training Officers to recess from the program.

It is recommended that an evaluation of the Field Training Program be conducted periodically--quarterly for example, for the first year to measure and isolate deviations within the program and provide corrective measures. After the first year, bi-yearly evaluations are functional. The evaluator's observation regarding the many specific concerns presented by program participants can be attributed to the ineffectual and inaccessible information system within the Field Training

Program. It is strongly recommended that in addition to quarterly evaluations, an ongoing, informal information gathering mechanism be provided to function as a check-and-balances system. This minimizes and, at times, alleviates problem areas which have long been overlooked. An open communication system will certainly increase the morale in this Department if suggestions, complaints, and observations are recognized and the identity of their contributors is anonymous.

The policy-making body must define the quality and quantity of work to be performed in order to measure whether or not the goal of providing training is being met. Field Training Program resources--manpower, capital, materials, equipment, time, and space--identified as measurable characteristics provide the status and progress of the Field Training Program. An agent independent from training is recommended to perform the evaluations.

To provide an acceptable training environment, it is recommended that the function of training be assigned to the Training Division within this Department. This would permit a central administering agent the autonomy, resources, and authority to fulfill training needs effectively.

It is highly recommended that the Deputy Chief of Administrative Services assume complete responsibility for

training. In so doing, continual appraisal of the program will be delegated by his office and he will be fully aware of the status, progress and needs of the Field Training Program. Concurrently, Administrative Services Division has access to training resources needed for complementary and comprehensive training. Placing training under the direction and guidance of a Deputy Chief affords the program the expediency by which policy changes can be made to reflect program needs.

Structurally, it is recommended that the lieutenant officiating the Training Division be assigned and respond directly to the Deputy Chief. It is also recommended that a sergeant from the Patrol Division who has done extensive research in the area of field training be assigned to the Training Division. This will allow participation from a member of Patrol who has had experience executing, amending, coordinating, and planning the curriculum for field training. This will expedite further research needed to begin reorganization within the program.

Field Training supervision in Patrol must be delegated to all lieutenants and sergeants. Isolating a selected few to function as supervisors of the program does two things--first, it reduces the importance of a supervisor's primary functions, which are supervising and training, by insisting that only designated supervisors will specifically train; second, it builds resentment by the Field Training supervisors who stated it is an extra burden to serve as Field Training Lieutenant or

Sergeant. This negative attitude is an indication that individuals representing this sentiment do not understand the fundamentals of their job duties. It is unnecessary to compensate supervisors with additional pay to function as trainers. Their promotion to sergeant or lieutenant signifies this expertise, and a primary function at this level is to train.

Require all lieutenants and sergeants to commit themselves to the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program.

All four shifts should be fully utilized for diversity and efficiency in fulfilling training and manpower needs. Finally, regular meetings between shifts and among rank is mandatory and should be coordinated once reorganization occurs.

With respect to trainers, their concerns presented in this evaluation should be addressed. Specifically, the item of compensation. It is recommended that the status of the Field Training Officer be elevated to a Specialist position.

Examining the resolution (71-9) which confirmed the position of Specialist, it does not specify whether or not Specialists are exclusively permitted outside of the Patrol Division. This observation is confirmed by the following statement recently submitted to the Police Department by James A. McKelvey.

"There is nothing in Fresno Municipal Code Section 2-1652.1

which would prohibit the use of Police Specialists in the Patrol Division. Utilization of the class, however, must be justified by indicating the specialized nature of the work which will be performed, as per the job specifications for Police Specialist." The need for career development within Patrol is rudimentary for providing a future for police officers within that unit.

Not everyone can advance to sergeant, lieutenant, much less captain, deputy chief or chief. Availability of positions does not permit this to occur.

Without the recognition, the compensation and incentive warranted Field Training Officers, productivity and morale will continue to be on the decline and trainees will be the most affected by this apathy. Upgrading the status of Field Training Officers to Specialist will provide the Department with a greater number of candidates by which selection of the more qualified is possible.

After qualified personnel are selected, they must be given the necessary training to complement whatever expertise they have acquired over the years. In conjunction with instructing trainers how to teach, monitor and evaluate, it is essential they be trained in social, community and interpersonal relations.

If upgrading the status of the Field Training Officer to Specialist is impossible, an immediate option must be implemented to offset trainers' frustrations with having to continually train without commensurate compensation. To minimize this problem program-personnel have suggested that the position of Field Training Officer Alternate should be eliminated. Instead, every individual designated as such, now, should be trained, made available and considered a fully qualified Field Training Officer capable of training. The idea of being a standby trainer should be eliminated. This will increase the number of active trainers and permit the rotation of manpower required for instruction of a full influx of trainees.

Regarding the specific policy within the Field Training Program, it is recommended that an amendment be made to the 12-week release policy. Rather than automatic release of the trainee to solo status, the following should be considered. First, Field Training Officers believe prior to release the nature of the trainees' deficiencies should be recognized. For example, if a trainee is receiving poor marks in officer safety, then further remedial training is warranted before his/her reaching solo status. If on the other hand, trainees' deficiencies are in the area of report writing, then the trainee may be released from Field Training Program because, as stated by a Field Training Officer, "no one is in a life or death situation if there are misspelled words in a report, etc."

Second, once a trainee is released to solo status, Field Training Officers should continue to assist Sergeants with training, evaluating, and monitoring a trainee's performance.

Should an individual need to return to a structured training environment with a Field Training Officer, there should be no stigma attached to the trainee for returning. Adequate training is more important than meeting deadlines.

Conclusion

The problem areas and recommendations presented in this evaluation are not intended to criticize or circumvent the existing Field Training Program administrators. The evaluator attempted to instill to those surveyed, that evaluations in this Department are positive tools and are not intended to intimidate, "blow the whistle," or suggest probable cause of program malfunctioning. Instead, it is used to assess, measure, plan, and offer guidance for the continued success and progress of the Field Training Program.

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY POPULATION INFORMATION

APPENDIX 1

Survey Population:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Avg. Age</u>	<u>Avg. Length Of Ser. (Yrs.)</u>	<u>No. w/Prev. Law Enf. Exp.</u>
Field Training Lt.				
Male	1	31	10.0	-0-
Female	<u>-0-</u>	-0-	-0-	-0-
<u>Total</u>	1			
Field Training Sgt.				
Male	13	33	11.5	2
Female	<u>1</u>	44	9.9	-0-
<u>Total</u>	14			
Field Training Off.				
Male	25	28	8.0	10
Female	<u>-0-</u>	-0-	-0-	-0-
<u>Total</u>	25			
Trainee				
Male	49	26	2.0	37
Female	<u>3</u>	25	Unk.	3
<u>Total</u>	52			
Total				
Male	88	N.A.	N.A.	49
Female	<u>4</u>	N.A.	N.A.	<u>3</u>
Total	92			52

Educational Level:

	<u>G.E.D.</u> <u>Hi.Sch.</u>	<u>Less Than</u> <u>2 Yrs.Col.</u>	<u>AA/AS</u> <u>Degree</u>	<u>BA/BS</u> <u>Degree</u>	<u>Grad.</u> <u>Degree</u>	<u>Post</u> <u>Grad.Wk.</u>	<u>Teaching</u> <u>Cred.</u>
FTL							
Male	1	-0-	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-
Female	<u>-0-</u>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	1						
FTS							
Male	10	5	2	3	-0-	-0-	-0-
Female	<u>1</u>	1	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	11						
FTO							
Male	24	8	13	7	-0-	2	1
Female	<u>-0-</u>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	24						
TRAINEE							
Male	49	28	14	10	1	2	1
Female	<u>3</u>	1	1	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	52						
TOTAL							
Male	84	41	29	21	2	4	2
Female	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Unkn.	<u>88</u> <u>4</u>						
Total	92						

Male trainees, on the average, had four Field Training Officers during the training program; female trainees had five. Average academy class grade was a "B" for male trainees; average class standing is unknown for females.

APPENDIX 2

FIELD TRAINING SERGEANT EVALUATIONS

1. What do you perceive as the basic purpose of the Field Training Program?

A consensus of the following illustrates existing perceptions of the Field Training Program:

- To educate new personnel through on-the-job training in the Patrol Division to work with a quality, seasoned officer and learn first-hand what and how things should be done.
- The purpose is to train a person to be a street cop, to provide the trainee with basic tools and knowledge he needs to perform his job. It also evaluates the trainee to see if he is able to do the job. It eliminates marginal employees.
- The Field Training Program is intended to train new officers on departmental policy and procedures, to review legal matters and general police procedures previously covered in the basic academy and to teach/show the new officer how to apply what he has learned to field operations. This is to be accomplished in 12 weeks to a degree sufficient to prepare the new officer to function as a solo, probationary officer. The FTP is not intended to provide enough experience to produce fully competent, solo officers but is intended to produce fully trained officers able to function in the solo capacity with close supervision and continued probationary training which should result in fully competent officers by the end of the probationary period.
- To train a new officer in the practical application of law enforcement and to eliminate those who are incapable of performing the duties of the job.
- The basic purpose of the Field Training Program is to produce competent solo beat officers through standardized training and evaluation and to allow for valid termination of the officers who cannot perform satisfactorily after all available assistance has been given.

2. Do you feel the Field Training Program is accomplishing what it is intended to? Explain.

36% - Yes
29% - Partially
14% - Most of the time
14% - No
7% - Unknown

General Comments

Pro

- The program is working as evidenced by the more qualified officers emerging from the program. The officers successfully completing the program have a much greater knowledge of the mechanics of the job. Example: Department policies, evidence and laws of arrest.
- Yes. I feel that generally the FTP is accomplishing its intended goals. However, I think that it still lacks standardization.
- Yes. Trainees appear to be able to function most of the time without in-vehicle supervision.
- Yes, to a degree. Trainees are receiving sufficient training to have some competency, however, there is a problem in standardization of training.
- Yes. All recruits receive the same information within a 12 week period. It has been up until just recently when the minimum requirements were changed. In the past, the trainee was not released to solo capacity if it was determined that he/she was not performing efficiently as a solo, competent officer. Now it seems the philosophy has changed to allowing those trainees that have reached the end of training to be released and they either sink or swim, whether they are qualified or not.

Con

No. As it is now, the FTO has no input into determining whether a person is retained or terminated. People who are not making it should be terminated in the program.

3. Should the FTP be an extension of the selection process and include, at some point, a recommendation for separation if adjudged not qualified?

86% - Yes
7% - No
7% - Unknown

General Comments - Pros

- Yes it should be, and I was given the impression we and the FTOs already had that authority, at least to strongly recommend dismissal. We need a strong uniform policy -- not constant change and lack of uniformity and information dissemination.
- Yes. The trainee should not be released from the FTP to a solo status regardless of the time frame until the Field Training Program can certify that the trainee is fully trained to the point of being ready to go to solo probationary status. If that point in training cannot be reached, the trainee should be terminated. The obligations for recommendations should be as follows: The FTO, in conjunction with the FTS and FTL, should make a recommendation at the end of 12 weeks to either release the trainee to solo status or to retain the trainee within the FTP for additional training. Some time later whenever it is found that the trainee has been successful, the same group can recommend release. If it is found that the trainee does not respond to training sufficiently to be ready for release, the FTO and FTS should continue to recommend retention until the administration determines, on the advice of the FTL, that further training will be fruitless. At that point, the trainee should be terminated. At no time should the trainee be released before the FTO, FTS, and FTL concur that the trainee is ready to go solo. This would solve all the problems outlined in question #2, but would remove the FTO from being part of the terminating group. The FTO and FTS would be concerned purely with training and would have the authority to continue that training if needed. This would also impress on the trainee that he has to learn the material and demonstrate proficiency or won't ever be released and will eventually be terminated. In the previous history of the FTP, the 11th and 12th weeks were used for solo observation to make a decision to retain or release or terminate. Often this led to a two to four week retention ending in either release or termination. This created a two to six week period with a threat of termination looming over the top. This type of stress and tension often resulted in total loss of the training atmosphere and resulted in very poor performances by the trainee. Doing away with the rigid time schedule and the immediate threat of termination as outlined

Question #3 Pros (Continued)

above would relieve this problem. But reinstating the power of the FTP to retain trainees would keep trainees from coasting through and would reinstill confidence and pride in the FTP.

- Definitely. As a number of recruits are being placed in the FTP regardless of their position on the eligibility list and their suitability for retention is an extension of the selection process.
- Yes. If a trainee consistently shows that he is not benefiting from the training given, constantly requires remedial training in the same areas, and has not developed the minimal level of competence, it would be better to separate the trainee at this point than to release the trainee to work in a solo status.
- Yes. I feel that the sooner we can determine that someone is not qualified, the better. If you make the Field Training Program separate and go to performance evaluation, you have wasted a lot of time and money on someone you will have to let go for a lack of qualification. Plus once they are out of the Field Training Program and not under daily observation, it would be easy for someone to be overlooked as not being qualified.

