A TASK INVENTORY FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION OF THE OAKLAND BASIC POLICE ACADEMY CURRICULUM: A SURVEY STUDY

---

by

Richard Allan Talley

A DISSERTATION

Presented to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Education

1984

ABSTRACT

A TASK INVENTORY FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION
OF THE
OAKLAND BASIC POLICE ACADEMY CURRICULUM:
A SURVEY STUDY

By

Richard Allan Talley

Basic police academy curricula are vulnerable to becoming outdated, unrealistic and ineffective. The traditional subjectivity associated with developing recruit curriculums, combined with the rapid police occupational changes and absence of satisfactory curriculum relevancy evaluations, has resulted in much criticism and uncertainty about the actual effectiveness of recruit training to prepare officers to adequately perform police work.

The purpose of the study was to comprehensively evaluate the Oakland Police Academy (OPA) in order to identify and prioritize curriculum deficiencies to facilitate program improvement. The evaluation was a curriculum product assessment. A task inventory follow-up curriculum evaluation methodology was employed. The methodology was designed to collect task training ratings from patrol officers regarding how effective the recruit training was in preparing new officers to adequately perform important entry-level police tasks. OPA graduates who had between one to two years of patrol officer experience were

surveyed. The sample (27) rated 304 entry-level patrol officer tasks. Range and consensus of agreement among officer judgments were analyzed to make reasonable determinations about the adequate effectiveness of the OPA training program. Graduates also provided comments and recommendations about the training they received.

A substantial majority gave an "overall" evaluation rating indicating that the training they received prepared graduates to perform patrol officer tasks from quite well to very well. However, when rating tasks independently, graduates reported that the training received was less than effective for adequately preparing officers to perform a significant proportion (102) of the 304 job-tasks rated. Twenty-seven of thirty duty fields were rated as having some meaningful training curriculum deficiency. Written comments and recommendations indicate that curriculum weaknesses may extend beyond those tasks rated below the adequate training standard criterion level. Written remarks critiqued the training for not providing certain essential entry-level job knowledges and skills. Recommendations generally called for a need to increase training for certain subject areas as well as to incorporate additional practical exercises to develop basic police job performance skills.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extol my deepest appreciation to all those individuals who assisted and advised me throughout this study. Special appreciation goes to Joel Allen, Director, Oakland Police Academy, who provided the opportunity to conduct the evaluation study out of his sincere interest to improve the quality of police training. I benefited, too, from discussion with my dissertation committee members Dr. George Ferns (Chairman) , Dr. Charles Blackman, Dr. Kenneth Christian, and Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, Michigan State University. I found the committee's support, encouragement and advice to be exceptional in every respect. Finally, I wish to acknowledge my wife, Becky, for her help and great patience which aided me throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM

The public service of policing within America has changed rapidly and extensively over the last quarter of a century. Policing today is a converging point for application of both the hard and social science disciplines. This is reflected, in part, by the advent of mandatory basic police training and its swelling curriculum content. The contemporary basic police curriculum for entry-level officers includes subjects such as fingerprinting, physical evidence, computer information systems, radio communication, handling abnormal people, human relations, civil defense, constitutional law, and enforcement of laws and ordinances, among others. The continual changes in laws, technologies and police practices has therefore made police occupational education and training a potential dynamic focal point for planning and managing the social evolution of police work.

Over the years the primary goal of basic police training has simply been to prepare the recruit officer to competently perform the patrol officer job. The development of the mandatory basic police curriculum was the product of a collection of subjective professional judgments regarding what necessary training a recruit must experience to meet the realistic job performance requirements of police work. However, recruit training curriculums have received much criticism for being inadequate and for failing to prepare

officers for realistic police work (Saunders, 1970, pp. 119-133). Yet, the quality of training has received little analysis (Ibid., p. 119). Evaluations which have resulted in changing the curriculum have generally been based only on professional judgment, not on a methodical empirical job study. Hence, curriculum changes have not been brought about systematically, but rather in a piecemeal fashion. One reason for making very subjective curriculum changes in a piecemeal fashion has been the apparent absence of comprehensive systematic curriculum evaluation instruments and techniques which were both available and designed for assessing the police occupation. As a result, it has continued to be a difficult and ongoing problem for training administrators to efficiently monitor and maintain the complete relevancy of the basic police training curriculum, which should be an accurate reflection of the ever changing needs of policing.

THE OAKLAND BASIC POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY PROGRAM

The Oakland Police Academy (OPA) is one of 13 regional basic police academies which deliver the state mandated Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council (MLEOTC) curriculum. The course of study includes vocational subject areas such as patrol procedures, traffic enforcement, investigation, emergency medical services, criminal law, court functions, physical fitness, defensive tactics, firearms, among others. Subject areas are taught by instructors who meet MLEOTC instructor qualification guidelines. The guidelines primarily emphasize that the

instructor has relevant practical work experience, and for certain special subjects specified training or education. Regional police academies vary in duration from eight to sixteen weeks of intensive training. OPA is a nine week program, and like all academies, at least 320 hours of MLEOTC subject specified training has to be included within the curriculum. The training is aimed at preparing new police officers that are oriented to the police function and capable of competently performing entry-level job-tasks. A program description of the OPA is contained within Appendix A.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of the study is to formatively evaluate the OPA basic training curriculum to determine if police recruits are being effectively prepared to adequately perform important entry-level patrol officer job-tasks. The evaluation is a curriculum product assessment. Findings will be used to identify and prioritize potential curriculum/training academy strengths and weaknesses in order to facilitate curriculum improvement through further targeted research and planning for making constructive curriculum changes.

The study is directed at answering the following evaluation research questions:

1. Does the OPA curriculum in reality effectively prepare police officers to adequately perform important entry-level job-tasks?

2. Which job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than others for the purpose of determining which tasks need additional curriculum attention and consideration?
3. What recommendations can be suggested by OPA graduates concerning how the OPA curriculum can be improved for the purpose of increasing the training programs effectiveness to prepare recruits for realistic police work?

TRAINING EVALUATION CRITERION

The Michigan legislature has legally delegated the MLEOTC the responsibility for establishing mandatory minimum selection and training standards for entry-level police officers (Michigan, P.A. 203, 1965). One official MLEOTC organizational goal is to develop and maintain valid minimum selection and training standards to "ensure that a uniformly high level of officer performance is maintained throughout the state" (MLEOTC, 1981, p.3). The MLEOTC strongly asserts that a police officer's " <u>failure to perform adequately</u> on the job may result in the loss of property, injury, or even loss of life" (Ibid). The criterion selected to evaluate the effective quality of the OPA recruit training program directly reflects the MLEOTC's principle concern for advancing adequate job performance through mandatory basic recruit training. In fact, the criterion model is a composite of over 300 entry-level job-tasks which were found by the MLEOTC to be so essentially relevant and important to job content that the state mandatory recruit curriculum content should be derived from those tasks. The criterion

model requires training ratings be collected for each of 304 job-tasks. Task training ratings as a unit of measure represents officer judgments regarding the effectiveness of OPA training to prepare the recruit to effectively perform each task listed.

RESEARCH PROBLEM WITHIN EVALUATION STUDY

The research problem within the evaluation study is assessing the quality of the OPA curriculum in relation to its perceived effectiveness to prepare recruits to adequately perform essential patrol officer entry-level job-tasks. Evaluative data was collected by utilizing a task inventory instrument which is a by-product of the MLEOTC Michigan patrol officer job analysis study. The evaluation instrument collects descriptive measures provided by police job incumbents regarding their judgments concerning the adequacy of the OPA basic recruit program to prepare them to perform actual police work. Incumbent judgments were collected after the officers have completed training and have reported to their job sites where they will gain valuable work experience performing the patrol officer job duties and responsibilities. After the officers have been performing the job from one to two years, the evaluation instrument with instructions were mailed to the officers via their employing police agency. Officers returned the completed instrument and the respondent data was analyzed to assess the range and consensus of agreement among incumbent judgments pertaining to how effective the OPA program was in preparing recruits to perform important entry-level police

work.

TASK INVENTORY APPROACH

The job analysis task inventory approach is based on some substantive assumptions believed to be advantageous to occupational analysis, especially concerning vocational curriculum development and assessment. First, it is assumed that a job can best be analyzed by exhaustively breaking it down into basic component parts, which are duties and task statements. Outlining the job in such a manner also greatly aids both management and the job incumbent to conceptualize and standardize complex occupations like policing.

A task defined is a meaningful unit of work activity, usually performed on the job by an individual worker within some limited time period. In content, a task statement generally describes a job activity that is "intermediate in specificity between a function or responsibility and a procedural work step or action"(Ammerman, Vol. 2, 1977, p.21).

> [A task] represents a discrete <u>unit</u> of activity and represents a composite of methods, procedures, and techniques which commonly serve to accomplish one meaningful unit of work. Tasks involve worker interaction with such objects and elements as equipment, material, other people, animals, information, ideas, data, events and conditions. In most instances the performance of a task by a worker has reasonably definite beginning and end; the whole activity requiring a mixture of decisions, perceptions, and/or physical actions serving a useful job purpose of a particular work assignment (Ibid.).

Duties as defined within the study are classifications of large job divisions composed of related tasks for descriptive purposes. Interrelationships among tasks classified in a single duty field generally are based upon common similarities which include (1) types of action, (2) systems or subsystems of objects acted upon, (3) areas of responsibility, (4) location or time of performance, (5) work goals, or (6) types of technical-knowledge subject matter that is of practical use in performance of the tasks (Ibid., p.58).

The task inventory method is built upon the reasonable premise that job incumbents can often provide the most accurate information about the job they perform. The method enables vast amounts of quantified job information to be collected from a large number of respondents in a very expeditious and cost-effective manner. Of additional value is that the task inventory method is considered quite comprehensive and does not rely on respondent task recall, but rather task recognition. These noted methodological attributes are some of the practical reasons why the task inventory method has to be considered an ideal means for assessing and defining the curriculum (Ibid., p.15). The main variables to be measured in the study, the OPA curriculum and incumbent job performance judgments, can both be readily classified and understood utilizing the task inventory duty-task concept and task training rating unit of measure.

DELIMITATIONS

The scope of the study is limited to evaluating only the OPA curriculum and its effectiveness to prepare recruits to perform the entry-level Michigan patrol officer positions. For the purposes of this study, the patrol officer position is defined in terms of 304 tasks selected from among those tasks which have been determined by the MLEOTC as being important entry-level police work and basic recruit training curriculum content. The tasks are classified within 30 different duty fields which were identified by the MLEOTC as major patrol officer job functions (Appendix B).

A thorough examination of dissertation abstracts from Dissertation Abstracts International, July 1965 to July 1983, revealed no doctoral dissertation related specifically to this study. Furthermore, the review of a number of periodicals and books revealed the same. The study is unique because there has not been found any directly related graduate follow-up task-inventory evaluation study of the basic police training curriculum at the Oakland Police Academy, or at any other police academy in the United States.

OVERVIEW

Basic recruit curriculums are vulnerable to becoming outdated, unrealistic and ineffective. The rapid occupational changes, combined with the apparent absence of systematic comprehensive curriculum evaluation methods designed specifically for the police occupation, have

resulted in much professional criticism and uncertainty about the actual effectiveness of recruit training in preparing the new officer to adequately perform realistic police work. The relevancy of the police recruit curriculums have traditionally been monitored and maintained by subjective professional judgment in a piecemeal fashion. The need to systematically and comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of recruit training to protect against curriculum slippage is indeed evident. The potential personal and social cost possibly resulting from ineffectively preparing officers to competently perform important police work has to be considered too critical to be either ignored, or neglected.

The proposed study is a formative descriptive curriculum evaluation of the OPA program. The task inventory follow-up curriculum evaluation methodology is systematic and quite comprehensive. The methodology focuses on obtaining task training ratings provided by job incumbents regarding how effective the recruit training was in preparing officers to adequately perform important entry-level police work. Range and consensus of agreement among officer judgments will be analyzed to make reasonable determinations about the adequate effectiveness of the OPA program.

In Chapter 2, a review of the related literature will first briefly examine the origins and development of police recruit training nationally and statewide. A pertinent review of curriculum evaluation as it pertains to recruit

training will follow.

In Chapter 3, the population, the instrument, the measures, and the analyses which are part of the study are outlined and explained. The actual results of the analyses are presented next in Chapter 4, with conclusions and recommendations derived from the study stated in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

August Volmer, recognized as the American father of modern police administration, has been historically credited with the original idea for developing formal schooling for police officers (Gammage, 1963, p.6). It is said that Volmer's idea was borne from his belief "that the principal problem of all police departments was inefficiency resulting from ignorance, and that the only solution was formal training"(Ibid.). In 1908, the first formal inservice police school began with police officers voluntarily attending lecture sessions during their off-duty time. Guest lecturers gave various police related presentations which were intended to aid police officers in performing their duties and responsibilities. Those officers attending "found out what they had learned in school helped them in the actual policing of their beats" (Parker, 1961, pp. 83-5).

The first formal police academy came about in 1909, and was operated by the New York Police Department. The academy evolved gradually from the NYPD's "School of Pistol Practice," which began around 1895. The formal academy curriculum provided recruit training in firearms, Department rules and regulations, police procedures and criminal law. During the next decade several other academies emerged

within the United States (Gammage, p.7).

Allen Gammage, author of Police Training In The United States , has to date produced the most exhaustive documentation of historical research about American police training. Gammage's prefatory remarks within his book describes an interesting and knowledgeable summarization of the development and advancement of police training until approximately 1963:

> Almost seven decades have passed since the New York City Police Department established its "School of Pistol Practice," thus initiating the first formal police training in the United States. In the sixty-seven years since this small beginning more words have been spoken and more pages written on the subject of police training than any other single aspect of police administration. In turn, some advancement has been realized; but, in the main "the wheels of progress have ground exceedingly slow." Even today a majority of the more than 300,000 law enforcement officers now employed in the many jurisdictions throughout the country have received no formal training whatsoever. Where formal training is available it is often perfunctory and elementary, and contributes little to the professionalization of the police service. General public, police practitioners, administrators, and educators are too often apathetic, confused, disinterested and misinformed. All too frequently we willingly and erroneously accept the minimum for the maximum; and, in matters relating to police training needs, values, programs, curriculums, necessary qualifications and training for police instructors, training methods and aids, tests, measurements, and evaluations, those who should be in accord are characteristically in constant disagreement (Ibid., p. vii).

Saunders agrees and adds:

> . . . little agreement exists among police agencies throughout the country what skills and understanding are essential for the recruit, and how they can best be inculcated. Even if a consensus were achieved on the length and content of training, the demanding nature of the law

> enforcement task itself would continue to challenge the effectiveness of even the most comprehensive training programs (Saunders, p. 121).

RECRUIT TRAINING CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally the development of the basic police training curricula have been based on subjective professional judgments of police administrators and practitioners. These subjective judgments are representative of the best approximations as to the kind of training which should adequately prepare a police officer to competently perform the job of policing. Making these curriculum determinations could not have been an easy task considering the recognized complexity and ambiguity historically inherent to the understanding of what policing is and should provide. Lewis Terman stated nearly 65 years ago that no one actually understood what abilities were necessary for successful police performance, let alone how to test for these abilities (Terman, 1917, pp. 17-29). The problem expressed by Terman still exists to a great degree today. Roberg comments:

> How much training and education is necessary to develop a new employee into a police officer? The answer is not known. Recommended basic police training program lengths are value judgments based on tradition, necessity, common sense, and what little analytic information is available (Roberg, 1976, p. 156).

Richard Blum gives some hope and future direction regarding how to proceed in order to acquire a better and more accurate understanding of the necessary job requirements for policing. He says:

> (to determine the) common denominators so that we can say what the minimum capacities of each recruit must be, the minimum capacities which will work anywhere and anytime in our agency and still turn in acceptable performance. What is required is that each agency perform a job analysis for each job, that it compare and combine the results of this job analyses, and that it come up with basic capabilities and skills which every policeman will need (Blum, 1964, p. 46).

Gammage noted the same need for a job analyses for the purpose of planning and developing a police recruit curriculum. He advises:

> The ultimate goal in the planning and development of each individual curriculum is arriving at subject matter which will accomplish the objectives of the program. All too often subject matter is adopted which is premised on custom, imagination, tradition or what other departments are teaching. Obviously, such techniques may result in programs of some value, but they will fall far short of the fulfillment of real need. Unless a careful analysis is made of the job for which the employee is to be trained the curriculum will be based upon mere conjecture or guess work. Thus, the only logical technique one may use in arriving at appropriate subject matter is a job analysis (Gammange, p. 157).

THE MICHIGAN EXPERIENCE

In 1965, the Michigan legislature enacted Public Act 203 which created the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (MLEOTC). The MLEOTC was legally delegated the responsibility and authority for establishing minimum selection and training standards for entry-level police officers. At that time in history the legislative action was very progressive since before 1965 there were few state law enforcement commissions in existence, especially commissions having the authority to require mandatory police recruit training (MLEOTC, 1972, p.1).

Kuhn Study

It was in 1967, that the MLEOTC with the aid of a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, initiated a groundwork project directed at improving law enforcement training in Michigan. The main focus of the project, hereafter referred as the Kuhn study, was to accomplish four general objectives:

1. To locate and identify county, township, municipal, and village police agencies.

2. To assess the functional status of these agencies in terms of administration; basic recruit training; pre-service training; in-service training; roll call training; higher education; recruitment and selection; and training instructors.

3. To generally obtain as much information as possible about the agencies so as to allow a better analysis and understanding of law enforcement training resources and conditions in Michigan.

4. To develop and recommend minimum advisory training standards for the MLEOTC in guiding the development of future law enforcement training programs in Michigan (Kuhn, 1968, V.1, p.8).

The emphasis of the Kuhn study was directed at assessing the state-of-the-art of police training in Michigan for the purpose of "developing guidelines for action in the form of a blueprint which the MLEOTC could follow in developing future Council approved training schools" (Ibid., p.5). Hence, the development of curriculum standards for recruit training was one main area of concern within the study. One important product of the study was a

set of detailed lesson plans which were recommended for distribution to all academies to promote a standardized basic recruit curriculum (Ibid., p.159). The lesson plans were generated by three methods: (1) Experienced administrative and operational officers were questioned about what they believed are important subject topics and what they believed an officer should have prior to going into the field; (2) A job analysis was conducted. "In the job analyses phase of the curriculum study, the researchers had to take into consideration the classes or types of calls, assignments, and operations encountered by law enforcement officers" (Ibid., V.7, p.23);and (3) The last phase consisted of a comparative curriculum study. In particular, the St. Louis and Chicago recruit training programs were primarily reviewed for their value since they were considered by the researchers as progressive police departments. The result of the curriculum development study was an emergence of a minimum recommendation for a 400 hour curriculum, which was a marked increase over the preexisting 130 hour curriculum (Ibid., pp. 20-24). The MLEOTC eventually did endorse and approve a collectively modified 240 hour version of the recommended 400 hour curriculum (Michigan, P.A. 203, 1965, as amended).

The Kuhn study has to be considered both a thorough and comprehensive police training study. The information generated from the research effort was extensive and the training recommendations made were certainly practical and insightful since many were later implemented. Much of the

information reported in the Kuhn study was obtained through a survey instrument sent to 444 county, township, city and village police agencies throughout Michigan. Of those surveyed, 364 agencies (82%) responded which represented a strong population sample . The validity of the state-of-the-art findings, from which many of the report's recommendations were derived, has substantial statistical support (Kuhn, V.1).

One weakness of the study has to be the lack of documentation on how the curriculum development job analysis phase was conducted. The job analysis was only briefly and vaguely addressed within the Kuhn study report. It is therefore difficult to determine what meaningful role the job analysis played in defining the recommended curriculum as compared to questioning job incumbents and/or making curriculum comparisons. The job analysis may have been very superficial, or perhaps quite extensive. There was also no mention what, or which, particular job analysis method was used for the purpose of reference and replication by future studies. The weakness is unfortunate in light of the literature promoting the need for a careful analysis of the job to ensure a relevant curriculum and to protect against curriculum conjecture, guess work and perpetuation based upon tradition.

The Kuhn study also failed to evaluate the effectiveness of the any existing Michigan recruit training programs capability to provide officers who could adequately perform at the job entry level. Instead, the study seemed

to be primarily a simple fact finding mission of what was generally occurring in Michigan pertaining to police training. Curriculum recommendations were based on comparisons to other recruit training programs operating in different states. The researchers provided no evidence that those recruit curriculums which were used as standards of comparison were producing officers that could better and more competently perform police work than other recruit programs. Hence, there was a fairly high degree of subjective determinations made about the quality of Michigan training programs when contrasted with the comparative programs. The comparison appeared to emphasize quantity of training hours and subject areas instead of quality of training.

Project STAR

From 1971 to 1974 Michigan, along with California, New Jersey and Texas, participated in a multimillion dollar criminal justice job analysis study called Project STAR (Systems Training and Analysis of Requirements of Training for Criminal Justice Personnel). The general purpose of the study was to identify appropriate roles for six different key criminal justice positions, which included police officers (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), 1976, V. 2, p. iii). Over six thousand people participated in the study. The findings were a result of a research effort which involved surveys, field observation, literature search, analysis of social trends and expert opinion. Two products derived from the Project STAR Study which were

potentially valuable as police recruit training curriculum resources for Michigan and the other states were: (1) an elaborate list of detailed performance objectives; and (2) a document entitled, Role Training Program for Police .