Cons

Not under the present selection process. People with the highest scores are not taken off the list first. Rather they are chosen according to ethnic background. People with spanish surnames are chosen, and they cannot speak the language or serve as interpreters.

4. A. Are there any administrative constraints which limit the effectiveness of the Field Training Program?

72% - Yes
21% - No
7% - Unknown

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- Yes. I think the amount of paperwork incurred is too great. I think the administration should streamline the program.
- Yes. The first and foremost is that which I discussed in the first three answers. In addition to this, there are several other problem areas. First, manpower shortages have dictated that training is done in areas that are manned by double units. This creates an unrealistic environment for training as it is done in primarily one geographic part of the town--West Side--where the trainees won't work after they are released. Second, the FTP is run on four shifts which leads to a lack of standardized training. This could be resolved by better administration and better communication and coordination between the shifts. Third, there hasn't been enough of a commitment to training at the administrative level to provide adequate resources and training to the FTP. The FTP needs better trained FTOs and FTSS and needs current manuals and reference materials. Fourth, the administration has not yet produced a current Department Manual, hence, it is impossible to properly train trainees in Department police procedures. This has led to a lack of standardized training which makes standardized and objective evaluation of trainees impossible. Fifth, the Department has hired new officers before an academy is available and put them into the FTP. The FTP is not geared to train at that level and has been over-burdened with these trainees (I believe this practice has ceased however).
- Yes. Manpower shortages limit a great deal of training to the West Side area. The trainee seldom gets a well-rounded exposure to the diverse aspects of Fresno.

4. B. Are there any administrative constraints which limit the effectiveness of your performance as a Field Training Sergeant?

57% - Yes
29% - No
14% - Unknown

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- Yes. I was not asked to become an FTS but ordered to go to school and become one. There are only two FTSSs on the day shift and I think is required for some sergeants, it should be required for all. Make all sergeants in the Field Division FTSSs.
- Yes. In addition to the above points which also affect the FTS, the FTS is saddled with making lengthy and time-consuming weekly evaluations on each trainee. This drastically cuts into the time the FTS has for observing and/or helping with the training of trainees. These evaluations are needed but should be streamlined. Likewise, the FTS is responsible for coordinating and preparing the other Field Training paper work at the shift level including trainee-FTO assignments, FTO pay accounting, and miscellaneous inter-shift correspondence. On the midnight shift, the FTS is responsible for much of the administrative work for the Field Training Program including maintaining and updating Field Training Program manuals and reference materials, trainee rotation accounting, new hire preparations. On all shifts, the FTS has his field training program duties in addition to his regular supervisory duties of non-field training personnel. All of this leaves very little time to observe or train.

5. What do you perceive to be the role of the Field Training Sergeant?

A consensus of the following, illustrates perception of FTS roles:

- The FTS is responsible for supervising the FTOs, both in their training duties and beat duties, including FTO counseling, evaluation, and discipline. In addition, the FTS is responsible for weekly review of the trainee's progress, deficiencies, and training needs along with a written weekly evaluation of same. The FTS also plans and implements remedial training as needed and makes recommendations to his superiors regarding the trainee's future. In addition, the FTS must perform shift-level FTP administrative duties including training-FTO assignment, materials issued and pay accounting. In short, the FTS supervises, counsels, and administers. He does not train.
- To supervise as normal and fill in as often as possible with the trainee on calls, so as to observe and be able to correct any problems as they happen. To work with the training officer to set up any necessary remedial training in areas of continued problems, to inform the lieutenant of any continuing problems that are not being resolved.
- To supervise and assist the FTO in the training of the new officer. To continuously monitor the feedback from both the FTO and the new officer regarding the new officer's progress or lack of progress. To maintain accurate and complete documentation of the new officer's performance.
- The role of an FTS is to bring about standardized training among FTOs. An FTS should also monitor and continually evaluate the FTOs performance vis-a-vis his/her recruit.
- The FTS is the overseer of the operation of the program on the FTO/trainee level. He is responsible for monitoring the training progress through the use of the daily observation reports and weekly tests. He provides guidance and counseling when needed, and settles any personality conflicts. He provides any needed remedial training.

6. A. Has this Department adequately prepared regular police officers for the position of FTO? Explain.

57% - No
22% - Yes
14% - Unknown
7% - As Well As Possible

General Comments

Pro

- Yes. The program is voluntary for the FTOs and most of them are above average officers. The schooling is there and the ones who liked it are in it for their own improvement, because the monetary gain is not that great.
- As far as the material to cover, I feel the Department has done a good job to prepare FTOs. More training could be done in making them more aware of the trainee's individual problem and tolerant of them.
- Yes, as a start, but more training is needed. To provide a three-day course and not retrain the FTOs periodically is harmful in that after a while, standardization deviates.

Cons

- No. FTOs need more experience before becoming FTOs. They need more training in "how to train" when selected as FTOs, and they need more in-service training while they are FTOs.
- No. More training is needed so that all FTOs and FTSS follow the same procedures and teach the same techniques. Too much variance in the program from shift-to-shift, FTO-to-FTO, and FTS-to-FTS.
- No. The department sends a man to a police academy, puts him through the FTP, lets him work as a police officer for a couple of years, then, with a 24-hour course on being an FTO, expects to get qualified FTOs. I feel FTOs should be more carefully screened and then provided with advanced training in how to be an FTO.

6. B. How are FTOs currently prepared to train recruits?

The following are comments from respondents:

- I think that question is obvious. The oral evaluation by the oral board is quite complete and the rest is covered above.
- FTOs must have two years of experience to become a FTO. When selected, they are given 20 to 24 hours of in-house training which covers teaching and evaluating principles. Along with a little exposure to human psychology and ethnic/gender consideration. This training is given by people, myself included, who aren't fully qualified to give it, but have been through the same training on a more extensive basis, given by those who are qualified to give it.
- In a structured class.
- Given a week, 4 hours a day course on the program, policy, and objectives material to be presented. How to test, etc. Not indepth enough.
- FTOs are given a minimum amount of instruction regarding the goals and objectives of the Field Training Program and then expected to correctly train and evaluate recruits.
- Short training course in the mechanics of the Field Training Program with a background of the philosophy of the FTP.
- Three-day course and off they go.

7. Would you like to see a more comprehensive training program for the FTOs within this Department? Explain.

64% - Yes
22% - No
14% - Unknown

General Comments

Pros

- Yes. First I think three years should be the minimum time on the job for qualification as FTO. This could be considered pre-selection training. Second, I think all FTOs should attend the 40-hour FTO course given by Glen Kaminsky, then attend another 20 to 40 hours of in-house training in our version of the FTP. Third, I think all FTOs should be given refresher training in law, search and seizure, officer safety, public relations, departmental function, driving, etc. In addition, we should extensively train selected FTOs to make them experts in the above mentioned areas and others. To provide an in-house expert trainer as a resource for the FTP and the department in general.
- Yes. A more comprehensive training program would better qualify them to properly train and evaluate recruits. This would give greater quality control to the Field Training Program.
- Yes I would. I feel that the FTO plays a very important role in the development of our Department. They are the backbone of the FTP and, therefore, should receive the greatest amount of training. With highly trained FTOs, we could develop better trained officers, thus, upgrading the Department.

Cons

No. I think what we have is adequate for the present. They do need to be uniformly advised irregardless of what shift or hours they work.

8. What areas should be included?

The following are opinions of the respondents:

- Emphasis should be placed on extensive training in "how to teach" and "functioning within the Field Training Program" along with refresher training in all aspects of the field officer's duties.
- The areas I'd like to see expanded would be teaching skills, how to impart the already known information on how to be a good officer.
- Sensitivity.
- Ideally, a comprehensive training program might include instruction in how to teach, how to listen effectively, and how to objectively evaluate field performance and how to relate to recruits. These are just a few possible areas of training.
- Refresher training in all areas that an FTO is required to train the trainee: Department policy and procedure, criminal law, patrol procedures, etc. Also some training in teaching techniques and psychology.
- More supervision.
- They could use courses dealing with the art of teaching, student/teacher relationship, advanced training in criminal law, recent court decisions and Department policies. They could be trained in how to observe, what to observe (as it relates to the trainee and their performance). They could use more training in how to evaluate and how to document their observations.

9. Are FTOs adequately compensated for the time and energy spent on training new recruits? Explain.

79% - No
14% - Yes
7% - Unknown

General Comments

Pros

- No, not as I see it. If they are doing a satisfactory job as an FTO, a lot of time is devoted by them on and off duty. They should be paid more for the job that they perform. Mainly as FTOs, they have to be on their best conduct to give the proper impression to the trainee. Also, alternate FTOs should be paid.
- No. Many have spent hours of their own time and energy in training the recruits and by not being adequately compensated for this has disillusioned many. They should be receiving as much as a Specialist, since their duties are more comprehensive and delicate and require a broader knowledge of police work.
- No. FTOs get 5% additional pay for training. If, and only if, they actively train for more than half the days in a pay period. 5% is equitable, but it should be full-time pay regardless of trainee assignments. Alternate FTOs should be paid in the current manner. In this way, FTOs could be used for update and resource development during those times they weren't training, with proper compensation. As it is, being an FTO, if it's done right, is a full-time job with part-time pay. Even now, FTOs must spend a great deal of time in study to be prepared to train.

Cons

- Yes, however they get no recognition.
- Yes. They are adequately compensated, however, the position should be made a specialist position so that a clear distinction could be had between the FTO and the new officer. There must be some designation of rank.

10. How often do you meet with FTOs on your shift to discuss the FTP? Explain.

- 29% - Have not met
- 22% - Daily
- 14% - Weekly
- 14% - Once a Month
- 14% - Unknown
- 7% - Infrequent

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- Daily. During the course of our duties, the program and concept is good. In practice, we find communications break down through the chain of command. The end result is, in many instances, confusion. One problem is that the trainee is moving to what shift, when, etc., or are daily evaluation sheets made by the FTOs when a recruit is in a double limbo or not.
- None at this time. Previously, once a week after five working days with a recruit.
- We meet as a group once a month and, unfortunately, daily. The formal group meetings usually last two to four days and are aimed at general concerns and means of bettering the FTP. The daily meetings include routine contacts and a weekly meeting with the FTO and the trainee to go over the weekly evaluation and discuss the trainee's progress, needs, etc.
- No set meetings, just when we get a chance. The Captain would have a fit if we took time for meetings on duty.

11. How do you resolve conflict between FTOs and recruits? Explain. (Personality problems, etc.)

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- I'd hear what both have to say confidentially, then evaluate. If no solution can be reached between them at that point due to personalities, I would change the recruit to an alternate FTO to determine if this particular recruit was having problems with other people in the same area.
- I discuss the problem with each individually, and if no solution is forthcoming, I switch partners and see how the recruit gets along with another FTO.
- Contact both parties, evaluate the situation, then tell the trainee if he can't get along with his FTO he should quit.

12. Should the FTO selection process be revised?

64% - Yes
22% - No
14% - Unknown

General Comments

Pros

- Yes. A little more depth should be gone into the selection, i.e., comments from his various supervisors, both present and past, not just relying on the oral board.
- Yes. The FTO minimum requirements should be three years experience and two years of college credit. The selection process should include a written test of the candidate's knowledge of law and procedures, along with his writing ability. The oral board should be scored on a percentage basis with a 70% passing level. The third portion of the selection should be a background investigation of the candidate composed of interviews with his past and present supervisors and current working peers to determine his suitability to train and function as a role model. Failure of any one of these three segments should mean disqualification.

Cons

- No. I think process is strict enough. I do think that the FTO list, when distributed and posted, should be in numerical order and not just lumped all together. The new FTOs should know who finished first, second or third as should the field supervisor. I sat on an oral board as a member and as a member I was not impressed equally by everyone who appeared before us.
- What selection process? We take what we can get.

13. A. Are there any FTOs whom you feel may not be quite prepared to train others? (Do not name FTOs but elaborate on incidents to support your belief.)

43% - Yes
36% - No
14% - Shortcomings
7% - Unknown

General Comments

Pros

- Everybody has their shortcomings. Some more than others. I feel that there are some that may not be prepared. I do not like the wording for this question. Let's say not qualified to train others whether it's because of over-aggressiveness, personality, existing views regarding the administration.
- Yes. Some of our current FTOs lack experience and/or current knowledge of laws, etc. This has been evidenced in trainees acting improperly based on erroneous training, which I verified with the FTO. Also, some of our FTOs provide a bad role model by being lazy, anti-administration, or poor public relation models. These have been seen by the complaints registered by both the citizens and other officers. Some of our FTOs are poor teachers, frustrating the trainee, or poor supervisors, intimidating the trainee.

Cons

- I know of none on my shift. All our FTOs are older, more experienced officers.