Volume Two of the Project STAR report lists over 170 performance objectives for police which are classified by "role" for reference. Performance objectives represent, "statements of operational behavior required for satisfactory performance of a task, the conditions under which the behavior is usually performed, and the criteria for satisfactory performance" (Ibid., V.2, p.2). The performance objectives generated from the study provided a strong foundation and wealthy resource of relevant job information to the participating states for future police curriculum planning and evaluation projects.

The Police Officer Role Training Program was directed at developing "desired personal characteristics, attitudes and behavior in students through their active involvement in the learning process" (Ibid., 1974, p.25). The programs scope was more inclusive than typical police training. Instead of only increasing the officers job knowledge and skills, the training program emphasized developing certain behaviors within the individual officer for use in performing various police responsibilities (Ibid.).

The training program was developed from information derived from other phases of Project STAR, which included the previously discussed performance objectives. Thirteen

training modules were developed with corresponding evaluation material. Each training module contained: (1) a description of a particular role and its related performance objectives; (2) at least 5-10 learning activities; and, (3) a minimum of five reflective questions designed to aid and facilitate program participants to review their knowledge and attitude regarding important police role concepts (Ibid., p. 27).

Although the police training modules were implemented in some fashion in other participating states, like California, there is no evidence the program had any meaningful impact on the Michigan police recruit program. The reason why Michigan did not make any curriculum revisions based on the study's findings is not clear; especially since MLEOTC was invited and did participate with administrative portions of the study. However, one possible reason for MLEOTC non-utilization may be as stated by Dr. Charles Smith, Director of Project STAR, while attending the National Symposium on Job-Task Analysis in Criminal Justice. He asserted, "There has never been a coordinated systematic or national effort to implement the results, in spite of the large expenditure of funds and the potential for positive impact (Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, 1978, p.26).

Unlike other police job analysis studies utilized for curriculum development, Project STAR methodology and findings were well documented. The project was unique in its job analysis approach which focused only on key criminal

justice positions in order to develop sound recommendations to improve role behavior performance. A regrettable weakness of the project is the lack of adequate implementation planning which resulted in the extreme underutilization of the study's findings and recommended training programs.

Project COSTER

Early in 1974, the MLEOTC established an objective to develop a comprehensive examination for the basic recruit training program (MLEOTC, 1976, p.1). A feasibility study was conducted by MLEOTC by preparing a request for proposals, which were then sent out to prospective contractors. Two potential contractors responded with proposals outlining their suggested approach for developing such an examination. According to a staff report, the proposals recommended "largely using the data contained in Project STAR and the previously developed basic training objectives contained in the MLEOTC Instructor Guidelines Manual (Ibid., p.1). The report goes on to say:

> During the summer of 1974, there was a change of emphasis and the decision was made to abandon the immediate development of a comprehensive final exam. Instead, it was decided it would be more practical to develop a competency based instructional system that would generate, as a by-product, a valid comprehensive examination. Apparently, the rationale for the change was that there would have to be an on-going competency based training system to allow for continued validation of the comprehensive examination (Ibid., p.1).

Late in 1974, the MLEOTC contracted with outside consultants to begin planning the development of a

comprehensive competency based training system (Ibid., p.1). The study was named Project COSTER. COSTER was an acronym for Competency Oriented System for the Training and Education of Recruits. The duration of the total project extended over two years and did result in some actual noteworthy basic recruit curriculum changes. The main impact of the project on the curriculum was the development and implementation of four so-called competency based audio-visual slide-tape training modules equipped with instructor and student manuals. The module topical areas included: Collection & Preservation of Evidence; Fingerprinting & Palmprinting; Latent Prints; and, Radio Communications. The Radio Communications module had an audio media program without the visual slide-tape accompaniment.

Although Project COSTER originally was intended to develop an entire competency basic recruit training system, the intention was never fully realized. The reason why is that the MLEOTC staff recognized what they believed to be many serious project shortcomings which precluded the completion of the project. The staff critique of the project cited some of the following problems:

1. The estimated cost to develop a total competency based recruit training system was grossly high and unrealistic considering the enormity and magnitude of the project (Ibid., p.7).

2. The validity for the identified competencies,

objectives and performance criterion recommended, within Project COSTER were considered quite questionable in relationship to actual job requirements for patrol officers. Staff claimed the problem developed because "the inadequate attempt to determine competencies" and since "the performance levels (criterion) were arbitrarily established by [those] who had little knowledge of reasonable and acceptable" law enforcement performance standards (Ibid., p.10-11).

3. The training "modules were developed in a haphazard manner" and significant police subject matter technical errors were discovered in several of the modules (Ibid.).

4. The contractors supposedly did not give ample consideration to " <u>who</u> and <u>how</u> MLEOTC would train (Ibid., p.8). The staff complaint regarding <u>who</u> noted that Michigan is composed of a variety of significantly different law enforcement agencies which should have been accounted for within the COSTER Project training plan from the on-set of the study. The shortcoming resulted in special training needs to be overlooked for agencies like conservation officers, airport security police and railroad police.

The <u>how</u> pertains to the training delivery

> system. As stated in the report, "Again, there is nothing in our [MLEOTC] files to show that this matter was properly considered by either MLEOTC or the contractors" (Ibid.). The MLEOTC staff believed the inappropriate consideration as being "critical" because of the direct implications to instructional strategies, the delivery system itself (regional vs. central academy structure), and the impeding political and economic feasibility associated with particular methods of training (e.g. self-paced instruction noted), (Ibid., p.9).

Although Project COSTER had some problems which the staff believed existed and were deemed serious, the study did produce a listing of eighty (80) competencies and corresponding enabling objectives. A very general guide referring to possible instructional strategies was also provided for the eighty objectives along with a lengthy list of related test questions (MLEOTC, Project COSTER, Phase I Report, 1975). However, an extensive review of MLEOTC documentation revealed an apparent absence of a serious comprehensive effort by the MLEOTC staff to salvage, or rework, credible portions of the COSTER project product for the purpose of improving the existing MLEOTC basic recruit curriculum. There is no mention within any documentation reviewed that a comparative curriculum study was conducted to examine if portions of the COSTER curriculum should

supersede the existing MLEOTC curriculum. Except for the four COSTER training modules which were eventually implemented as part of the MLEOTC recruit training program, the project did not have any additional meaningful curriculum impact. Hence, the MLEOTC curriculum failed to undergo a comprehensive systematic change to a total competency based program as Project COSTER was originally intended to accomplish.

Statewide Job Analysis of the Police Patrol Officer Position

The field of job analysis has been expanding and improving since the Industrial Revolution. Three broad areas of work design can be traced back to this era. They are the engineering approach, role content approach and job content. "As generic types, they describe the philosophies that support various techniques of occupational analysis. Interestingly, these three approaches all focus on the task definition and measurement" (Moore, 1976, p.2). However, over the last twenty years a relatively new job analytic method has emerged which has been rigorously tested by the United States and Canadian Armed Forces. The method has both a high degree of validity and utility for analyzing jobs for multiple purposes. The method is the task inventory survey system (Ibid.).

To utilize this method the first procedure is to construct a task inventory. The inventory lists all important tasks which are performed by workers in a given occupational area by generating a compiled list of tasks from every available source of occupational information.

These resource materials can include previous job descriptions, expert opinion, trade manuals, training programs, and school curricula, among others. "The structure of task statements is carefully worded to be readily intelligible to workers at the operational level. This structuring of task statements permits economic, standardized, self-reporting by direct survey of all workers or large samples of workers" (Ibid., p.6).

During the decade of the 1970s' and early 1980s' many police organizations began utilizing job analytic techniques for police selection and training purposes (Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, 1978). Among those conducting a job analysis study was the MLEOTC. The Michigan study used the task inventory method to determine which specific police tasks are essential to the successful performance of the entry-level patrol officer position. The findings obtained from the job analysis project, in part, would provide a means to establish a valid job-related basic police curriculum. "Developing valid minimum selection and training standards will ensure that a uniformly high level of officer performance is maintained throughout the state" (MLEOTC, 1981, P.3). As stated, it is important that MLEOTC establish standards which will maintain an efficient work force and prevent a police officer from failing to perform on the job when "the consequences of job failure are so severe" (Ibid.).

The task inventory instrument which was utilized in the Michigan patrol officer job analysis study was composed of

649 tasks which were generated from other police job studies and panels of police job incumbents. The panels represented twelve different police agency types. The instrument was pilot tested for reliability and was found acceptable. The formal study was then conducted. The sample included over 3,000 patrol officers obtained from a stratified sample according to agency types identified within the population. Incumbents provided task ratings regarding frequency of performance. Supervisors rated tasks by four factors describing the importance of job performance. The task factors were consequence of inadequate performance, task delay tolerance, task learning difficulty and task training priority. The findings and conclusion of the study indicated that over 300 police job-tasks were identified as essential core work activities which should be part of the recruit selection and training process (MLEOTC, 1979, p.27).

The procedure whereby tasks were selected as core tasks from among the 649 tasks was accomplished by developing a decision model. Two rules were designed as criterion to eliminate "only those tasks which obviously lack core significance" (Ibid., p.27). The two rules attempted to reflect the MLEOTC position that a task should not be a core task if the consequence of inadequate performance (CIP) is less than 3.5 (fairly serious to serious) and less than 7.5 percent of the officers perform the task in at least 11 of the 12 agency categories (assuming that the statewide CIP mean is less than "very serious"). After this analysis was completed, the MLEOTC reviewed each eliminated task in order

to assure that the decision rules accurately differentiated between tasks which had no statewide significance and those that did have potential significance. Based on the review, MLEOTC concluded that the rules were "accurate" discriminators when applied as task analysis factors for the purpose designed. The result of the analysis was elimination of 218 tasks from among the 649 originally listed (Ibid., p. 27).

Additional analyses were performed to further refine the remaining tasks into an acceptable collection of core tasks for selection and training purposes. "Any of the 431 remaining tasks that satisfied at least one of the three criteria listed below were designated as core tasks" (Ibid., p.27).

1. Mean CIP > 3.0 (fairly serious) and Percent Performing > 0 or Mean CIP > 2.5 (2.0 being not very serious) and Percent Performing > 25 for each of the eight traditional agency types.
2. Overall Percent Performing across eight traditional agency types > 50%.
3. Overall CIP > 6.00 (extremely serious) across eight traditional agency types.

The MLEOTC is currently developing a mandated basic police curriculum based on the patrol officer job analysis project findings. Worker requirements necessary to perform each of the core tasks were identified by "task analysis panels" (MLEOTC, 1981, p.8). These panels consisted of "a patrol officer or first-line supervisor for one of the traditional types of agencies, and knowledgeable in the content area" for which s/he was assigned. Seven panels

composed of 4-6 officers completed this phase of the study. Worker requirements have been transposed and formally implemented into the basic curriculum for only the defensive tactics subject area as of January, 1982. However, in the Fall of 1984 it is anticipated by MLEOTC that an entire basic recruit curriculum will be formally implemented in the basic academy system, although not all subject areas will have MLEOTC developed lesson guides (MLEOTC, letter, 1983).

The MLEOTC effort to develop a training curriculum from an empirical job study which is intended to produce police recruits who are prepared to competently perform essential job requirements is noteworthy indeed. The related literature has indicated the MLEOTC effort is in fact a historical change from the traditional ways whereby police curriculums were originally developed and changed. However, it is difficult to assess with any accuracy at this point in time what effect the new revised curriculum will have on police job performance compared to the past curriculum, or if the revised curriculum is effectively preparing recruits to meet the patrol officer job requirements. Vocational curriculum evaluation is necessary to make such important determinations.

BASIC POLICE TRAINING EVALUATION

Seitzinger Study

Seitzinger's exploratory law enforcement training evaluation study stands alone as being the first meaningful research attempt to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation methodology for the purpose of improving the Michigan basic police training system (Seitzinger, 1974). Seitzinger's study first describes the process undergone to develop a systemic analysis evaluation model, which is then followed by a pilot study of the model. The evaluation model, Systemic Analysis and Decision Making Model for Law Enforcement Training, was developed in cooperation and total concurrence with an evaluation committee (Ibid., p. 59). The committee was composed of thirteen basic police academy coordinators and one representative from the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (MLEOTC). The pilot study was conducted at Macomb Community College's basic police training program which was attended by 44 police recruits.

As a systemic model does imply, the intent was to comprehensively evaluate the police academy program by measuring system factors such as input, process, product and feedback in terms of related variables. The methodology utilized several instruments to collect an array of system factor variables. The instruments included:

1. Recruit Evaluation of Individual Blocks of Instruction

This instrument served to provide the recruits of

the basic recruit academy, used in the pilot study, an opportunity to evaluate those persons, properties, and processes employed during the instructional phase of this study. This evaluation rating scale provided the recruits a means of evaluating (a) the various personality characteristics of an instructor for a specific block of instruction; (b) the method of instruction for a block of instruction; (c) the learning objectives designated as essential to that block of instruction; and (d) the use of visual teaching aids.

2. Evaluation of Coordinator and Facilities

This form provides the recruit an opportunity to evaluate the coordinator and facilities. It provides an opportunity for the researcher to obtain data that is relevant in determining the coordinator's leadership and personality traits that may play an important role during the training process.

3. Coordinator's Evaluation of the School Administration, Facilities and Supporting Staff

This questionnaire was designed to determine: (a) the coordinator's evaluation of the school administration, attempting to determine whether appropriate support, financial stability, and sufficient assistance were provided; (b) an evaluation of the facilities necessary for a recruit training as well as evaluating supporting staff (e.g., secretaries, instructors, etc.), salaries, and additional services deemed necessary.

4. Instructor's Evaluation of the Police Recruit Academy

This rating device, executed by the academy instructors, measures the various persons (e.g., coordinators, secretaries, administration, etc.), properties (e.g., classroom supplies, equipment, etc.), and the processes (e.g., teaching objectives, operational procedures, etc.) associated to the instructional phase of the pilot study.

5. Evaluation by Supportive Personnel

This evaluation was designed for the supportive personnel providing services which supplement the training process. The instrument provides data concerning (a) working environment, (b) task assessment, (c) concurrent supportive services, and (d) general information.

6. Evaluation of Police Academy by Local Agencies

This rating form provides the chiefs of the police agencies sending officers to the training academy an opportunity to provide inputs into the training process. Indices of communication, knowledge of goals of the academy training process, and the ability of providing inputs in the training process, are interpretable from the data provided herein (Ibid., pp. 66-7).

Three standardized tests were also utilized as part of the evaluation study and were administered to the recruits during the pilot study. The standardized tests included: (1) a diagnostic reading test which measured reading speed, vocabulary and comprehension; (2) a police occupational vocabulary test; and (3) the MLEOTC pre- and post-test which was developed to measure the recruit cumulative achievement of training objectives for general program assessment. To accompany all the forelisted means of evaluation, the evaluation committee, the instructors, recruits, supportive personnel and police chiefs were interviewed both formally and informally (Ibid., p. 67).

Three analytical techniques were employed to analyze the data: (1) content analysis, (2) the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two sample test and, (3) correlational analysis (Ibid., pp. 109-10). The major findings derived from the analysis indicated a positive correlation between the MLEOTC pre- and post-test; the MLEOTC post-test and the Diagnostic Reading Test; and, the MLEOTC post-test and the Seitzinger Police Terminology Quiz. A significant difference was found in the reading abilities between those recruits scoring one

standard deviation above the MLEOTC post-test mean and those scoring one standard deviation below the mean. It was generally found that the evaluation instruments used during the pilot study were positively rated and that the evaluation committee worked "harmoniously" throughout the pilot study (Ibid., p. 110).

The major analytic findings of Seitzinger's study are revealing in that one can infer, in part, that the better reading ability the recruit has and/or the greater familiarity the recruit has with occupational vocabulary of police work, will result in the likelihood of the recruit's increased level of academy academic achievement. This finding should not be surprising. However, Seitzinger points out the important evaluation implication is that police academies can use reading and vocabulary diagnostic tests in order to identify recruits who need remedial assistance (Ibid., pp.118 and 122). He emphasizes:

> As may be predictable, the wide range of educational experiences brought to the training centers by the respective recruits, also brings a wide range of learning abilities and skills. This knowledge may be the most imperative to the entire training structure. The learning levels of the recruits entering the system would, to a large extent, predicate the type of methods and procedures used in the training processes. The information would also enable the coordinator the opportunity for establishing remedial programs, geared to the needs of a wide-variety of skills, select the proper level of reading materials and determine the most suitable level of instruction. Currently, there are no means of attaining this information from the training system or the departments who hire the respective recruits (Ibid., p. 122).

The need for diagnostic reading tests are apparent based on the diagnostic results which indicated 61% of the 44 recruits tested at Macomb scored below the 50th percentile norm established for the instrument (Ibid., p. 87). Five recruits were found to have reading levels below the 6th grade level. Yet, all recruits academically passed the police academy (Ibid., p.94-5). Seitzinger added he did not find any real appreciative difference of reading levels for those recruits which had college education and those who did not (Ibid., p. 87).

Seitzinger reported other meaningful findings pertaining to the perceived need for an evaluation system for Michigan police basic training. These findings were obtained through recorded discussions at the evaluation committee meetings, other related workshops, questionnaires and interviews with academy coordinators. As noted, "All (academy) coordinators feel an urgent need to improve the law enforcement basic recruit academy program" (Ibid., p. 80). However, 90% of the coordinators did not believe they were qualified to conduct an effective evaluation of the training process. Coordinators further admitted that there is an unavailability of appropriate basic police training evaluation instruments (Ibid.). Even the academy current recruit testing system was believed to be inadequate and coordinators indicated a need "to have some form of standardized examinations" (Ibid., p.85).

Regarding MLEOTC program evaluation efforts, the coordinators voiced an general attitude of disapproval for

the agency's proposed method for evaluating academies (Ibid., p. 75). "The coordinators were informed that a formula would be established from which the MLEOTC would be able to evaluate the regional training centers with a single percentage point ranging between 0-100%" (Ibid.). Coordinators contended that "a single digit could not adequately describe the performance of a recruit academy," since there are too many important variables involved and which need to be accounted for (Ibid.).

The pilot test of the developed evaluation process and instruments revealed some noteworthy findings about the Macomb police academy program. Seitzinger said it was found that recruits rated instructors and blocks of instruction as being "above average" overall (Ibid., p. 101). However, the First Aid instructional block and instructor were found to be unsatisfactory. Seitzinger further commented that the "personality and teaching style seemed to play a major role in evaluation of that instructor and the respective block of instruction" (Ibid.).

Thirty instructors completed an evaluation questionnaire of the Macomb Police Academy. Although instructors indicated on eight of the fourteen questions that they were satisfied with the academy program, there were four questions which revealed definite instructor dissatisfaction (Ibid., p.103-4). Those areas of dissatisfaction included instructors' believed they "were not provided sufficient background information for the recruits entered in the academy" (Ibid., p. 104). It was

also found that nine of the thirty instructors did not have a part in the selection of test questions. Instructors' were also not provided feedback about recruits accomplishments or test results for the blocks of instruction taught by the respective instructor (Ibid.). "Fourteen instructors were not informed of any problem recruits represented in the academy" (Ibid.). In summary, these problems cited indicate a general problem of communication between the academy administration and the instructors.

The data collected pointed out that "no instructor was involved in providing remedial help to the recruits who performed poorly and only eight of thirty counseled any of the recruits in the academy" (Ibid., p. 105). Twenty percent (20%) of the instructors believed the MLEOTC training objectives were outdated and should be revised.

The pilot study revealed some training facility problems and a dissatisfaction on the part of local police agencies for not having input about training academy policy and procedures (Ibid., p.107). Sufficient time was found to be allotted for most classroom activities except those where "hands on" training was required (Ibid., p. 140). Opportunity was not afforded to every officer to participate in essential practical training exercises. However, other ratings obtained about supportive personnel and the training program appeared favorable for the most part. One important conclusion based on the research was the police academy coordinator "is the key figure in the operation of the

entire training system. It is his prescribed actions and initiative which directly reflects the effectiveness of the entire training system" (Ibid., p. 121).

Seitzinger's study must be recognized as a valuable basic police training evaluation effort for several reasons. First, there is an extreme lack of of police academy training evaluation studies. Another reason is that he designed an evaluation process and methodology which accounted for many training input and process factors. His study probed into the recruits learning ability, quality of instruction, training administration, training objectives, supportive staff, training facilities, and more, all from different key perspectives representing recruits, police agency administrators, academy coordinators, instructors and supportive staff. As a result of the study the practical need for developing, implementing, and establishing diagnostic learning techniques and standards to identify recruits who may need remedial assistance is substantiated. The study disclosed the diversity of learning ability among recruits is significant, yet the differences are not considered within the training process.