13. B. Why have these people been retained as FTOs?

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- To some supervisors, they can do no wrong, especially those who they work for. For others who are more objective instead of subjective, they can see their shortcomings.
- They have been retained for two reasons. One, the FTSSs haven't been strict enough or conscientious enough in monitoring, documenting, and acting on FTO deficiencies. Two, we have a shortage of FTOs and no volunteers to take their places. The last call for FTO applicants a few months ago drew only one response.
- Because we don't evaluate the FTOs anymore, nor do the trainees as originally set up in the program. Like all other positions on this department, once in it, they seem afraid to move you out for lack of performance. It seems that minimal performance is accepted.

14. Have you observed any inconsistencies between FTOs regarding the teaching of policy and procedure?

57% - Yes
36% - No
7% - Unknown

General Comments

Pros

- Yes. Some FTOs are quick to criticize and look for every fault in a recruit. These same FTOs never praise and offer very little constructive help to the recruits. I think the 7 point spread on the rating system does not help with consistent evaluation of the recruit by his FTOs.
- Yes. FTOs have no current guidelines in many areas due to the lack of a Department Manual. Consequently, FTOs teach what they feel is the best way to do things. Another FTO may feel differently and will teach differently. Many trainees have brought this to my attention and have pointed out that both FTOs were in conflict with our existing manual. This has been rectified with the issuance of the one-write and traffic collision manual. But these only effect report writing. Other procedures are largely undefined and consequently not standardized in training. In addition, each patrol shift has different ways of doing things which often conflict. Trainees therefore get conflicting training on different shifts.

Cons

- No. Different teaching methods, but not inconsistent in regard to the end results.

15. What have you done to minimize inconsistencies?

The following are comments which indicate the consensus among respondents:

- Most inconsistencies cannot be rectified until the Department procedures are standardized and put out in written form. On the shift level, we have had several meetings aimed directly at discussing and standardizing our training and evaluation. (graveyard shift)
- I explained it to the FTOs who don't want to change so the system continues. Both approaches may be acceptable but each feels theirs is the best approach. As both are acceptable, I can't order them to change under my authority as it now stands.
- By adhering as closely as possible to Department policy and procedure, I will enable myself to set a good example for both the FTOs and recruits to follow. Also, when I observe these inconsistencies, I take the time to teach and correct them so that both the performance of the FTO and the performance of the recruit will be improved.

16. How often do you monitor a trainee's performance?

- 50% - Daily
- 29% - When Possible
- 7% - Thru FTO
- 7% - Weekly
- 7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Whenever I can. It was somewhat difficult in the past as I would be assigned to different areas of the City than the FTOs and recruits assigned to me. I would work with both the FTO and recruit whenever possible.
- Previously through his FTO and personal observation.
- In theory, I monitor my units in the field for approximately four hours per shift, five days a week. I have three units--each a training unit all five days. By applying a little math to this, it figures out to a theoretical trainee observation of 6-2/3 hours per trainee per week. In reality, I see each trainee in action for probably one or two hours per week spread out in 15 minute slots on a daily basis. In addition, I do a weekly review and compilation of their daily evaluation which includes an approximate 30 minute interview.

17. Is there any interaction between you and the trainee?
Explain.

- 57% - Yes
- 22% - Little
- 7% - Depends on Trainee
- 7% - Unknown
- 7% - No

General Comments

Pros

- Yes. We interact during an interview/counseling session conducted as soon as they come to the shift and during the weekly reviews. On a daily basis, the conversation is usually limited to small talk or in answering questions brought to me by the trainee and FTO jointly.
- Yes. I make myself available to the trainee whenever possible. Respond to the calls, meet in the field, and review reports.
- Yes. The trainee must be made to feel comfortable and at ease. The under-the-gun feeling one goes through in this program creates stress. An interaction must take place to alleviate some of the stress.

Cons

Usually not. I observe and talk to the FTO later on what I say.

Nothing specific, however, counseling has been given regarding adaptation to the job.

18. What criteria do you use to determine a trainee's progress?

General Comments

- His length of time on the Department, whether or not he has been to the academy, personal history statement, the FTOs daily evaluation, plus my own observations.
- I compile the daily evaluations done by the FTO. Couple it with my observations and rate it per the standardized evaluation guidelines on a weekly basis. In addition, I subjectively review the FTOs narrative comments, talk with the FTO and observe the trainee and his reports and compare this picture to what my experience tells me is normal progress. This is not used for formal evaluation, but it is used for counseling and/or general area deficiency spotting.
- The amount of time he has been in the program, whether or not he has been to the academy, and where in ability he started from. Report writing and the way he relates to citizens.
- Comparison of his performance as related to past performance and training as he progresses through the 12-week program.

19. A. Do you have an active part in correcting the trainee's errors; or

- 79% - Yes
- 7% - No
- 7% - FTO
- 7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Not usually. His FTO with the constant contact would do most of this.
- A thru C, yes. But not generally on a daily basis. My involvement with this is usually by way of the weekly review or through daily incidents brought to me by the FTO which is infrequent. In performing this function my instructions or suggestions are usually to the FTO for him to implement and regard overall training deficiency trends. I am not involved in the day-to-day training of the trainee. This is the FTO's function.
- I have an active part insofar as it does not interfere with the normal FTO/recruit relationship. I feel that by properly evaluating the performance of the FTO, I can have a greater part in correcting the recruit's errors. I can always strengthen a recruit's performance by positive recognition of his performance.

19. B. In strengthening his/her performance; and/or

79% - Yes
14% - Unknown
7% - FTO

General Comments

- If weak in certain areas, I try to give them new ideas and different ways to approach the problem areas.
- Yes. Positive reinforcement when trainee observed to perform properly. Yes. Positive strokes.
- Yes. If I notice a problem, I usually make sure the FTO is doing something to correct the situation. If not, I usually suggest ways in which I handle the situation.

19. C. Assisting with problem areas. Explain.

79% - Yes
14% - Unknown
7% - FTO

General Comments

- If FTO runs into a repeated problem with a recruit, I usually enter into the picture and offer advice and criticism within some cases, documentation of the repeated incident or more serious infraction.
- If trainee is experiencing unusual difficulty and remedial training by FTO in solving the problem does not work effectively, personal counseling is then necessary.
- Yes, by offering resources, such as books, or referring a trainee to the Department library, which incidentally is in incredibly bad shape.

Supervisor

20. Do you feel your supervisor is responsive to the objectives of the FTP?

- 65% - Yes
- 14% - No
- 14% - Some
- 7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Yes. He sees the need for the program, but he is not actively involved in it.
- Yes, however, he is stifled by the administrative constraints under which he functions.
- Unfortunately, my FTL is loaded down with administrative training responsibilities and is therefore not afforded enough time to actually see for himself the strong and weak points of the practical application of the FTP. If my field training lieutenant could be freed from the administrative responsibilities, I think that he would then have an opportunity to better see and implement the Field Training Program objectives.

21. Does he make any attempt to improve the program through reorganization, meetings, bulletins, etc? Explain.

- 43% - No
- 36% - Yes
- 7% - Sometimes
- 7% - Infrequently
- 7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Only when the need to improve the program is brought to his attention by an FTS. Refer to response #20. When he does perceive a problem, he is generally helpful in offering any type of assistance to resolve and improve the program.
- He always keeps the shifts up-to-date on changes in the program and informally on the functioning of the program. He does this both verbally and written. He asks our input in regards to proposed changes in the program.
- Yes. He insists in manpower assignments which are best suited to benefit the Field Training Program. Encourages meetings between FTOs and supervisors.

22. Is there anything you would like your supervisor to do to enhance the FTP that he/she now does not do? Explain.

50% - Yes
36% - No
7% - Left to FTL
7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Yes. Make all sergeants FTSS and given them a bigger say on the selection of the Field Training Officers by letting the sergeants interview and select them.
- Have periodic meetings, solicit comments and suggestions, exchange ideas.
- Yes. Many things, most of which I have discussed in the questionnaire. However, as I said, he is stifled. I would like to see his supervisor release control of the Field Training Program to him and then see him exercise his authority to make the changes that are painfully obvious. In addition, I would like to see my supervisor exercise the authority he now has to a greater degree and make decisions and give direction to the Field Training Program rather than take a let's-not-make-waves approach.

General

23. Do you have any specific concerns regarding the Field Training Program? (What are its weak/strong areas?) Explain in detail.

79% - Yes
14% - No
7% - Unknown

General Comments

- Most of it was covered above except for the fact that many times the recommendations of the Field Training Officer, Field Training Sergeant and even the FTL are over-
road by a staff officer who does not know the capabilities of the trainee as far as extending, retaining or dismissing him or her. This leads to an "I don't give a damn" attitude and the loss of the more qualified FTOs to the dismay of many FTSSs.

- Since the new Chief has taken over, he has destroyed the morale of the FTOs and FTSSs. They are now only able to give the training information. They have been removed from the effective screening process that we had where unqualified trainees were terminated during the training program. Now, any trainee, regardless of how bad, is sent out by himself to do the job. One of the objectives was to upgrade the quality of officers and the old program did it. The new program makes us keep our mistakes and not get rid of them. No supervisor can follow an officer around when they are out by themselves and effectively evaluate them like an FTO can. These new policies have weakened the program to the extent that the last request for FTOs met with zero applicants. This is a sign of what the officers feel. They are just babysitters for 12 weeks. They receive no Department recognition and are not recognized by the public. Give them a recognizable emblem and more authority.

APPENDIX 3

FIELD TRAINING OFFICER EVALUATIONS

1. What do you perceive as the basic purpose of the Field Training Program?

Examples of the perceived objectives of the FTP are as follows:

- Most importantly to identify those who are not suitable for police work. Secondly, to prepare a recruit for a solo capacity role as a beat officer both mentally and emotionally.
- The Fresno Police Department Field Training and Evaluation Program is a selection process that combines in-service training with objective evaluations to insure that the standards of a competent solo beat officer are met.
- The basic purpose of the FTP is to produce competent solo beat officers through standardized training and evaluation. We must allow for valid termination of those officers who cannot perform satisfactorily after all available assistance has been given.
- Promote professionalism by better training of personnel and removal of those who are incompetent.
- The basic purpose is to train and supervise the new officers. To assist them in learning a new skill and to document them in their weakness in the event they do not have the ability to be a police officer.
- To establish the ability and suitability of a new officer to the police environment and responsibility. To give the new officer as much training and information as is practical prior to his assuming the responsibility of a solo officer.

2. A. Do you feel 12 weeks of FTO training coupled with the academy is ample time to adequately train an individual to operate as a solo beat officer?

52% - Responded Yes
12% - No
12% - MOST of the time
12% - SOME of the time
8% - No Answer
4% - Possibility

General Comments

Pro

- Twelve weeks should be used as a focal point for a training period; different people comprehend training at different speeds. Therefore the training period should remain flexible. In most cases 12 weeks is ample time to give the recruit the basics to perform a satisfactory beat assignment.
- If the subject is "suitable" for police work the time allotted is enough. Any longer time, the recruit is bound to become dependent on the FTO. It is time to cut the apron strings so to speak.
- An option to extend the training period should be kept to meet "special needs."
- It can be ample depending upon:
 1. The ability of the FTO to teach.
 2. The ability of the recruit to learn.
 3. The amount of time available for training.
- Yes, provided the department sends the individual to a good, competent stress academy and then places the individual with a competent and properly trained FTO. It should be noted that an individual will spend approximately 3 months in an academy (approx. 480 hrs.). The academy coupled with 12 weeks (approx. 480 hrs.) of field training instruction should give a new recruit about 6 months of intensive training. As a result, the recruit should be adequately prepared and trained to efficiently function as a competent solo police (patrol) officer.

Con

- No, not unless trainee has prior experience.

2. B. If not, how long do you feel the program should be and why?

- 48% - No Answer
- 36% - Should be extended
- 8% - Flexible for needs
- 8% - N/A

General Comments

- An additional 2 - 4 weeks should be more than enough time to train any individual.
- I think 12 weeks and the academy is enough time to train a new officer. But the program should be extended 2 weeks. In doing this the recruit would complete the study material at the end of week 12, and week 13 - 14 would be an observation period. That way the recruit would be able to concentrate on performing as a solo officer and not having to study and prepare for a weekly test. Spend week 13 - 14 observing the new recruit as an officer not a student.

3. Does the Department adequately prepare regular officers for the position of FTO?

68% - No
24% - Yes
8% - Some

General Comments

Pro

- Yes, but we need updated materials. Primarily a new department manual that consolidates present RCTB, General Orders, Special Orders, memoranda.
- Yes, but more standardization and communication between shifts is needed.

Con

- No much more time is needed to prepare new FTOs for the tasks; much more time is needed for ongoing training and feedback between the shifts.
- Simply stated, "no."
- No. We are essentially teachers, so we should have some instruction in appropriate teaching methods and be issued new material relating to training on a regular basis.
- The selection process is poor to begin with and the training is almost totally worthless.