The study demonstrated the advantage of using a systems evaluation approach. The methodology provided a wide array of training information by focusing on many factors using diverse evaluation techniques and obtaining feedback from key resource people. As a result a more objective and holistic evaluation picture can be obtained to preclude false evaluative assumptions based on a narrow research

investigation. For example, recruits may evaluate a specific block of instruction as being taught poorly. However, the instructor may rate the training objectives for that same block of instruction as being inadequate and outdated. Further analysis may indicate the reading material for that same block of instruction is far above the reading comprehension level of most recruits. When it is found that most the recruit trainees' score poorly on the final test, to infer a single cause for the training problem from just the recruits ratings, or just the instructors ratings, would easily misrepresent the complexity of the situation.

A critique of the study indicates some important weaknesses in the systemic evaluation model. Seitzinger evaluation does not address product assessment in realistic terms. Instead, the study evaluates input (trainee learning ability) and process (e.g. instruction, training objectives, administration, academy examinations). In realistic terms the product of the academy is a police recruit who is adequately prepared to perform police work. Seitzinger did not obtain supervisory ratings of graduated recruits to discover if the recruit-turned-rookie performed police work up to agency expectations for a new officer. Also, recruits evaluated the training only while they were participating in the training program, not after they had gained work experience which might have tempered their ratings. Hence, the evaluation ratings about the quality of instruction and the blocks of instruction may have been quite naive.

The manner which the evaluation study reported the

training program deficiencies lacked a sense of organized prioritization. As a result the relative value of the deficiencies were unclear for those responsible for future program planning. Prioritization is important when there are limited resources to apply towards improving a program and those doing the improving (academy coordinators) lack evaluative skills.

The questionnaire instruments asked respondents to answer very general questions and did not allow for the respondent to qualify, or clarify their answer. The problem is that the findings were so general that they did not lend themselves to indicating what the specific reason for the problem was, or how it could be remedied. Some example questions are: "Was the teaching environment conducive to your teaching needs?; Were you provided with a general background of members of the recruit class?; and, Do you feel the administrative staff is doing an efficient job?" (Ibid., p. 154).

Houghtaling Study

Houghtaling conducted a follow-up study of the Michigan pre-service law enforcement college program. The study's purpose was exploratory, but was aimed at determining whether the graduates of the regional basic police academies, when compared to those graduates produced in the pre-service college programs were at least equally trained (Houghtaling, 1976, p.5). In addition, the study attempted to answer other questions about the preservice college program relating to its advantages, weaknesses and overall

program acceptance by police administrators.

The main difference between the preservice and basic academy system is that recruits who attend basic academies are employed for the express purpose of becoming a police officer, whereas the preservice student is not employed by a police agency and police employment is not guaranteed. The basic recruit is only required to have a high school diploma or equivalent upon completion of the program, whereas the preservice student must possess a college degree. The duration and scope of the basic training program is generally limited to the MLEOTC curriculum, whereas the preservice program is comprised of both the MLEOTC curriculum and academic degree curriculum program. Hence, basic academy programs last several weeks, preservice programs are extended up to two years of occupational and academic study.

Three survey instruments were utilized in the study to obtain preservice program data from employers, graduate's immediate supervisor and graduates. Employers were asked about program acceptance and need for improvements and immediate supervisors and graduates provided judgments about the capability of the graduate and the quality of training they received. Comparative performance and training judgments were also collected (Ibid., p.5). The sample included: 111 (73% responding) graduates representing all preservice programs; 111 (56% responding) supervisors; and, 44 (62% responding) chief law enforcement administrators.

Graduate and supervisor categories of factor ratings

describing and comparing the graduate ability and knowledge included number of felony arrests, number of other arrests, number of traffic tickets, non-criminal services, number of commendations, number of citizen complaints, knowledge-criminal law, knowledge-arrest laws, knowledge-first aid, patrol techniques, firearms capability, crime scene investigation, traffic accident investigation, report writing, motivation, human relations skills, handling abnormal people and overall capability. Summary statistics of the study indicated that "80.2% of the employers and 80.1% of the graduates rated on an average for all categories the capabilities as 'average', 'somewhat better', or 'far superior' to the average academy recruit. However, only 32.6% of the employers and 44.2% of the graduates believed the students capabilities are either 'far superior' or 'somewhat better'" (Ibid., p.85). The researcher therefore concluded that the findings are favorable in substantiating that basic and preservice programs provide at least equal training, but the findings cannot verify that the preservice program is indeed better (Ibid.).

One conclusion the researcher makes about the findings is the apparent overwhelming need for review and improvement of preservice courses which instruct written and communication report writing skills (Ibid., p.84). Twenty-five percent (25%) of the supervisors rated preservice graduates as 'somewhat worse' than the average academy recruit. In addition, handling abnormal people and public relations categories were rated low for preservice

graduates by supervisors and the graduates themselves.

The need for practical application exercises to improve training was emphasized (Ibid., p. 85). The study expressed "the need for development of methods of allowing the students to utilize their decision making skills in practicing the application of textbook knowledge to common on the job situations" (Ibid., p.85). Suggested practical areas for decision making included when to make an arrest, detain a subject, search, and coax or coerce. The researcher noted that practical training exercises will help develop self-confidence that the study's findings found lacking in preservice graduates.

Houghtaling's study does a sufficient job as an exploratory and comparative program assessment. However, there are critical weaknesses within the study's methodology in terms of being considered highly credible program evaluation research. To begin, the validity of supervisory ratings is very questionable. Supervisors rarely directly observe how police officers handle various situations and therefore are forced to make subjective and unsubstantiated inferences about how an officer performs independently on the street. It is interesting to note that supervisors rated preservice recruits lowest in the category where they [the supervisors] were most directly familiar with the rookie's actual performance; that is, written communication. Validity of comparison ratings provided by supervisors between preservice and basic recruit programs is further complicated because there is no absolute standard of

comparison. Job performance conditions and requirements are never quite the same to allow for precise comparison of performance capability. Police work in terms of performance demands are diverse and range considerably according to each situation, although general categories would indicate uniformity (eg. number of felony arrests, crime scene investigation). There may have been some "halo effect" affecting supervisory ratings since supervisors were aware the officer they rated was not typical - s/he was a college graduate.

There is another validity problem because comparative performance data was only obtained from preservice graduates, not basic recruit trainees. The research indicates that college graduate officers are not confident about their capabilities to do police work. This may be due to their rookie status and inexperience, and because they are more introspective and critical about their own performance due to their high expectations, education and self-achievement need. Basic academy recruits' judgment, like preservice graduates, may also suffer from inadequate self-confidence and therefore underrate their true capabilities when asked to compare their own training and performance to other college trained officers. Hence, ratings should have been collected for both groups to adjust and balance for different group judgment biases and perceptions as required.

Another weakness in rookie officers comparing themselves with the training and performance of other

similar rookie officers is that rookies generally lack the background to make credible comparative judgments. One reason is that rookies rarely work with other rookies, rather they work with senior officers, or alone. They therefore rarely have the opportunity to extensively observe other rookie performance. Furthermore, even if the rookie observed another rookies' performance, their inexperience with different acceptable styles of police behavior and performance may wrongly influence their quality of judgment about another officer's actions.

Plog Study

Debora Plog (1981) conducted an assessment study of Michigan's basic police training delivery system. The survey study was conducted for the purpose of documenting the state-of-the-art of basic recruit training with the assumption the research findings would have implications for implementing MLEOTC's "new" basic police curriculum. The new curriculum is to be developed by the MLEOTC by means of a multiple phase job analysis project which is directed at improving the training curriculum and satisfying federal and state fair employment requirements (Plog, 1981, p. 1).

Before implementing the MLEOTC curriculum there was a decision that the following information would be needed:

> assessment of the current state of recruit school training;
>
> identification of relationships among coordinators, instructors, the MLEOTC, and the implications of those relationships;
>
> assessment of student reactions to the present recruit training;

identification of the resources used in teaching various subject matter areas;

identification of the opinions, practices, and needs of recruit school coordinators and instructors; and

identification of potential problems in the field caused by implementation of the "new" curriculum (Ibid.)

The study attempted to assess the above listed informational needs for both the preservice college recruit training programs and the regional basic recruit police training academies. The focus of study was on surveying instructors since it was believed "a significant degree of the success of the implementation phase will depend . . . [on] the instructors" (Ibid., p. 6).

The study identified more than 754 instructors as having taught between 1979 and 1980 in the basic training program for 48 basic training sessions. An average of 38 instructors were used for each session, with the range of number of instructors per session being 22 to 52. It was found the there was an approximate 25% turnover rate of instructors for all basic programs. A sample of 250 instructors were surveyed with an overall response rate of around 31% (Ibid., pp. 6-14).

The instructor survey and interviews solicited much potentially valuable general assessment information. It was found that 60% or more of the basic police academy instructors had received instructional training in any one of the four following areas: (1) developing objectives; (2)

designing and using audiovisual materials; (3) evaluation of instruction; and, (4) instructor platform skills (Ibid., p. 31). Instructors rank ordered instructional methods and indicated lecture as being predominantly (90% or more) used respectively followed by group discussion, demonstration, "hands on" activity, role-playing/simulation, and other (Ibid., p.35). Instructors provided ratings of instructional obstacles which are hindrances to successful instruction in the basic police program. The rankings of instructional hindrances from greatest to lowest are: (1) lack of time to present material; (2) work schedule conflicts; (3) low pay for time invested; (4) poor physical setting; (5) lack of MLEOTC direction/support; (6) poor student ability/attitude; (7) difficulty gathering content materials; (8) short notice to begin teaching; and, (9) lack of support by academy administration (Ibid., p. 37).

The researcher analyzed MLEOTC school evaluation forms for 12 police academies which are normally completed by recruits during the last day of the program. A replication of the Table of findings serves as a descriptive summary (Ibid., p. 38):

TABLE 2-1

SCHOOL EVALUATIONS BY STUDENTS
(Last Two 1980 Sessions For 12 Basic Training Academies)
(5 point scale: 1=Poor, 5=Excellent)

Subject	Rank	Ratings
Adequacy of Facilities		
Firearms	1	4.07
Physical Training	2	3.83
Classroom	3	3.52
School Administration		
Availability of School Coordinator	1	3.93
Compliance With School Rules and Regulations	2	3.83
Classroom Discipline	3	3.72
Effectiveness of Instruction		
Firearms	1	4.23
Accident Investigation	2	3.87
Physical Training	3	3.86
Criminal Investigation	4	3.79
Legal	5	3.77
Patrol Techniques	6	3.76
Defensive Tactics	7	3.74
Motor Vehicle Law	8	3.60
First Aid	9	3.56
Civil Disorders	10	3.55
Human Relations	11	3.45
Overall Evaluation		3.91

The study does have several weaknesses. In terms of the instructor survey, it must be pointed out that there was an overall very low response from instructors. The study did not attempt to determine if those instructors responding to the survey were in someway meaningfully different than those not responding. Hence, perhaps the nonresponding instructors, which made up nearly 70% of the sample, perceived the basic training program differently than

responders. Without being able to determine if meaningful differences existed between these two groups, the validity of any conclusions and generalizations made from the study findings purporting consensus of agreement among instructors can be reasonably challenged.