4. A. Would you like to see a more comprehensive training program for FTOs within this Department? Explain.

76% - Yes
20% - No
4% - No Answer

General Comments

Pro

- Why not let FTO become better trained in specialized areas of police work, i.e., bomb tech, interview and interrogation, and other specialized training. As recruits are trained by FTOs that have received specialized training the recruit would benefit from his training.
- There should be a uniformity within the training of FTOs. One very important area should be "what to expect of a new officer."
- Yes. I feel that the training given to FTOs is not adequate. The training given is directed towards how the program is ran and how to evaluate recruits. I feel FTOs should receive extensive training regarding department policy and law. Quite a few of the FTOs are not that knowledgeable in this area. I also feel FTOs should be given first choice whenever any type of training is given. For example, C.I.P. training. When FTOs are trained the material in the training guide should be gone over in detail and tests should be given on the material.
- Yes, we need a more comprehensive training program for FTOs. Ideally, a comprehensive training program might include the following:
 1. How to teach in a vocational/field setting.
 2. How to listen effectively.
 3. How to objectively evaluate field performance.
 4. How to relate to recruits.

These are just a few areas that one might include in a training program for FTOs.

- Yes. First I would like to see a stiffer selection process. A check on past performance, education, and compatibility. This would aide in more respect for the FTO and the program.

Question 4A (continued)

Con

- No... I believe it to be up to each and every officer to prepare himself for service.
- No. Just follow-up training on regular basis.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

4. B. What areas should be included?

- Teaching methods relating to training material for appropriate weeks of training. The department needs to stress standardization within the evaluating process, so instruction may be indicated for that area.
- Officer survival; investigative techniques, driving skills.
- A complete refresher course.
- Supervisor training - FTO has become 1st line supervisor.

5. A. How often do FTOs formally meet to discuss the program's problems?

- 20% - Never
- 16% - Seldom
- 16% - Monthly
- 12% - Yearly
- 12% - Once
- 12% - Unknown
- 8% - Often (did not specify how often)
- 4% - Impromptu

5. B. Should it be more/less often? Explain.

48% - More often
28% - Monthly
20% - No Answer
4% - Bi-yearly

6. Are there any specific concerns you may have regarding the Field Training Program? (What are its weak/strong areas?) Explain in detail.

100% - Yes

General Comments

- My specific concerns are the length of time one FTO should be training, inadequate pay, and beat assignment. I would like to see FTO assignments rotated among FTOs on a shift; specialist pay for the designated FTO during his/her turn as the training FTO regardless of how many days spent with an FTO; and work on beats in the center of town and not on the West Fresno area.

- Strong areas: Procedures and documentation on entire program are standardized. High percentage of well-qualified officers currently FTOs.

Weak areas: No training; no incentive for FTOs and recruitment of new FTOs; poor supervision of program on shift levels; preference to midnight FTOs, apparently because the program is always run by the junior lieutenant on midnight shift. "Why is the lieutenant who is lowest in seniority always assigned as FTO? Shouldn't this important task be assigned to a more experienced lieutenant?"

Inability to give FTOs a rest from training. The FTO should not train (in reference to current program) any longer than 6 months consecutively without being allowed to work solo for an extended period of time.

Inability to take time earned or holiday because you're an FTO.

- You would think that after two years, staff would have the program working as smooth as silk. The strong areas are the capable FTOs. Some very good FTOs have dropped out because of the hassle between them and staff.
- Yes, the move on the Chief's part to recognize it solely as a training period and not a way of eliminating unfit personnel. The weak points stem from the subject being held on swing and lap shift too long. There is not enough time for training as opposed to midnights where it's busy up till 3 a.m. There is a lack of exposure to "real" police work. On 11-7 shift, it's common to have burglars in custody, car thieves in custody, etc. Strong points are rotating among different FTOs so the trainee picks up different good habits.

- Program has lost much of its credibility...when you attempt to match low ability training officers with low ability new officers, the result is self-evident.
- Basically, the program seems to be operating, firstly, as a means to compiling data to use in termination; then, secondly, to train the individual, which I think is backward.
- I've noticed that there are several excellent police officers who would make excellent FTOs, however, they do not want to become an FTO. After talking with these officers, they have related that there is no incentive. They feel that the difference in pay is just not enough for the responsibilities of an FTO.
- I am concerned about the liability of FTOs with responsibility for a trainee. I also think the Department needs to be more specific in goals and philosophy of the FTP.
- Program must maintain competent FTSS who will work with FTO and trainee. If two or more FTOs want a trainee terminated, they should be seriously considered. If that trainee is allowed to try solo, it is too easy for the trainee to just slide by. I don't believe there's a better monitoring program than the FTP. Our job is primarily to teach, but we often can recognize that some people will not make it as police officers.
- The amount of material covered during the last few weeks of the training period and total observation during this time should be relieved. The observation period should be after the trainee has completed the material covered during the first 12 weeks.
- First, it is fragmented. There are FTOs and FTOAs. Either you are a training officer or you aren't. Second, it seems no one knows what the hell the last FTO did with the trainee. Third, no one cares to listen to the FTO, if he has a new officer that needs to be dropped from the program.
- Yes. I feel the program will lose a lot of its credibility with other patrol officers if something is not done to recruit more qualified officers to be FTOs. At the present time, field officers do not want to become FTOs. The officers feel there is not enough reward for the amount of work and headaches the job has. By allowing the unqualified officers to become FTOs, it sets a bad example for them and they are not taught very important things that are not in the manual.

Question 6 (Continued)

- The strongest point the program has is the training guide. This is an organized guide that teaches the recruit week-by-week information that will help him when he makes a solo beat. Even though this is the strongest point I feel it could use some improvement. It should be kept more up-to-date.
- I'm concerned about the left hand not knowing what the right one is doing. You would think after two years that staff would have this program working as smooth as silk.
- Seems to lack guidelines. No uniformity between FTOs on goals or rating. As of now, not sure of duties regarding recruits.
- I think that poorly trained FTOs is a weak area in the program. One of the strong points is that this FTP is a progressive step towards improving the caliber of officers employed by the FPD.
- Lack of standardization due to FTOs being placed on all shifts.
- The biggest problem with the program is its lack of uniformity. I feel the program should be conducted on one shift with time set aside for formal instruction. Recruits come from other shifts or inadequate FTOs and suffer because they haven't been given the instruction for the period of training.
- FTOs should be given more material to teach from. Can't explain further because of my status.
- The weak areas as I see it are concerning stress problems, and also the FTOs need additional training occasionally.
- My biggest complaints are the nature of the selection process and the pressure on the FTO to produce competent people with inadequate time and motivation. The selection process recently has absorbed all willing candidates as FTOs without adequate attention to qualifications. It seems to be a "take what you can get" attitude rather than to be extremely selective as should be the case. The second problem is that FTOs are not really treated fairly resulting in very low morale and productivity. Some FTOs don't get paid because of insufficient days in a pay period. If a person is training at all he should get paid. Also, the FTO does not always have the time he needs for training because of work to be done (especially swing and lap shifts). Extra office time should be allowed as the quality of time does not always allow for proper training.

Question 6 (Continued)

Also not enough weight is given to the FTO's opinion. One of the biggest reasons for the program was to put the evaluation process in the hands of the most accurate observers (partners) and away from the casual observer (sgt. and lt.). Yet when the FTO recommends termination, he is reversed by those who have not experienced the recruit's inability to function. It is more like "You decide but your decision doesn't count." Another very serious problem is that the curriculum, FT Guide and tests is extremely outdated as is the reference material including the Police Manual.

7. Is the Field Training Program accomplishing what it is intended to? Explain.

56% - Yes
16% - No
16% - Uncertain
12% - Partially

General Comments

Pro

- If you compare the new officers who have come through the program with the older officers who did not, you will find that the newer officers are more advanced at their time in their careers than the older officers were at the same time.
- Yes, except for terminating unacceptable employees.

Con

- No. At one time perhaps at this time the lack of dedication to goals of training is very evident.
- I am not sure. A recent change in policy allows a trainee with an obvious lack of ability to still go out of the program. A probation officer has little contact with a sergeant and in some cases able to slide through his probation and become a burden to his fellow officers and the department.
- No. The outdated curriculum, poor quality of recruits, poor quality of FTOs, and the unwillingness of management to execute appropriate recommendations have all contributed to a very inefficient program. Also the morale of the FTOs very negatively influences the quality of training provided. FTOs haven't got the time to train, don't get the pay or recognition they should, and are frequently ignored when a recommendation is made. All of these factors defeat the two (2) purposes of the program.
- The intentions of the program haven't been clearly defined.

8. Are you disenchanting with the FTO program? Why? Be specific.

52% - Yes
24% - Some
24% - NO

General Comments

Affirmative

- Yes. Chief Hansen's statement that no one will be let go from the program.
- Yes. The department has always paid lip service to the program. No real effort in terms of time, money, and training is given to the FTO.

The very serious problem of lack of inter-shift feedback and standard training procedures has never been addressed and changed. The department demands much from the FTO and gives little in return. FTO status has always been a police specialist position but the department has never made any effort to meet this demand.

- Yes. The program as it stands now has lost its validity. This is due to not being able to make recommendations concerning the retention/dismissal of trainees. Also, the pay is not adequate for the time spent or the extra pressure placed on the FTO.

Negative

- No, not really, like I stated before I just wished the philosophy was stated in more distinctive terms as to overall purpose and expected end results.
- Not totally, the program still has a lot of good if an effort was made to correct its flaws the FTOs would work harder to better the program and department.
- No. I think it's generally good just needs a little more organization.

9. Do you think the FTO Program should be a way of eliminating personnel? Why?

- 80% - Yes
- 16% - Partially
- 4% - No answer

General Comments

Pro

- Yes, because the FTO is in constant contact with the trainee instead of a sergeant who only gets brief exposure to the trainee.
- Yes. Why wait two years and find you have a dummy working for the department.
- Yes. The real goal of eliminating unfit people should rest in the police academy. This almost never happens. This puts a very difficult burden on the FTO program. Field evaluations by sergeants only is all but useless. The FTO spends many hours with the new officer and can very quickly identify people who cannot respond to training. Without elimination in a formal FTO setting, unfit officers will be put in a potential time bomb mode. When an unfit officer is not eliminated in the FTO setting and is placed in the field for hit or miss evaluation by sergeants, the Department puts the responsibility of identifying failure with day-to-day field calls and problems. This can set the stage for tragedy. The public, another officer, or the new officer himself may pay the price of injury or death. If the Department has 12 weeks of written evaluations on a new officer that identifies him as unfit, the very real possibility of liability in court is self-evident.
- Yes. Who better knows how someone will be to work with, next to, or for. Guidelines should be established as to particular goal. As FTOs, we should be allowed to participate in the dismissal of recruits who are obviously incapable of handling their job. In the case of the average performing recruit, I feel that the FTO should provide the required instruction and then release the recruit to fend for himself in a sink-or-swim situation. An individual can be given only so much instruction. It is then his/her responsibility to utilize it at the best of their ability.

Question 9 (Continued)

Con

- Some. Partially, the FTOs are with the recruit 40 hours a week and see how they perform. The FTOs observe the recruit and know if the person is or will be able to perform as a solo officer. If the FTOs see a recruit who has not demonstrated the ability the department should accept the FTO's evaluation and take action to get a qualified person in their position.

10. What is your function as an FTO?

- The field training officer is the essential means by which the goal of the program is achieved. Specifically, the production of a police officer able to work in a solo assignment in a safe, skillful, productive, and professional manner. In his role as a trainer, he provides ongoing instruction utilizing innovative and practical techniques to train and evaluate trainees.
- To instruct recruits in the basic workings of the department, its goals and expectations. Also to provide assistance in problems encountered by the recruit as to availability of resources, sick time, time earned, vacation, etc., policies. The other area of concern is to teach recruits codified laws, report writing techniques, investigation techniques, etc., to prepare the recruit for solo duty.

11. What is your technique for teaching departmental policies and procedures, city geography, ordinances, etc.?

- Setting a relaxed atmosphere the recruit will feel comfortable in to ask questions. Also learning by doing. If he is driving the wrong way let him drive the 9 or 10 miles or whatever it takes to recognize his error.
- Formal review of the material both on and off the job. Formal guidance under field conditions. Use some classical conditioning by going over weak areas again as needed. One on one feedback to identify and help resolve problem areas. Hands on approach for many field tasks is very helpful.
- Require reading and study of reference material; discussion and demonstrations; questions and practical field exercises; written tests and verbal evaluation; repeat of process if #4 is unacceptable.

12. What information do you use to prepare for instruction?

- FTO manual, other written materials - 10 years of experience.
- I use the following sources: Penal Code, Vehicle Code, Muni Code, FPM, RCTB, G.O.s; S.O.s, California Criminal Law Manual, Police Officer Law Reports, Officer Down--Code Three, Crime Investigation by Kirk, and anything else that I can find.

13. A. Has the FTO Manual been any assistance to you?

- 68% - Yes
- 20% - Some
- 12% - Never received one

General Comments

Pro

- It would be very difficult for me to train without it.
- Yes, only slightly, mostly for evaluation criteria.
- Yes, the manual should be updated. The manual also should be made into a reduced form so that an FTO could go over the material in a short period of time. The information in the study guides should be summarized. This would allow the FTO to carry the material with him at all times and have all 12 weeks of material available to him to use as a reference material when he needed it.
- Yes, as often as is needed to remain accurate. (This is not in reference to the FT guide which is totally unacceptable and out-of-date.)

Con

- Very minimal. All the information in the manual is carried by most officers in their briefcase. The FTO manual is bulky and merely another item to cart along.
- No. The FTO manual has not been that useful as it is out-dated.

13. B. Should the Manual be updated?

- 76% - Yes
- 24% - No Answer

14. Do you consider yourself an instructor or monitor; that is, do you do more teaching or watching for errors?

- 44% - Instructor
- 36% - Both
- 12% - Unknown
- 8% - Monitor

Instructor

- I personally consider myself as an instructor. I find that by teaching recruits techniques relevant to the field duty, they are more likely to develop self confidence in themselves than would be the case if I constantly looked for their faults. I discuss the obvious or serious faults that I see, but I am totally against nit-picking as it only causes a breakdown in one's performance.

Monitor

- The program is set up more on the monitoring side than teaching. Plus the academy should have been adequate as far as teaching the recruit is concerned.

15. Is your effectiveness as an FTO hindered when you are assigned to several different trainees in a short period of time?

- 72% - Yes
- 20% - No
- 8% - Unknown

Pro

- Yes the recruit and the FTO can't effectively understand each other in short periods of time.
- Yes, it takes me at least one week to get to know the recruit so I can find out where the recruit's weaknesses are so we can work on same.

Con

- No, but you tend to get burned out.

16. A. Are the evaluation forms functional?

80% - Yes
16% - Unknown
4% - No

16. B. Do they need to be revised?

40% - Yes
36% - No
24% - No Answer

17. Is the pay differential commensurate with the responsibilities you have been given?

- 92% - No
- 4% - Yes
- 4% - No Answer

General Comments

Pro

- Yes, but I feel it should be a position that gets full-time pay.

Con

- No, this is one of the main reasons many of the present FTOs want out of the program.
- No, the pay in no way makes up for the additional responsibilities and pressures you take on when training.
- No way. I personally feel the FTO has a more important role in determining the quality of officers on this department than anyone else. Also for the amount of pressure the job has the pay is a joke. Personally, the only reason I became an FTO was for career advancement. If that element was not there I would give the position up for a regular beat officer even though I would lose the 5%. I feel the FTO should be getting at least specialist pay. If this was done more officers would want to be FTOs; this would allow the dept to be more selective. Thusly, improving the department. The idea of getting the 5% only when training is even worse.

When the FTO becomes an FTO he usually attempts to enhance his knowledge so he can answer the questions when asked by the recruit. This normally makes him a more qualified officer and quite often other officers in the field asks the FTO questions and advice. Quite often the FTO is more up on laws and procedures than the sergeant. I feel the FTO is a valuable employee of the department and he should be justly compensated.

18. Overall, how do you rate yourself as an FTO?

60% - Good
16% - Excellent
12% - Average
12% - No Answer

19. A. Are you aware of the errors you make?

84% - Yes
12% - No Answer
4% - Some

19. B. Are you objective enough to instruct your trainees not to make the same errors?

80% - Yes
12% - No Answer
8% - Some

20. How do you correct your own errors?

- By admitting them to the recruit, then correcting them.
- I correct my errors/faults through a self-evaluation appraisal system that involves daily private meditation.
- If it is an error in procedure, I will admit the mistake and advise the recruit of the proper method. For the most part, I think I take sufficient time in examining a situation before taking action, which, for the most part helps to minimize mistakes. I do not, however, profess to be anywhere near perfect. I merely feel that my actions should be based on good, thought-out decisions.

21. How do you know when you have taught the trainee what you had planned? (What is your way of measuring success?)

- If they can do something or if they know.
- Not only by his test scores, but by observing him hourly.
- I try to always be attune to the recruit's different forms of communication. This would include verbal comments, body language, etc. I don't think that you can measure success. I generally know when a recruit is ready to perform a certain task--when I no longer feel the weight of the recruit's decision-making processes on my shoulders. This is a unique evaluation process that has to be learned from experience and from an educational setting. I have the fortunate opportunity to be involved in such situations.
- When the trainee is able to apply the material to field situations.
- When he demonstrates knowledge of the subject taught.
- When he meets the standard I set for an officer to function solo.
- I usually show recruits the desired method for conducting an investigation, writing a particular report or handling a situation. Subsequent performance by the recruit is the best indicator of my success in the instruction. If the desired results are not accomplished, we go over it again until we get it right.
- You can tell when he has learned (he may not know it word-for-word, piece-by-piece, but a little here and a little there, with time, he remembers more than even he gives himself credit for.)

22. A. Are you interested in knowing how well you are doing as an FTO from the trainee's view?

76% - Yes
12% - No
12% - Unknown

Pro

- Yes. The trainee knows better than anyone as to how the FTO is relating to trainees.
- Most assuredly. I need to know how well I am doing from the recruit's point of view. I frankly would prefer being evaluated by a recruit. I would also like to see and understand the recruit's evaluation of my performance.

Con

- I really don't care but I can usually tell what the trainee thinks of me, plus my training ability.

22. B. How do you assess your own performance?

- After providing instruction, I open myself to the questioning of the recruit. Should there be areas of doubt, we take the time to make them clear.
- By my recruit's progress.
- I ask myself if I have given the material to the recruit and have I honestly tried to train him. I also ask myself if I have given him all the tips on how to survive on the streets and within the department.

23. Are there any FTOs presently in the program who you feel are unqualified to train others? (Do not name them, but elaborate on incidents that support your belief.)

64% - Yes
16% - No
16% - Don't Know
4% - Possibly Some.

Pro

- Yes, one FTO has frequently contacted me by A.M. message on how to handle routine calls and reports. He shows inability to make decisions and seems to need more supervision than he could give.
- Yes, while I was off another FTO had my trainee and verbally chewed him out in front of three fellow officers and a sergeant. He continually maintains a highly stressful FTO/trainee relationship which prohibits a learning atmosphere. On disturbance calls when I'm primary he intervenes and "throws gasoline in the fire."
- Yes, some of these officers had very serious problems when they were in training. How they feel they can train people now is a question I can't answer.

Con

- I don't know that I am in a position to say but some have had so little time on I don't feel they are able to train.

24. What criteria do you use to determine a trainee's progress?

- Ability to handle variety of calls and situations.
- The weekly test plus duplicated stress problems periodically.
- My basic criteria for measuring the recruits progress is how often does the recruit have to depend on the FTO for assistance in his decision-making process while handling a field situation.
- To a limited extent, I give the recruit the freedom to progress at his own pace. I will explain my expectations and show a recruit how to handle various types of situations. The recruit's subsequent performance in like situations serves as a good indicator of progress.

25. How do you assist the trainee in correcting his/her errors?

- Identify the error; advise on correct procedure; give example, test.
- I teach them, show them, let them try it; then let them evaluate what they have done. If the recruit is not satisfied with his/her performance but I feel that the performance can be perfected, then I attempt to show the recruit how to perfect the performance. Once the recruit acknowledges and has an understanding of the principles taught, then we let him/her try it again after remedial training in those areas that he/she was uncertain about.
- Review classical conditioning, hands on approach.
- Point out the error and try to identify the cause. Then provide instruction and/or information to correct the problem.

26. A. Do you solicit constructive criticism, comments, and suggestions from your trainees?

- 64% - Yes
- 20% - No
- 8% - Some
- 8% - No Answer

Pro

- I want my trainee to be honest with me. They should be able to speak what's on their minds. They should be able to tell the FTO what he is doing wrong (in teaching the trainee) so that if the FTO is having a problem he is not aware of, it can be corrected.
- Yes, listen to what is said then try to be objective with what was said.
- I recommend it; it is a good learning tool.

Con

- No, it puts them on the spot. I prefer an anonymous evaluation.
- If justifiable and they can show me fine. But they better be right.

26. B. How do you react to a trainee who disagrees with you?

- Generally I am open minded and actively solicit disagreement. However, my final conclusion on the matter must be accepted while I'm their FTO.
- I look at what he says and evaluate what he says and put it to use.
- If he can prove his point, no reaction. When he is wrong I try to modify his reasoning on factual deficiency.

27. Do you feel it is a trainee's place to make suggestions or criticize the Field Training Program or your training techniques? Explain.

80% - Yes
12% - Don't Know
8% - No

Pro

- Sure. We should listen to everyone on ways to improve. It should be realized though that some recruits will criticize the program or an FTO to try to minimize his own faults.
- Yes, but not to me directly in a written evaluation.
- Yes, without feedback the program is worthless.

Con

- No. Not to me personally. Should be done to supervisor in the form of the already accessible evaluation.
- Not at first. They need to learn to adjust and work with different people. New employees need to put 100% of themselves in learning. After 8 weeks, they will have some idea what is going on and might have some real basis for complaint or suggestion.

28. A. Have you experienced a situation where a trainee has been reluctant to sign an evaluation because of his/her disagreement with your comments? Explain.

48% - No
36% - Yes
16% - Unknown

Affirmative

- Yes, I explain that the evaluation is my opinion on his performance and that he should take it as that. If there is a disagreement on exactly what occurred I will put the recruit's opinion of the incident in the evaluation.
- Yes, I have experienced the situation where a recruit was reluctant to sign an evaluation. Sometimes I have changed the grade as the recruit pointed out an error in my observation of the situation. In other areas, the recruit does not understand the reason for the evaluation and its purpose. I personally don't mind changing an evaluation after discussion between the recruit and myself. I think the recruit's input is just as important as mine.

Negative

- No. Once I did, but after explaining to him about his fault of second-guessing me or the program, he then agreed and signed.
- I told him he didn't have any choice and he got to evaluate me later on.

28. B. What do you do?

- I explain the deficiencies in the report and the areas where improvement was needed. The trainee was very defensive but signed the evaluation. The situation arose the second time and the trainee and I had a meeting with the FTS.
- In each case, I explain the reason for the rating, then allow them to respond as their feelings about same. In some cases I changed the rating if the recruit's argument was valid, and in others, the recruit accepted the explanation and the rating stood.

29. Do you treat all trainees the same regardless of their ethnic background, religion, or sex? Be specific.

- 84% - Yes
- 8% - No
- 8% - Don't Know

Pro

- Yes. I try to treat all trainees the same and remain objective in each trainee's performance.
- I try to be fair with all trainees but somehow I find some of the minorities defensive but I usually bring them around.
- Outside, we all have our preferences. When I get a new trainee, it is clearly explained that the only gender is officer and the only color is blue. I rate all recruits on that basis and will not take any other type of stand.

Con

- No you have to take into regards their different backgrounds.
- No, I treat each recruit as an individual. I don't think that I should treat all recruits the same. They all have different personalities and as a result, require personalized assistance and training. I do think that an FTO should know where a person of a certain ethnic background "is coming from" or where a female is coming from, but my personal basic goal is to make each recruit attain his/her personal best. Of course each trainee is told the only color is blue and it is up to them to apply themselves.

30. A. Do you find yourself being highly critical of a situation or trainee's behavior?

- 40% - No
- 28% - Yes
- 4% - Depends
- 4% - Some
- 4% - Seldom
- 20% - Unknown

Pro

- In the case of officer safety in part, I would say yes. In most other situations I attempt to maintain a somewhat low key approach. I do not like to nit pick and feel that those who do, are doing an injustice to their recruits.

Con

- Very seldom unless it is life threatening.

30. B. Would you rate yourself the same way you rate the trainee if the roles were reversed?

- 72% - Yes
- 20% - Unknown
- 8% - Probably

30. C. Do you verbally let a trainee know when he/she is doing a good job?

- 80% - Yes
- 20% - No Answer

31. A. How do you handle situations where a trainee complains of inconsistencies between FTO's? (One teaches one way; another teaches another way.)