Another weakness the study had was in the reporting of rank-ordered data. Instruction methods utilized by instructors only indicated the proportion of instructors who ever used that method, not how often the instructor used the method compared to other methods, or to determine if the utilized method was appropriately selected and administered to aid the trainee to adequately reach the training objective. The instructional method data obtained therefore is too superficial to be of substantive guidance to correct instructional method problems, or to determine if any overall problems exist.

In the case of rank-ordering instructional hindrances, a statistical shortcoming is apparent. Although the hindrances are rank-ordered, which is informative, the proportion of respondents indicating each hindrance is not presented. The weight of agreement among instructors that any factor is a hindrance can therefore not be reasonably ascertained. In addition, the degree that any hindrance factor is a problem is neglected.

The research report presented several written comments made by instructors, coordinators and recruits which were either obtained by survey forms, or interviews. The comments were definitely intended to add a qualitative value

to the research study findings; however, the qualitative value was greatly diminished since there lacked sufficient quantitative support. To explain, the content analysis provided summary evaluative statements regarding the basic training program, but there was no statistical report as to how many instructors agreed with any of the summary statements. As a result, an evaluative statement could have been commented on by one instructor, or a hundred instructors. The difference is important.

The analysis of the recruit evaluations of the basic training program has validity problems. The recruits who provide evaluations about the quality of training they have received before they have actually tested the adequacy of learning against the demands of the real world are speculating. There are many factors which can falsely persuade the ready to graduate recruit that s/he is sufficiently prepared to perform actual police duties and responsibilities. First, the anxious ready to graduate recruits have satisfactorily passed the academy testing system. The recruits may be over confident that the testing system is a true indicator about their readiness to perform as a police officer. Second, the recruits are not afforded the opportunity in the police academy to self-test their ability by performing a wide range of police work simulation performance exercises. Performance exercises are highly limited to areas like defensive tactics, handcuffing and firearms because of the time and cost. Third, the recruits are inexperienced and therefore cannot adequately judge the

quality and practicalness of the academy instruction. To a large extent, they are at the mercy of the instructor in that s/he is competent and adept at conveying the critical job knowledges and skills the rookies will have to assimilate to become good performing officers. The recruits by their very academy status and naiveness have to accept much instruction on good faith alone.

The table of recruit evaluations does lack the necessary specificity for practical evaluative purposes for determining corrective action. The evaluation form requesting the recruit to give an overall rating for a general subject area may, with subtlety, discourage the responder from indicating, or recalling, specific training problems which need attention. Such a form serves as a poor diagnostic evaluation instrument for programs which are generally very good in quality, but nonetheless lack acceptable quality in only a few particular areas. Responders evaluate in general terms when asked general questions. Yet, it is the few specific problem areas the evaluator should want to know about so s/he can take corrective action.

Toledo/Lucas County Study

Bolinger et. al (1975), conducted a police training evaluation study for the Toledo/Lucas County Criminal Justice Supervisory Council, Ohio. The authors' claimed that their comprehensive model for training evaluation was a "dynamic one, involving continuous feedback, and is more comprehensive and well-integrated than previously existing

police training evaluation models" (Bolinger, 1975, p.205). The evaluation model was interactive and dynamic in that "it calls for continuous reassessment of objectives, course content, instruction, etc." (Ibid., p.8), which requires input from "patrolmen themselves, police command personnel, the full range of interacting agencies, and--at the broadest level--the public and elected public officials" (Ibid., p.205-6). The researchers believed that any factor which had implications for training should be considered. Some example factors provided were change in policy, department structure, and budget (Ibid., p.8).

The evaluation methodology procedure for data collection included personal interviews and several survey instruments which were sent to various groups. The population consisted of all metropolitan mental health and drug treatment directors, key criminal justice personnel, over 150 patrolmen, 83 police command personnel, 93 mental health workers, 49 various public officials, 800 citizens, among many others (Ibid., p.16-17). The breadth of the overall sample was quite extensive in composition.

One primary survey instrument inquiring about the adequacy of basic police training was administered to both police officers and supervisors. Sixty-one (61) general police activities were assessed on a four point Likert type rating scale which ranged from totally unprepared to fully prepared. Responses were categorized in two subsamples representing large urban/rural and small urban/rural police agencies for the purpose of identifying perceived

differences in training needs. Pronounced deficiency differences among officer ratings were found between both agency subsamples. Serious performance deficiencies traceable to training for large urban/rural agencies were identified as "interaction with information, law enforcement, criminal justice agencies; constitutional rights relating to liability; and pursuit and emergency driving;" - whereas, for small urban/rural police agencies the most serious deficiencies were:"suspect interrogation, obtaining search warrants; handling technical equipment and handling investigations" (Ibid., p.125-6).

Supervisor responses differed from uniformed officers in that they identified additional training deficiency areas which included report writing, control of crime scene, recognition and processing of evidence (Ibid., p.126). These differences existing between supervisors and uniformed officers were considered important by the researchers since they believed:

> . . . Such disagreements focus on the possibility of serious difficulties with departmental policy - - whether essential policy has actually been formulated, disseminated, understood, and is congruent with training objectives. If policy, because of its absence, lack of clarity, or being misunderstood, is not supportive of the performance objectives of training, it may be more advisable to focus upon policy re-evaluation than upon altering training in order to improve performance. Increased attention to policy becomes even more imperative when it is in direct conflict with the objectives embodied in the training. A fundamental part of complete training evaluation therefore, is a scrutiny of policy (Ibid., p.133).

Another survey questionnaire was administered to uniformed officers, supervisors and command personnel in order to assess the perceived clarity of department policy for guiding performance of 61 police activities. Several differences of agreement were found between both department subsamples regarding adequate clarity of policy and also differences were found among uniformed officers and supervisors. However, the main summary finding reported was "more uniformed patrolmen in these departments agree than disagree that field performance evaluation criteria are not supportive of basic training" (Ibid., p.143). The majority of command and supervisory personnel held that performance criteria was supportive of basic training. The authors comment, "The source of such clear differences in orientations must be traced, whether it be in inadequate attention paid to policy, lack of understanding of the training objectives on the part of command, or the need for more attention to be paid to the quality and consistency of supervision" (Ibid., p.146).

There are several study weaknesses which need discussing. First, the sample of officers who provided ratings regarding the adequacy of training were not recent trainees of a basic police training academy; instead, the officer sample was selected from a population of seasoned officers. The study did not indicate how many years, on the average, it had been since the sample had last attended an academy, or even if the officers had attended the same police academy system. Both these points seriously

challenge the credibility of the officers used as a source of data. The researchers admit:

> For maximum effectiveness such a field oriented question should be asked of the most recent trainees who have acquire sufficient field experience to assess the impact of training on their performance capability. Because we did not have such available, in order to test the functionality of the procedure the question was given to a random sample of all patrolmen and asks for a recall as to how well prepared they were (Ibid., p.117).

Some patrolmen providing ratings may therefore have as many as ten or more years of experience since they completed basic police training. The ability to evaluate their past training with any accuracy decreases as time increases. The credibility problem is compounded since both police training and job requirements were not held reasonably constant over time to allow for a congruent and sound evaluation. Training programs have changed over time, as well as police work. Officers may be comparing the training they received years ago with the new contemporary job requirements which they now must meet. More simply said, they may be unequitably comparing the old with the new.

Another weakness is the subjectivity encouraged by the evaluation study. One cannot expect the public, public officials, or agency administrators to credibly rate the quality of police training based on their finite experience and little expertise. These kind of respondents actually know very little about the subject matter, instruction, or overall quality of training the officer receives. Such respondents would do better to only provide satisfaction

ratings concerning the quality of police services they have experienced. However, there are many other factors besides training alone which can affect the quality of police service - examples, the officer's attitude, the subject's attitude, departmental policy, immediate patrol priorities, patrol staffing level, among others. Inferences made about the quality of training based on third party respondent quality of police service ratings have to be considered speculative without more substantial supporting evidence.

The study also failed to identify specific problems within the basic police training program. Problems were stated in very general terms (eg. report writing, departmental policy) without enough clarification to help propose any meaningful resolutions to correct program deficiencies. The evaluation study conclusions and recommendations were scant in that they did not give any well defined direction on how to go about improving the current basic police training program. As a result, the final evaluation product was not very conducive for utilization by program administrators, curriculum specialists and instructional staff as a means for program improvement.

Earl Study

Earl conducted a study to test the hypothesis that "persons exercising a high degree of responsibility, authority and discretion --such as first-line peace officers --perform their duties with a higher level of proficiency and personal satisfaction and in a manner more acceptable to

the people being served when they have been trained under authoritarian or stress conditions than when their training is conducted under non-stress conditions" (Earl, 1973, p.58). A quasi-experimental methodology was utilized to determine the influence of stress upon field performance, job satisfaction and performance acceptability to those served. Control classes were subjected to the Los Angelas Sheriff Departments established stress training program which employed rigorous discipline and organization. Treatment classes were kept as equivalent as possible with the exception that the recruit academy environment was relaxed and non-stressful. The sample consisted of 174 recruits who were distributed to control and treatment classes by matching subjects according to six factors: education, previous military experience, marital status, previous police experience, age and race. Field performance data was collected for both classes over a two year period (Ibid., p. 83-4).

Three instruments were used to collect and analyze field performance data. A Deputy Evaluation Form was the primary instrument which divided field performance by eleven traits: personal appearance, communications, public and personal relations, job knowledge, following instructions, attitude toward duties, adaptability, judgment, initiative, responsibility and leadership. A five point ordinal scale served to measure trait evaluative ratings ranging from inadequate to outstanding. The Work Quality Questionnaire measured subjects interpersonal relationships with their

peers and supervisors. Immediate supervisors provided ordinal ratings approximately every six months for ten questions. Paired Comparisons were performed to assure that every subject would be compared to every other subject and the result would be a definite judgment about which subject is the better performer (Ibid., p. 96-8). In addition, personal impressions of the subjects were measured on two other questionnaires: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and Training Effectiveness Questionnaire (Ibid., p. 99).

The summary findings indicated, with the exception of the Training Effectiveness Questionnaire, that evidence supported the hypothesis proposing, "Non-stress trained subjects displayed a higher level of performance proficiency in the field, a higher level of job satisfaction and higher level of performance acceptability by persons served" (Ibid., p. 143). The Training Effectiveness Questionnaire findings were relatively neutral indicating equality between the stress and non-stress approaches to basic recruit training. The author concluded that the overall evidence is definitely in favor of non-stress training over stress training.

Earl's study is one of the most respected and renown basic police training evaluation studies ever conducted; however, the study did have some weaknesses and limitations. Earl himself expressed that the nonconfidentiality of the experiment probably influenced to some degree the subjects' and raters' performance (Ibid., p. 148). He adds that the first sample did experience self-induced stress although the

staff maintained a relaxed learning environment. In order to counter the extraneous variable, the researcher said the potential weakness "prompted creation and administration of the Post-Experiment Questionnaire" (Ibid., p. 149). The study was limited in that it really focused only on the philosophical operation of the training delivery system (Stress vs. Non-Stress), not on other qualitative curriculum concerns.

A thorough examination of dissertation abstracts from Dissertation Abstracts International, July 1965 to July 1983, revealed no doctoral dissertation related specifically to this study. Furthermore, a review of a number of periodicals and books revealed the same. The study is unique because there has not been found any directly related formative graduate follow-up task-inventory evaluation study of the basic police training curriculum at the Oakland Police Academy, or at any other police academy in the United States. However, the review of the literature has provided a critique of similar research addressing the development and evaluation of basic police training programs.

SUMMARY

The review of the precedent literature has indicated that the advancements in police training between the early 1900's to the early 1960's were described by many authors as being subjective developments without a consensus of training practices and standards. Police training has too often been based on tradition, custom, imagination, or what other agencies are doing - not by analyzing the occupational learning needs of the police. In order to identify and plan to meet police occupational needs through training, police educators and trainers have proposed the need to conduct job analysis studies to develop relevant curriculums.

The Michigan basic police curriculum was developed in the historical traditional mode. Basic training program requirements were not based on job analytic information and evidence, but rather on subjective judgments of police administrators and practitioners reflecting their opinions about what police training should provide. With the advent of Public Act 203, 1965, the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Council (MLEOTC) was legislatively created and was empowered with the responsibility, in part, to establish a mandatory minimum basic police training curriculum standard. Hence, the Michigan basic police curriculum was centrally controlled by the State of Michigan.

The Kuhn study in 1967, initiated a long influencing groundwork project which was directed at reviewing and improving law enforcement training in Michigan. One product

of the study was a recommended curriculum with lesson plans, which was later implemented by the MLEOTC in a modified form. The recommended curriculum was supposedly a result of a job analysis study and comparative curriculum study; however, neither the job analysis or the comparative curriculum study methodologies were described in enough satisfactory detail to understand their relationship to the final recommended curriculum.

Michigan has participated in other studies which were intended to revise and change the basic police curriculum, but little curriculum change actually occurred. Project STAR (1974) findings did not have any influence upon the MLEOTC basic curriculum. The reasons why Michigan did not make any revisions based on Project STAR findings is not clear, especially since MLEOTC was invited and did participate in the administrative responsibilities of the project. Project COSTER (1976) was an effort to establish a comprehensive examination and develop a competency based curriculum for the the basic police academy system. The bulk of the entire project was later scrapped with only some slide-tape programs being integrated into the curriculum. The decision to terminate Project COSTER was based upon MLEOTC staff beliefs that the project suffered serious problems which could not be overcome.

Soon after Project COSTER, the MLEOTC conducted a job analysis study of the Michigan patrol officer position in order to develop job related selection and training standards for entry-level patrol officers. The study

utilized the task inventory survey approach which asked both supervisors and job incumbents to make judgments relating to the importance of various job-tasks. The study findings indicated that over 300 job-tasks were found to be important to the selection and training of entry-level patrol officers. The MLEOTC intends to develop a basic police training curriculum from further analyses of the findings of the study.

Evaluation studies of basic police academies and their curriculums are seriously lacking; however, Michigan has experienced a few evaluation studies. Seitzinger's exploratory study was designed to be a comprehensive law enforcement evaluation training model. The evaluation took into account many key people such as instructors, coordinators, recruits and even police administrators. The evaluation study findings pointed to the need for diagnostic instruments to identify recruits with learning deficiencies. However, the evaluation study model was training process oriented, not training product oriented. There was also an absence of organization and prioritization of training deficiencies.

Houghtaling conducted a follow-up study of Michigan pre-service law enforcement college graduates to determine the comparative quality of training between pre-service and basic police academy programs. Pre-service graduates and their supervisors completed evaluation instruments which provided judgments about the quality of training the preservice and basic graduate received. Although the

evaluation comparative ratings between pre-service and basic academies are suspect as to their validity, the researcher concluded that the findings cannot verify that the pre-service program is better than the basic. Houghtaling's study did partially focus on curriculum product assessment.

Plog's (1981) study assessed the Michigan basic police training delivery system with the purpose of documenting the state-of-the-art with the assumption the findings would have implications for the MLEOTC "new" basic curriculum. The study suffered from a low response rate from the primary sample group - instructors. The credibility of recruit ratings of training were considered questionable since they were made without police experience. Other statistical weaknesses in reporting the data were noted. Instead of the assessment study being training product oriented, it was process oriented.

Other police training evaluation studies were reviewed. One of the most consistent summative findings is the general agreement among the studies that there is a need for more "hands-on-training" (exception being Earl). The studies reviewed were found to lack the specificity and prioritization of curriculum deficiencies which is conducive to constructive curriculum revision. Many of the studies reviewed were found by this researcher to suffer serious methodological and/or statistical weaknesses.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in cooperation with the Oakland Police Academy (OPA), which is affiliated with Oakland Community College, Michigan. The evaluation is one of descriptive design. A sample of recruits graduating from three different OPA basic training sessions were selected. Recruits graduating from the OPA reported to their respective agency job sites where they performed the patrol officer position. After performing the job from one to two years, the subjects were mailed a task inventory instrument which requested evaluative measures regarding the police officer's judgments concerning the adequacy of the training they received at the basic police academy. The data was analyzed to determine if there was sufficient evidence to support a meaningful agreement among officers as to the curriculum effectiveness in preparing recruits to perform entry-level job-tasks. The analyses did include a comparison of officers' judgments against a set of standard criterion for identifying and prioritizing potential curriculum weaknesses in order to facilitate necessary curriculum research, planning and change for the purpose of improving the OPA basic training program.

POPULATION

The <u>intended population</u> was to have consisted of Michigan police academy recruits who had graduated from

anyone of thirteen state certified basic police academies and are employed as patrol officers. The number of graduates a year ranges on the average from 500 to 2,000. However, with the employment of police officers dropping considerably over the past few years, the average number of graduating recruits is approximately 500 per year. The population is listed within the basic training academy roster system recorded by the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council (MLEOTC). The record system indicates where each graduating police recruit is initially employed within Michigan.

However, a more defined population of recruits was required for the research study since the MLEOTC Administration was unwilling to provide a cover letter of endorsement. Without the cooperation and the endorsement of the MLEOTC it was determined by the researcher that the probability of obtaining a reasonable response from recruits would likely be poor. Research adjustments had to made regarding the scope of the research population. OPA was therefore contacted and invited to become the focus of the evaluation study. Their response was most favorable and they were willing to provide a cover letter of endorsement to recruits as well as give some administrative assistance.

The actual population of the study are recruits who have graduated from the OPA basic training program and have employment experience as a police officer. Patrol officers as defined within the study includes only state certified uniformed police personnel who are responsible for all basic

police functions which consist of enforcement of laws, maintenance of order, prevention of crime and protection of property. The definition excludes officers assigned exclusively to special functions within a police agency such as controlled substance, detective division, juvenile division and jail security.

SAMPLE

In July 1983, a sample was selected from the population by surveying all graduating recruits from three different OPA basic training sessions. The three sessions selected started and ended on the following dates:

Session 1	July 20, 1981 to September 11, 1981
Session 2	October 8, 1981 to December 4, 1981
Session 3	March 1, 1982 to April 30, 1982

The criterion for selecting the sessions was based primarily upon a reasonable time parameter factor. To explain, those OPA sessions which had been completed within a time frame where the graduates would have attained approximately one to two years of patrol officer experience since graduation were utilized as the sample base. The criterion served principally to assure that the sample surveyed had enough experience as patrol officers to provide a valid detail evaluation of the basic training they had received, yet not so removed over time from the training program where recall and recognition of their training may become inaccurate and unreliably obscure. The sessions selected had been completed recently enough to be reasonably considered representative of the contemporary OPA basic recruit training program. Selecting three sessions also provided a

potentially large enough sample base to conduct the necessary statistical analyses whereby reasonable inferences could be derived about the OPA program.

Controls were administered to ensure the elimination of dissimilar subjects within the sample. Some examples of dissimilar subjects are animal control officers, police dispatchers, housing guards, community service officers, correctional officers, marine officers and any other position which does not have patrol officer responsibilities. Background questions within the questionnaire assisted in determining if in fact the subject was officially authorized and did exercise patrol officer responsibilities. MLEOTC records were checked to make certain each subject was certified to practice law enforcement in a public police agency.

SPECIFICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERION AND CONCERNS

The primary source for specifying the evaluative paradigm is the by-product of a patrol officer job analysis project conducted by the MLEOTC in cooperation with law enforcement supervisors and police patrol incumbents. A representative statewide sample of police agencies participated in the job analysis project utilizing a task inventory methodology. The project resulted in the identification of just over 300 police job-tasks which were determined to be essential core job-tasks which should represent the foundation of the Michigan basic police curriculum.

Since the MLEOTC's stated position is that trained

recruits should be competent job performers because inadequate performance may result in unacceptable consequences, the criteria for evaluating the OPA curriculum are the officers collective judgment regarding the effectiveness of the training to adequately prepare them to perform essential entry-level job-tasks. Based on the MLEOTC's position expressing the importance of training officers to perform competently, it is held that patrol officer consensus indicating anything less than adequate job-task preparatory training must be considered a curriculum weakness. Such is designated as the conceptual criterion standard for the evaluation. The criterion will serve to answer the following specific evaluative concerns:

1. Does the OPA curriculum in reality effectively prepare police officers to adequately perform important entry-level job-tasks?
2. Which job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than other job-tasks for the purpose of determining which tasks need additional curriculum attention and consideration?
3. What recommendations can be suggested by OPA graduates concerning how the OPA curriculum can be improved for the purpose of increasing the training programs effectiveness to adequately prepare recruits for realistic police work?

EMPIRICAL DESCRIPTION OF CRITERION

In order to answer the evaluative concerns, job data was collected from the sample on a task inventory instrument

which is a composite of 304 essential job-tasks. Officers provide a criterion rating score for each task which reflects their judgment of perceived adequacy of the OPA training in preparing them to perform the job (Appendix B: Instrument). The criterion ratings are represented by a five point Likert type ordinal scale which ranges from training being considered "Totally Inadequate" to "Excellent". The operational criterion standard as designated is "training received was Satisfactory ", which has the numerical value of 3 . Hence, mean scores are calculated from the task ratings for each and every task for the entire sample. Any mean score resulting in a value of less than 3 is considered a potential curriculum weakness, or problem which needs attention.