- Talk it over and advise everyone has their own way of doing things. As long as it is within policy, they should pick up the points they use best and learn from each FTO.
- All I can say is that all FTOs are given the same material, however, we're all different by nature and this may account for some inconsistencies.
- I tell the recruit that if my performance conflicts with another FTO, then the policies and procedures are the ruling factor in determining what is right or wrong. If the recruit has been taught incorrectly by another FTO, I generally don't rate them down right away. I let the recruit read and know what the rules say about the conflict then ask them to follow the policies and procedures of the Department.
- I advise the trainees of what I expect. I also advise the trainee that he needs to be flexible because there will be inconsistencies. He should make himself/herself aware of Department policies and then adapt the best technique from each FTO.
- I allow the recruit to explain the past example and discuss its benefits and faults. I attempt to show the recruit the means most desirable to attain satisfactory results, then let him/her apply the teaching in his own way.
- Explain that any two people are different and hopefully he will choose the best from what both are trying to do for him or her.
- $1 + 7 = 8$; $4 + 4 = 8$; $3 + 5 = 8$
More than one right way of doing things.

31. B. What can be done to eliminate or minimize these inconsistencies?

- Probably have more meetings of FTOs and more updating of material.
- This problem is easily eliminated. Tell the FTOs to start following department policy and procedure instead of their own personal, traditional discretion.
- Standardization is needed in training, report writing, and policy among shifts, sections, divisions.

32. What have you done as an FTO to improve a trainee's deficient areas and provide special training needs?

- Good solid study, work, and practice makes perfect. An example are the basic tools for correction of deficiencies.
- I will concentrate on problem areas, offering additional training and assistance, sometimes extra reading or actual physical demonstration are used.
- More instructions on the matter and also volunteering for those types of calls so the recruit gets more exposure to his weaknesses.

33. What does documentation of trainee's performances serve to do?

- Shows progress and substantiates firing when needed.
- Mainly it serves as a future trainee background in case the trainee is terminated and takes it to court.
- Documentation assists the recruit in knowing how he/she stands in the training program. Assists the department in measuring the performance of the recruit in order to see if the recruit has reached the high standards of performance required of a professional police agency.
- Shows deficient areas and whether there is a response to remedial training. It also shows that the trainee is capable of learning, retaining, and applying materials presented.
- It sets a standard for rating and defines any problems through establishing a pattern.
- It provides written documentation as to recruit's high and low points, singles out obvious problems, and is an indicator of progress.
- Used to be very helpful and some people don't seem to respond no matter what is done. But with Hansen around, not a damn thing.

34. What is your relationship with your supervisor in the FTO Program?

Positive

- Good. He overlooks the program and can give ideas on how to deal with specific problems when asked.
- I have an excellent relationship with my FTS. We have a very open channel of communication that assists me in improving my performance as an FTO.

Negative

- My supervisor has a bad attitude and he admits to it. But he is an excellent sergeant.
- It's a relationship in which I feel I go to him with all the problems that come up and that I need help dealing with. However, I do not feel that I see him enough in the field filling on calls. I've noticed that most FTSs complete the weekly evaluation entirely from the use of the dailies.
- Don't even know for sure which sergeant is my FTS.
- Fair. I do not see sergeant very often.

35. Does your supervisor assist you with carrying out the Field Training Program objectives? Explain.

48% - Yes
20% - No
16% - Minimally
12% - No Answer
4% - Some

Pro

- Yes. He takes my evaluations and if necessary, evaluates from the FTO and looks for progress and deficiencies. If there is a problem area when I get a new trainee, he makes me aware of it so I can spend extra time working on that area.
- Some supervisors take an active interest and provide necessary supervision, assistance, and evaluation. Others are seldom seen at calls and only discuss problems when it comes time for their weekly summary evaluation.

Question 35 (Continued)

Con

- My sergeant does not seem overly interested in the FTO Program. Previous supervisors have in one case been actively involved in program and was extremely helpful and concerned in incident where recruit didn't understand documentation and what it was to accomplish. Another supervisor completely disagreed with entire FTO philosophy and destroyed credibility of program with each recruit he contacted.
 - No he signs the evaluations and that's it.
 - No. Most sergeants are not actively involved in the program. Most of them do not even go by the calls to see how the recruit is doing or even read their reports. Most sergeants' weeklies are a copy of the FTO's.
36. Do you seek assistance from personnel other than your FTS/FTL who may help you in general with problem areas?
- 52% - Yes
 - 20% - Some
 - 16% - No
 - 12% - Don't Know
- Yes at times I will call to the D.A.'s office or some other related agency or division within the department for help in certain areas.
 - Yes. I often obtain input from other FTOs and from Administrative Services.
37. How does your supervisor handle conflicts between personnel involved in the FTO program?
- Changes the FTO.
 - I have no idea. I have my own ideas but I have never really seen one of our supervisors really handle any real supervision.
 - My FTS, having had a great deal of administrative experience in private enterprise, is able to find the route of conflicts and has the wisdom to solve the basic problems that develop between FT personnel.

38. Does the FTS/FTL monitor and evaluate the FTO Program constructively and on a regular basis? Explain.

- 48% - Yes
- 28% - No
- 20% - Don't Know
- 4% - Some

Pro

- Yes. My FTS keeps current evaluations on recruits that I am training. He seems to always know what week of training the trainee is in, and if he/she is or isn't experiencing any problems.
- Yes. My FTS monitors and evaluates the FTO Program. He is desirous to improve the FTP, however, he finds it difficult to bring about change when tradition is the preferred method for resolution of any problems.

Con

- With the exception of only a couple swing supervisors there is a lack of interest in the FTO Program. Most FTL/FTS interest seems to be a communication gap between the two shifts. How much monitoring is done by the FTL is unknown to me.
- I have not observed any active monitoring or evaluating of anything but trainees.
- FTS, don't know; FTL, never seen.

39. Is there anything you would like your supervisor to do to enhance to the FTO Program that he/she now does not do? Explain.

48% - Yes
40% - No
12% - Unknown

- Stay abreast of the program and be aware of my recruit's performance. Also to make suggestions to me on how to improve as an FTO.
- Allow direct participation with vice units, detectives and intelligence.
- Feedback is only done on a shift basis not program-wide.
- I would like him to fill in on more calls and offer more ideas to improve training.
- As little of communication between FTOs, it is even less with FTS and supervisors. Again more communication is needed.
- Nothing besides keeping closer track of problems with the program and its participants.
- I would like to see more supervision from the FTS. The FTS could evaluate the FTO and recruit in attempts to better department and program.
- I feel at least a weekly meeting should have been held by the FTS.
- Work more towards standardization. Different shifts have different policies and they need to be the same.
- More active participation in the supervision and the evaluation process is needed.

40. A. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions, or complaints regarding the Field Training Program, field training personnel, trainees, etc.?

56% - No
36% - Yes
8% - Unknown

General Comments

- Yes, in reference to my previous statements on differences between midnight and swing shift, one example: FTOs on swing have requested HIC training but were not allowed to receive the training because of lack of seniority. However, FTOs on midnights with less seniority have been to this training. Do you have to work midnights to get training to do a better job?

The program is about to lose FTOs because of frustration, poor pay, and not being given a break. Is there a solution?

Suggestions should be solicited on how to get more good officers to sign up for the program.

- The best program we had was the cadet patrol program. Unfortunately, it's being phased out. Perhaps new recruits could work in cadet patrol prior to going to the academy as a slow transition phase.

I recognize a big difference in progress rate between former cadet versus off-the-street personnel.

- This evaluation is so long overdue it may be too late. The length of time it took to do this type of action supports the contention the Department is not responsive to the program. Many times the trainees view the program as a free ride and any FTO who makes performance demands is viewed as too tough or demanding. If the Department was more responsive to the needs of the program, it would not be in the shape it is now.
- I do believe that the program relies too heavily on just a few FTOs and excludes the alternates. I feel it should be made a permanent position and more officers that are certified used as FTOs. I also believe that an officer entrusted with the practical training of an impressionable new officer should be paid accordingly.

Question 40 (Continued)

- The theory of the program is good, however there is considerable distance between theory and actuality.
- Yes I do. I have alot of suggestions that I think would improve the program. SUGGESTIONS:
 1. FTO meetings once a month
 - a.) training
 - b.) gripes
 2. FTOs given preference when selection is being made on who will attend special training sessions.
 - a.) A few FTOs should be sent to special schools or sessions and then present information learned at monthly meetings.
 3. FTOs given preference on the beat assignments.
 4. FTOs given more money and not have it dependent upon whether or not they are training.
 5. SGTs should be more responsive to FTO's complaints and he/she should try to personally observe the recruit more often at calls.
 6. FTOS should be rotated every six months if they request it.
 7. When promotions are made the FTO should be considered first.
- FTO/FTS should be given more compensation for their time and effort. There should also be more responsibility placed on the FTOs and FTSS recommendations regarding a recruit's performance.
- I think that in the case of a recruit who is released to solo duty, there should be more intense supervision and evaluation on the part of the supervisors and/or possibly the consideration of allowing FTOs to perform this function when available. There are often complaints from other officers of poor performance on the part of new recruits which obviously goes unnoticed as they seem to be getting past the probationary period. I also question the standards of the program whereby obviously unqualified recruits, who have been through the program at a deficient level with clear documentation of their deficiencies, are allowed to continue employment. As earlier stated, if qualifications and performance are satisfactory, then additional work as a solo officer are justified.

Those whose attitude, aptitude, and performance does not fall within the desired level should be terminated. Officers allowed to continue end up in the dead-wood pile, a group of officers whose presence only hampers the effectiveness of everyone else. I also feel that when new recruits are hired, the FTO personnel should be involved in the initial orientation

Question 40 (Continued)

of the department functions. Too little time is spent during the first week orientation relevant to the program. This lack of explanation necessitates the FTO to fully explain the program during training time which presently is short enough.

40. B. Have we overlooked anything? Explain.

76% - No
16% - Yes
8% - Unknown

- Just the duration that one officer should be training for a given time. My suggestion is to only have an officer serve as an FTO for not more than two consecutive months then rotate as an alternate.
- I am glad I got a chance to air some of my opinions.

APPENDIX 4
TRAINEE EVALUATIONS

1. A. What is the basic purpose of FTO program?
(How does trainee perceive it?)

The following illustrates general comments:

- Enforces what was learned at the academy.
- Appears that it is to gather data which will support the Police Department in the event they choose to terminate a trainee.
- The trainee views mostly the scoring of evaluation as a threat to him and pressured by short period of time to complete the program. The trainee anticipates the completion of the period rather than utilizing the FTO as a reference guide.
- To assist the trainee in the development of skills and a confident working knowledge of basic law, department procedures and officer safety in conjunction with public contact.
- Give trainee actual on-the-job-training under close supervision. Enables both trainee and FTO to evaluate "Do I belong Here."
- To train competent solo beat officers.
- To prepare officer in relative application of law enforcement duties in the manner dictated by department policy.

1. B. What is your role as a trainee?

- To observe and learn from the FTO as much as possible in 12 weeks. To study assigned weekly material to ask questions in doubt, to mold yourself into the FTO model.
- To sit, listen, and learn.
- Take in as much as possible during a prescribed length of time.
- To learn to function in a solo capacity.
- Is a time period in which certain individuals can discover for themselves that police work is not their type of work.

2. Does the FTO inform you as to the objectives of your daily, weekly, and monthly training session?

66% - Yes

17% - No

13% - Some of the time

4% - No answer

- We discussed them as they came up. I was free to ask questions.
- Some FTOs do and some don't. I was fortunate to have been taught by some of the best and most informative FTOs.
- No, most of the FTOs don't know themselves.

3. If a brief orientation as to the types of things to be covered in a given period is absent, how is the session conducted? On an as-the-situation-arises basis?

78% - As the situation arises
6% - Before situation arises
8% - NA
6% - No answer
2% - Hit and miss

The vast majority indicated as the situation arises.

- I think it was a little of "you ask me - I'll tell you." In some cases with certain FTOs...the FTOs tried very capably to prepare you as much as possible.
- Usually on an impromptu basis - if something comes up it was explained, if not then the information goes by the wayside.
- Training efforts culminate to critique the trainees' actions, and the ability of the officer to justify his actions. Training ends up a list of things done wrong.

4. Do you feel you are getting the technical assistance and training needed for your independence on the job; particularly related to legal interpretations, municipal codes, department policy and procedures, city geography, etc.?

82% - Yes
14% - No
2% - On own
2% - No answer

A major portion of the respondents stated the Department Manual and Training Manual are outdated and are in severe need of update.

- Basically yes, however, the level of proficiency each officer obtains is directly related to his own desire. Information on these subjects is readily available to those who wish to take the time and effort to seek it out.

5. Do you, on your own time, study material.

92% - Yes
4% - No
4% - Occassionally

- In order to keep your grades up, you have to study.

6. Do you feel that you have the rapport with your FTO enabling you to question, discuss, and comment comfortably the events you share?

7. If not, why not? Be specific.

62% - Yes
33% - Sometimes
3% - No
2% - No answer

Although the majority said yes, there were some very definite negative comments.

- FTO informed trainee that it was in his best interest not to ask questions.
- Situation varies from FTO to FTO.
- He was a perfectionist to start with and made it very clear he didn't want to train me. Consequently, he didn't. I have nothing but unpleasant memories of those agonizing six weeks. I didn't dare correct him when he was wrong (even when it was in black and white) because I would pay for it. He would ding the shit out of me. In short, he was never wrong.
- No because of personality conflicts.
- With most of the FTOs I had a definite yes. With a couple of others, no. A couple of my FTOs either felt they were better than me and felt they were just baby-sitting, or they would just advise me of my training material, then keep to themselves.
- Some were overbearing with God-like attitudes.
- Some look at you as if you are stupid, and then grade you down for asking a question.
- Out of 4, 3 were open minded. The other one criticized anything I did, no matter what it was, it was wrong. And when I would ask how to improve or do better, he would not answer, but grade me lower in the daily evaluations. I received more stress from him than anything I have done since I have been an officer, and most of it I believe, was unnecessary.
- A trainee will not usually ask questions for fear of being marked down on his evaluation. Also, when a trainee is first put with an FTO, he is not sure what the FTO will grade down on, and it usually takes a week or more to learn what each FTO expects and how he works.
- Personally, I had a positive relationship with my FTO's, but I can see where some trainees and FTOs may have problems, such as in personality.

8. Does your FTO assist you in defining and discussing your basic functions as police officer recruit? (i.e., understanding and proper use of equipment;
- . Driving ability;
 - . Proper and appropriate use of radio and MCT;
 - . level of observation and awareness of surroundings;
 - . self-initiation of activity;
 - . effective use of management of time.

92% - Yes
6% - No
2% - No answer

Although the majority indicated the FTOs did discuss the trainees' basic functions as a Police Officer Recruit, at least one perception was very definite.

- Most FTOs do not discuss basic functions, but tailor their instruction to fit their own needs and desires, and comfort. Most FTOs are not conscientious, not hard working, do not take their roles seriously, as I feel they should.

9. Is your FTO helpful and enlightening regarding the handling of calls and incidents?

90% - Yes

4% - No

4% - Sometimes

2% - No answer

- Most were helpful, but there were some who could not be pleased.
- Any problems or questions that I might have had were always answered or explained thoroughly. If my FTO did not have the answer, he would obtain one from his supervisor, but in any case, I was always given an answer.

10. What is your role as a trainee in handling calls and incidents initially and at the end of the program? Elaborate.

Most all respondents identified the process as one of initially observing and learning, and progressing to the point of handling the calls with little assistance.

11. A. Do you feel you have had adequate training regarding report writing?

83% - Yes
15% - No answer
2% - No

- A standardization is needed in this area. One FTO will check a report and feel it is a good report; the next one will take it apart and say it's no good. This appears to me to be the problem area of the program.
- This is the area which has the greatest lack of standardization.
- The trainee is not necessarily incapable, but the FTOs way may not be the only way. It is similar to peoples' personalities--basically, you may have the same idea, but just a different way of getting the point across.
- I was assigned to three different FTOs and instead of the FTOs looking at content and being sure the elements were all there, they each tried to teach me their style, saying that their's was the right way.

B. Do you feel your FTO is capable of teaching you and rating you in this area?

71% - Yes
21% - No answer
6% - Sometimes
2% - No

C. Do you know what the reporting procedures are and the use of the forms?

69% - Yes
25% - No answer
6% - No

D. Do you need to improve your language usage, grammar, spelling, etc.?

52% - Yes
35% - No answer
14% - No

E. Is the FTO helpful in assessing and explaining your deficiencies?

60% - Yes
38% - No answer
2% - No

11. F. Can you accurately and in an organized manner
reflect the investigation in writing?

52% - Yes

48% - No answer

12. Do you feel the FTO sets an example as far as being the kind of officer you would like to become?

- 62% - Yes
- 25% - Sometimes
- 7% - No
- 4% - Most
- 2% - No answer

Pro

- All of my FTOs set an example for me to strive for. I was very impressed by the way they performed their duties as Police Officers.
- Yes, though there are a few exceptions. Not all FTOs have been good officers and good role models for this recruit.

Con

- Definitely not. It has become evident to many officers in the Department that the FTOs are the laziest officers. Most FTOs are what I would term "average officers" who don't want to work anymore than they have too. It would be wrong to categorize all FTOs in this manner, but it does fit many of them.
- Definitely not. Who wants to be known as a guy who sits on his butt for more pay.

13. Regarding your deficiencies and special training needs, is the FTO aware of these areas; in your estimation, how accurately does the FTO assess your weaknesses and strengths? Does the FTO arbitrarily make determinations or does he cite examples so that you are aware of the areas that need improvement?

87% - Yes

7% - No

6% - No answer

Pro

- Most FTOs cover this area well, citing examples.
- Yes. He makes you work your weaknesses out till they are one of your stronger points.
- My FTOs assessed my weaknesses and strengths accurately. They made me aware of the areas that I had to exert a greater effort to bring them up to par. He brought up my problem areas, and then advised or instructed me as to a better or proper way to handle each.
- If the FTO is with you for more than just a few days, he can usually determine your weaknesses fairly well.

Con

- FTOs emphasis appeared to be on finding weaknesses not correcting them.

14. A. Are there times when you initial and sign the evaluation form and you are in disagreement with the comments and ratings made by your FTO?

58% - Yes
38% - No
2% - Sometimes
2% - No answer

- There were times when I did not agree with the FTO, but felt the "best thing to do" was to go ahead and sign the evaluation.
- There have been many times that I have signed my evaluation and didn't agree with what the FTO had said. I found out that you do not disagree with what he might say--it has a way of turning back on you.
- Yes. As a result of this system, the FTO is required to find errors of any magnitude in performance. All errors are recorded and discussed.

B. Does the FTO review evaluations with you?

84% - Yes
10% - No answer
4% - No
2% - Sometimes

C. Does FTO work with you to correct errors?

75% - Yes
21% - No answer
4% - No

D. How?

- By showing proper ways.
- Explains the need to correct errors, why they were errors, recommends solutions to errors.

15. A. Are there any specific concerns you may have regarding the Field Training Program?

75% - Yes
23% - No
2% - No answer

- My major concern is that FTO recommendations, when supported by documentation, be followed by supervisory and staff personnel. All too often this is not done, usually for the benefit of so-called "Affirmative Action," quota programs.
- There is too much pressure put on both the FTO and the trainee. It seems as though the only thing the FTO looks for is negative things about the trainee.
- A lot of the information is outdated. Many changes have taken place regarding policy, and it sometimes becomes difficult to sort what is policy. The training program should always be kept up-to-date.
- I sincerely think the program should be two to three weeks longer than it is now. It is difficult for an individual, with no prior police experience, to enter this Department and be expected to act as a competent solo officer in 11 or 12 weeks.
- The process for choosing FTOs will have to become more critical. I know of three current FTOs who had problems passing the program. The promotion of these individuals to FTOs casts a dim light over the entire program.
- I was concerned about the high pressure during the program. It is difficult to learn in this type of environment. I didn't like it then and I like the high pressure of the FTO program even less now. I've seen too many good trainees "dumped" because they were not fairly treated on the program.

B. Is it accomplishing what it is intended to?

56% - Yes
25% - No
11% - Did not respond
8% - Sometimes

- Some people who are definitely not officer material are being promoted to officer.

15. B. (continued)

- The program is better than nothing, but not a whole lot.
- I feel that it is used to accomplish what it was intended to do. Now, I have seen too many FTOs who either almost flunked out themselves or did not do well.
- It is better than nothing.

16. Do you think the Field Training Program is a way of eliminating or assisting personnel?

68% - Both
15% - Assisting
15% - Eliminating
2% - No answer

- The material is constructed to assist, but many attitudes among FTOs seem to be toward eliminating.
- It is a way of eliminating personnel. Until they decide to try and make the trainee have his own beat, and work by himself to get the pressure off of him. I think this is the only way they can determine if the person can apply what he has been taught in the last 12 weeks.
- Both of these areas. If a trainee cannot meet the standards established by the Department, he should be terminated. Continuance of a substandard officer places other officers in danger, as well as disregarding the attempts to professionalism being strived for by the Department. If the program is properly completed, the new officer should have an excellent foundation on which to build his police skills.
- When FTOs are proud of nick names like the "Ax," I think elimination is a part of the program used by administrators to fire an employee and have documentation in the event of recourse by the employee.

17. Are you treated the same as your peers regardless of your ethnicity or sex? Be specific.

79% - Yes

14% - No

5% - Don't know

2% - No answer

- If I had the problems numerous minority trainees have encountered while completing the program, I think it's safe to say I would not be employed here as evidenced by the fact two of four of my academy graduating class were washed out of the Department--the two being minority.
- No. Many persons of this Department are very racially biased, possibly to the point of bigotry. I have felt some racial alienation.
- I personally am, however, I have seen cases where trainees had unjust prejudices logged against them because of race.
- I just think more is expected in regards to the ethnicity or sex of a person. That person has to show that he can perform the job as well as or better than other officers. The hiring of minorities is a new area, and hasn't become widely accepted.
- I personally think too much emphasis is put on ethnicity and sex in this Department, and we are now undergoing reverse discrimination, resulting in inferior people being given positions that should go to officers that are qualified.
- I have been tested the same as my peers, regardless of my ethnicity or sex. It seems that if a person is a minority and is having difficulty in the training program, they can always use this as an excuse.
- It has been my experience, gained through personal knowledge, that the unqualified or deficient officer, when confronted with his/her failures, usually attacks the program or its operators. This is why so often the program is accused of prejudice in one form or another.

18. Are you disenchanted with the FTO program?

56% - No
33% - Yes
9% - Sometimes
2% - No answer

- Very much so. Field training is not what I received.
- The program needs to be polished, but it is an improvement over what the training system consisted of prior to the program's implementation in 1976.
- I believe more concern should be placed on field procedures, but basically, the program is very sound, when the time allotment and available resources are added up.
- I feel the selection process of the FTOs could be more elaborate and selective so that the best teachers and not necessarily the best officer is an FTO. I did not have such FTOs, except for one.
- Excellent program on paper but it has numerous problems in actuality.
- I think the FTO program has a good start. There is room for improvement and it shouldn't become stagnant.

19. List areas which negatively affect you.

- The only negative affect the program had on me was that you could be marked down badly in an area by one FTO and not by another, because of the FTO's own individual ways of doing things.
- I found I had to train myself or find answers on my own.
- Sometimes you handle a call as "What do I do to please my FTO?"
- FTOs tend to label a trainee.
- The programs short duration of recruit training, 12 weeks instead of 14 or 16.
- FTOs with inadequate field experience to be FTOs (I am currently an FTO with 2 years experience.)
- Officer morale within the training program is low. The program is thought of as a "Joke" by most personnel outside this training program.
- The only negative affect is being able to cope with the "Make it - Break it" pressure.
- The refusal to let people go who should not make Officers.
- The disinterest shown by some FTOs regarding routine training, they wouldn't talk shop, or get involved sometimes.

20. List areas which positively affect you.

25% responded there were none.

- All of it is a good learning experience.
- 3 of 4 of my FTOs were excellent.
- The training guide molds a lot of necessary information.
- Strong note on Officer safety.
- Recruits are exposed to all 3 shifts.
- Recruits are trained by at least 3 FTOs.
- An FTO is present with the trainee to guide him along thru unfamiliar territory. This is important so the trainee becomes comfortable with the new surrounding.

21. A. Is there or have there been personal relationships between you and your FTO which affect your job performance?

61% - No
35% - Yes
2% - Sometimes
2% - No answer

- Yes. I had an extreme personality clash with one FTO. The unfortunate thing regarding this is the lack of any courses of action the trainee can take without fear of reprisals. My evaluations showed it.
- Personality conflict with an FTO led to unfair ratings.
- I had an FTO that was immature, insecure, and hell-bent on cramming down my throat his own intellectual superiority. I was spending so much time with my hands over my butt I could not work or learn effectively.
- Oh most definitely. One FTO had a serious psychological problem. He and I never felt comfortable with each other. I don't know what his problem is, but I don't ever want to work with him again. Additionally, I did not learn anything from him.
- Yes. At times there were personality clashes. For example, a few FTOs were on a power trip, simply because they were FTOs.

21. B. For example, is there a personality clash, difference in culture, upbringing or perspectives which limits your capabilities?

64% - No answer
21% - Yes
15% - No

Pro

- With one of my FTOs I had a personality clash. I got so that I was tired of receiving negative evaluations every night. I also did not speak unless I had to. He noticed this in my performance. I went down in my test scores. We solved the problem by speaking to a sergeant. The problem was that program was designed to make you aware of what areas you are weak in.
- Yes. Personality conflict with an FTO led to unfair rating.

Con

- No problems but good to get more than one FTO.

22. Have you been supplied with adequate supportive information which allows you to understand the sequence of events leading to the completion of your field training period?

87% - Yes

10% - No

3% - No answer

- Major complaint was the outdated information.

23. A. Do you consider your FTO an instructor?

72% - Yes

28% - No

- Definitely not an instructor - emphasis was on criticism.
- Varied - Some FTOs rated as instructors, some as critics.
- Yes, the FTOs I had, both criticized and instructed, in that order.
- I considered my FTOs as a source of knowledge and experience. One FTO made me know the information. If I didn't and had any questions, I would get marked down. He did more criticizing than instructing. If you didn't do it his way, you got marked down, even if it was against policy.

B. Does he take time to explain, teach, etc.?

76% - Yes

24% - No

C. Does he do more criticizing than instruction?

79% - No

21% - Yes

- The daily evaluations are obviously designed to criticize, not instruct.

24. Do you feel your FTO nit-picks or are there substantial reasons for the way he rates?

40% - No

37% - Yes

13% - Sometimes

8% - No answer

2% - Both nit-picks and shows reasons

- It varies. Some had substantial reasons, others seemed to nit-pick. Once again, extreme lack of standardization.
- The system asks for nit-picking. On a few nights, I had to suggest a possible negative point to write about on my rating report, since my FTO was unable to think of a negative point.

25. A. Does the problem or the documentation of the problem coincide or is the documentation blown out of proportion to the incident?

42% - Yes
27% - No
19% - No answer
12% - Sometimes

- Documentation is way out of proportion. He lists the worst thing of the day and taken out of context, you can appear incompetent.
- It depends on if the FTO is trying to get you terminated or it is constructive documentation.
- Felt documentation was way out of line. Things that would normally not cause concern were documented. I felt this possibly was done to have ammunition in case a trainee was going to the "Axe."
- If the FTO likes you, the documentation is subtle.
- My FTO rated me more. The Sergeant wasn't at many of our calls to actually see me perform. I never saw a sergeant on swing shift, but always on graves. I don't think the swing sergeants care and only report what they are told.

B. Who rates you most--FTO; Field Training Supervisor?

83% - FTO
9% - No answer
6% - Both
2% - Field Training Supervisor

- FTO did most of the rating when I was in the program. I very seldom saw a FTS. I was always curious how the sergeant could write an evaluation and never respond to any calls.
- I rarely saw a FTS.
- FTS rates you from FTO's evaluation.

26. How does FTO react to your disagreeing with him?

55% - Positive
21% - Negative
12% - Good/Bad
12% - No answer

- I tried to avoid this area as indications to me were that the FTO didn't welcome this type of behavior.
- Most of them took it in stride, if you were dumb or gutsy enough to disagree.
- From what I remember, it wasn't tolerated.
- Most FTOs have the impression they are "the boss" and the trainee is supposed to do as they are told, not disagree. I feel this is wrong. I think if there is a disagreement, it should be talked over, not just dropped with the FTO saying, "don't argue, that's just the way it is."
- Most were understanding. Only a few got upset.

27. Should there be female training officers?

83% - Yes

14% - No

3% - No answer

- Only if they are competent. No tokens, as this only lowers our training standards.
- Not now. No one has enough experience.
- As long as they can do the job as well as a man.

28. A. What kinds of pressures (inside the department or outside) affect your performance?

- Peer group pressures.
- Being constantly criticized and not always being wrong.
- The pressure of someone waiting for you to screw up or looking to get you.
- Nit-picking from the supervisors.
- Working midnight shift and going to school.
- Probation.
- Everything.
- Non-support by supervisory personnel is the most difficult pressure. If the officer doesn't get the backing of superiors, he is usually frustrated.
- Internal affairs.
- Peer group and brass.
- Administrative pressures.
- Low morale due to Department conflicts.
- Animosity and hostility from citizens and upeer echelons.

28. B. Do you try to divorce yourself from these pressures?

46% - Yes
32% - No answer
14% - No
8% - Impossible

29. Do you approach other personnel who are in a position to assist you other than your FTO? Explain.

79% - Yes

19% - No

2% - No answer

- Yes. It's a lot easier to ask someone who is not always grading you. This includes other officers on the Department who are willing to help you.
- Yes. When uncertain of learning material and not wanting the FTO to know of weak areas.
- Yes. I had to as one FTO went home and left me to complete reports that I was unfamiliar with.
- You are not allowed to ask questions during the two week observation period.

30. Do you feel the FTO gave you adequate tools and training to work a beat solo after 12 weeks?

85% - Yes
9% - No
4% - No answer
2% - Sometimes

- No. Had I not had prior experience, it would have been very difficult.
- If a new officer does not pick up on the methods used in 12 weeks, it is not the FTOs fault.
- Considering the time available, my FTOs did a good job.
- In most cases, however, due to the lack of training time, some weak areas were not well covered.
- Yes, but I had prior involvement in law enforcement.
- Yes, barely.

31. How do you handle situations where you have been assigned to a different FTO and the instructors differ in methodology, policy, and training?

- Conform.
- You ask him how he would prefer it done. You do it his way while with him. He's the one you have to humor.
- Roll with the punches.
- You do whatever it takes to pass the program.

32. How do you correct mistakes?

- By learning the correct way.
- Don't make the same mistake twice.
- By trial and error.
- By questioning someone in a position to adequately answer the problem.

33. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions or complaints regarding the Field Training Program?

61% - No
37% - Yes
2% - No answer

- I feel that a trainee should be allowed to receive a sufficient amount of training before being evaluated in the area of performance. If the trainee is to be evaluated early in the program, these areas should be limited to attitude, carelessness, ability to benefit from training.
- I have seen FTOs bust their butts to train people who are washouts and they documented the beans out of the weak areas, but these inept people are still around.
- I think that FTOs should be evaluated by their trainees on a weekly basis so information can be seen on the FTO's ability to instruct the trainees, how the FTO and trainee get along; is the FTO doing an adequate job.
- FTOs require more training.
- Better selection process of FTOs.
- The rating system needs to be standardized throughout all FTOs.
- Possibly paying more to the FTOs and enriching their position.
- More time should be allotted to training. More meetings with FTOs to have a systematical approach on training.
- The FTOs should be those officers that want to teach and not those that are more interested in the 5% pay increase.
- The Field Training Program should be extended by four weeks. During this time, training should be devoted to development of self-initiated preventative patrol procedures.
- Update tests and study material.

34. Have you had the opportunity to evaluate your field training officer?

69% - Yes

29% - No

2% - No answer

- No, never. I heard there would be an opportunity at the end of the program but no one knew what form or where it was.

35. A. Rating FTO.

Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
33%	46%	7%	7%	7%

B. List Positive Areas.

- He helped me to do better in my weaker subjects, and set a very good example as a Police Officer. He would give information that would not usually be covered, but I could use in my career as a Police Officer.
- Very supportive of trainees - is very congenial and conducive to learning. Gives extra time and help when needed.
- Very interested in my training.
- Knows what he is doing and communicates and teaches it.
- All of the FTOs I had, especially the three I was assigned to, were probably three of the best FTOs or Officers, I have had the opportunity to work with.
- He showed concern and helped me out quite a bit.

C. Negative Areas.

- FTO is very knowledgeable, however, is very reluctant to help his "inferior" trainee. I felt his whole thing was to keep this trainee in constant turmoil, possibly to see if you could "cut it".
- Been on patrol too long, he is burnt out.
- Extremely poor attitude; inability to relate to trainee; inflexible and non-adaptive; non-supportive of the trainee.
- FTO slept entire shifts and, while doing so prohibited me from advancing in self initiated areas.
- Most were good, a couple however, thought they had the "power of God" "I'm going to crucify you for that mistake".
- I don't feel free to comment as this form can be traced back to me. It is not as anonymous as I feel it should be.

Question 35C (Continued)

- FTOs did not impress me, because they were on the whole, unprepared, lazy, domineering, pompous, authoritarian, and not overly bright. One was at least bright, and well read regarding Department procedures and policies.
- He let outside activities influence training too much.
- All of my FTOs had the attitude that regardless of the time and energy expended by themselves, they were being hampered and restricted by the supervisors and administration. This adversely affected the learning atmosphere at times.

36. A. Overall, is or was your FTO an asset or detriment to your learning environment as a trainee?

85% - Asset
9% - No answer
6% - Detriment

Generally, responses indicated the FTOs guided them in applying academy learning to Department policies and procedures.

- They were able to show first-hand how things were done and assisted me on subjects that I was weak on.
- Made sure I understood the training material well before I took each test and would apply field experience to the training material.
- They encouraged me to ask questions regarding situations I didn't understand.
- I felt the FTO program was an asset. I was able to develop skills and have qualified training officers to assist me in developing the basic skills needed to handle a solo beat. Both FTOs would let me handle situations and would step in only if it looked like I was having some difficulty. Both FTOs would not let me get in over my head before they would step in. They helped my learning process in all aspects of patrol work.
- Except for "perfectionist."
- FTO pushed me to do better; was always present to give advice.
- All FTOs were an asset in one way or another. One FTO interpreted my questions and different opinions as a negative attitude. He evaluated me fairly in other areas.
- Overall, it was definitely an asset. It helped me (gain) considerable confidence. It was a time where I could apply my academy teachings. It seasoned me for if I'd of been sent out solo right away, I would have had problems.
- Had no problems.
- Overall, all of my FTOs were assets. What I learned from each, I incorporated into my own procedures along with my own ideas on how to perform.

36. A. (continued)

- Provided time and made me work on my mistakes.
- Overall, my FTO was an asset to my learning environment. I felt that I was learning the material and felt comfortable. He would explain situations of report writing procedure and wanted me to write good reports.
- He helped me gain the tools to be a good officer.
- My FTOs were an asset. While feeling uneasy with one, I felt relaxed with another. Some give off a feeling of complete relaxation while another keeps you constantly on guard. One FTO would write down notes during an investigation. I would see this and wonder what he was writing. I would lose track of my investigation. He would say, don't worry about it, but I did.
- An asset because I feel without the FTO program, I would have encountered serious problems which could have led to another officer getting hurt or killed, or my report writing not being up to an acceptable standard and many other things.
- I feel the FTO program overall for me has been successful and a definite asset for me becoming a solo officer.

36. B. Detriment

- Because discouraged me from asking questions and receiving training which I felt I needed and deserved.
- Definite detriment. I was so uptight the whole time I couldn't learn. Pressure is not conducive to learning.

37. How could your FTO have improved to become a better FTO?

- The new policy of sending a trainee out solo after 12 weeks, despite his/her performance in the 12 weeks, has got me confused as to the purpose of the FTO program. I was under the notion that the FTO program got the best Police Officers to teach and evaluate new trainees, and try to get them to a level of competence in 12 weeks. After 12 weeks, if all a trainee has shown is incompetence and an unwillingness to try to learn, why send them out solo? I realized that as soon as I heard of the new policy, that I could be incompetent and still pass probation by "lying low" when solo (meaning the FPD is stuck with dead weight for possibly another 29 years). The daily evaluations mean very little to me anymore, and the tests have no significance except for personal pride.

1. Make the FTO position more attractive. All but two FTOs were wanting out, and felt there was too much paperwork involved.
2. Make the program more conducive to trainee.
 - a. Provide us a day to train, show video tapes, hear lectures from different divisions, at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of a shift, a week.
 - b. This academy taught me no offensive moves, and very few holds or come alongs. In addition, I am not completely satisfied with my handcuffing techniques, either.
 - c. The academy, in other words, is only a start. The 12 weeks of training should enhance and better the skills to a point of perfection. In its current stage, the skills learned at this academy start to fade, not improve.
3. Stability. I've had four FTOs in 10 weeks. It takes at least a week with an FTO to really begin working with him.
4. Streamline the Program. The length of the daily evaluation is self defeating. It takes an FTO about 45 minutes to fill our a short one. No wonder they don't like the paperwork. The "most" and "least" slots are ridiculous. Several days it has been slow, and my FTO has had to make up something unacceptable.

Question 37 #4 (Continued)

In addition, I have worked four different shifts in 10 weeks, and trying to study for tests, the MCT Manual, penal code, report writing, general orders, maps of the city, collision manual, and vehicle code is nearly impossible along with trying to adjust to different schedules.

5. Eliminate the two weeks of day shift. Why you want us to adjust to a new schedule, and the opportunity to pick up bad habits on the slower shifts, I don't understand - forget days. My FTO on days was excellent, but I learned nothing. His procedures were old-fashioned and not consistent with midnights or swings (which is where I will be the next ten years) plus it is slow on days.
6. Except for one FTS, I feel all should resign from the program.
7. He could have spent more time on the problem areas that I had. There were times when he said that I would eventually get the hang of it with more time. I think he should have explained the situation when I had the problem.

END