MEASUREMENTS

The instrument is designed to measure various variables relating to the patrol officers perceived adequacy of the basic police curriculum to provide the necessary learning to competently perform the patrol officer job. The data collected is both quantitative and qualitative. Nominal data represent officers simply indicating if they have, or have not, performed a task. Ordinal data are representative of the officer judgment ratings of the curriculum adequacy to prepare recruits to perform essential job-tasks. Qualitative measurements collected from the instrument zero in on obtaining specific recommendations from police officers about how the actual training program can be improved as well as which training subject areas need the

most improvement. A content analysis is conducted to determine what graduate feedback can be formulated into reasonable constructive recommendations for immediate administrative action. The overall measurements serve well for performing the appropriate analyses required to address the evaluative concerns within the study.

INSTRUMENT

The instrument utilized in the study is the by-product of a task inventory instrument used in a job study conducted by the MLEOTC to determine the patrol officers job content. Job content was further defined by distinguishing tasks which were considered essential to the job and tasks which are of less significance of importance. The instrument utilized in the study is composed of 304 tasks which were deemed essential job tasks and would be part of the mandated basic police curriculum. Officers will report on each task indicating if they had performed the task and how well prepared they were to perform each of the 304 tasks listed. The instrument can be found in Appendix B.

The instrument used in the study was not extensively pilot tested since a very similar task inventory instrument developed by the MLEOTC had been used successfully during their occupational study of the Michigan patrol officer position. However, reasonable precautions were taken in that selected police officers were requested to review the instrument to assure the instructions and content were indeed reasonably understandable. The instrument was found to be easily understood and not difficult to complete by the

reviewers.

One clarification needs to be explained about the instrument duty-task statements and their relationship to the curriculum being evaluated. The task statements strictly represent the important entry-level patrol officer job content which should be part of the basic police training academy curriculum as defined by the MLEOTC Statewide Job Analysis of the Police Patrol Officer Position The tasks found to be important to entry-level patrol work were not necessarily a part of the MLEOTC mandatory curriculum, or the expanded OPA curriculum, when the police graduates attended the basic academy program. In short, at the time period being studied, the MLEOTC had not revised their basic police training curriculum based on the 1979 job analysis findings.

DESIGN

The instrument is designed to measure the officer judgments regarding the effectiveness of training received concerning job-task performance. The measure is directly related to the Michigan police job training being provided in terms of the criterion, as well as the essential job-task content of the Michigan patrol officer position. The information is collected from the incumbents because it is assumed the workers are the most reliable source to provide accurate information about their job training. The rationale is that the officer is the one who has completed the training and the person who has to perform the job-task. This assertion is especially realistic since the police

officer job is one which receives very little direct on-site job observation and evaluation from supervision.

The instrument is further designed to assess if the officer has actually performed a particular task. The measure aids in the analysis by assuring the reliability of the data is acceptable. The consideration here is that officers who have performed the tasks may consistently rate the adequacy of training differently than non-performers. Consistency of ratings is important to distinguish since it is a fair assumption that ratings reported by subjects who have performed the job-tasks are likely more valid than non-performer ratings. Hence, a special analysis isolating task performer ratings is conducted for each task for comparative purposes.

PROCEDURES

Graduating OPA recruits completing basic police training return to their employing agency where they begin working as certified police officers. The police officer job status is verified by questions within the background of the research instrument. The control questions will protect against non-police officer types from entering the sample. After the officer has been on the job for approximately twelve to twenty-four months s/he is sent the research instrument with appropriate instructions on how to correctly complete and return the instrument. The instrument is directly returned to the OPA, Oakland Community College.

A cover letter from the OPA encouraging a response did

accompany the survey instrument mailing to the patrol officers. Follow-up letters were mailed two weeks after the initial mailing as reminders to OPA graduates to complete and return the instrument. Anonymity was promised to respondents.

Instruments were reviewed for obvious respondent errors. Errors needing correction were corrected by corresponding with respondents. In those very few instances where the respondent could not decide if the training was, or was not adequate for a particular task - the task was given a satisfactory rating. After instruments were found to be acceptable for processing, they were analyzed.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected were analyzed to illustrate findings in a meaningful way and usable fashion. Respondent background information and related experience were reported by simple frequency and proportional statistics for the purpose of describing the sample. Tables of statistics were provided in instances where a composite display of statistics might serve to better illustrate important variances among the sample. In addition, the data analysis of the sample of the population provided a check procedure to identify and exclude those respondents who did not qualify in accordance to the definition of the population.

The analysis of the respondent training evaluation data primarily focused on presenting the findings by two major complimentary ways: (1) quantitative duty-task evaluation comparisons; and, (2) qualitative duty-task evaluation

comments. Quantitative duty-task comparisons are displayed within various tables for the purpose of prioritizing, highlighting and contrasting both adequate and inadequate task training evaluation ratings within the basic police academy program. Tables include organizing tasks according to their relative curriculum priority with all other tasks, by relative priority when comparing tasks within their own duty-field and by comparing each duty-field relatively to all other duty-fields according to overall task training evaluation strengths and weaknesses. In order to establish a relative priority among tasks and duty-fields which need curriculum attention, a rank ordering format was applied to many of the tables.

Within the tables the task evaluation ratings are classified in three data fields. These fields are consensus, performers and non-performers. The consensus field is representative of the calculated mean task rating for all respondents. The performers field represent a calculated mean rating exclusively for those respondents which reported they have performed that particular task. Non-performers simply represent those respondents mean task rating exclusively for those respondents who reported they did not perform the task rated. The field analysis serves to offset the possibility that not enough officers will have performed all 304 tasks to obtain sufficient and necessary task performer ratings to reach a reliable finding. However, if non-performer task ratings are found to be reliably consistent with performer ratings, then some

reasonable inferences can be made about those tasks which few officers have performed.

Qualitative duty-task evaluation comments were collected and organized for the purpose of providing some thoughtful evaluation insight about task training weaknesses, as well as how training might be improved from the patrol officer's standpoint. Each respondent was asked to select three tasks which they believed needed the most improvement in the basic academy curriculum and comment why according to directions. Comments are assembled in Appendix C for reference and future curriculum consideration.

METHODOLOGY LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The main evaluation questions of the study are both classic and difficult ones which have taunted many educators and trainers; that is, does the curriculum accomplish what it intends to accomplish in reality? Or, does the curriculum prepare the student/trainee for the determined needs of reality? It can be stated fairly that these questions represent some of the most serious evaluation concerns, which are far from easy to assess. The difficulty of assessment increases for an occupation like policing when the occupation itself is in a state of continual transition because of changes in law (job knowledges), related technologies and contemporary police practices. Yet, the need to ask the question of congruence between intended curriculum outcomes and observed outcomes, or the congruence of the curriculum being reflective of the needs of reality, are even more critical for curricula which are impacted by

change, because those very same curricula are in the greatest danger of becoming prone to obsolescence.

Robert Stake (Stake, 1967, pp. 372-90), does an excellent job of laying out a schematic of the different approaches to curriculum evaluation. He points out that the purposes and procedures of educational evaluation may differ and as a result so will the curriculum evaluation approach. His conclusion is that the "countenance of evaluation should be one of data gathering that leads to decision-making, not trouble-making." He contends that educators need to be more deliberate and formal when performing curriculum evaluations. They should ask and try to clarify their responsibility by answering such questions as:

> (1) Is this evaluation to be primarily descriptive, primarily judgmental, or both descriptive and judgmental? (2) Is this evaluation to emphasize the antecedent conditions, the transactions, or the outcomes alone, or a combination of these, or their functional contingencies? (3) Is this evaluation to indicate the congruences between what is intended and what occurs? (4) Is this evaluation to be undertaken within a single program or as a comparison between two or more curricular programs? (5) Is this evaluation intended more to further the development of curricula or to help choose among available curricula? (Ibid., p.389)

These questions are indeed helpful guidance to the prospective evaluator. In terms of this evaluation study the researcher has attempted to answer these questions and consider their weight in the design of the evaluation methodology. In brief response, regarding question one, the evaluation is both descriptive and judgmental. Judgments are

provided by police officers who have graduated from a police academy within approximately two years and have at least one year of job experience. Descriptions consist mainly of descriptive statistics and explanation of the training system being evaluated. Question two can be answered by saying the study focuses primarily on "outcomes," but some recommendations are compiled from job incumbents pertaining to antecedent conditions and transactions. Question three is definitely addressed by the study because it is directly concerned with establishing if there is a congruence between what is intended and what occurs. Question four can be answered that the study is undertaken within a single program, however, with hope that some general inferences can be proposed about other similar programs. Question five is best answered that the evaluation should help facilitate further development of the curricula.

What becomes apparent after answering the questions is that the study does have its definite limitations. In particular, although the study will probably do a very good job in answering program intentions and what occurs in reality, the research will lack comprehensiveness and depth in evaluating descriptively and judgmentally the antecedents, transactions and their contingencies. Antecedents are those conditions existing prior to instruction and learning which may relate to outcomes and transactions consisting of the innumerable encounters of instructor with trainee, trainee with trainee, author with reader, etc. - which are "the succession of engagements

which compromise the process of education"(Ibid., p. 377). The primary focus of the study is therefore measuring program intentions with learning outcomes with the accepted deletion of a thorough investigation of the learning process.

However, curricula evaluation which focuses on measuring the congruence between educational intentions and actual outcomes has much support within the literature. Ralph Tyler, one of the most traditionally renowned curricula authorities, asserts, "The process of evaluation is essentially the process of determining to what extent the educational objectives are actually being realized by the program of curriculum and instruction" (Kliebard, 1970, p. 63). Bloom (1962) notes, "The criterion for determining the quality of a school and its educational functions would be the extent to which it achieves the objectives [intentions] it has set for itself..." (Cronbach, 1963, p. 322). Cronbach emphasizes that when evaluation is conducted for the purpose of course improvement,"the chief aim is to ascertain what effects the course has -- that is, what changes it produces in pupils" (Ibid., pp. 322-3). Cronbach contends that the greatest service evaluation can provide is to identify aspects within a course where revision appears necessary. Evaluating educational intentions and outcomes according to many authorities is an important and central concern pertaining to curriculum development and overall assessment.

Now, a brief explanation must be given to interrelate some of the concepts and authoritative assertions with the

evaluation methodology which the research study utilizes to evaluate the OPA basic police training curriculum. To begin, the methodology is a task inventory follow-up study. The task listing represents a symbolic philosophical statement, in part, by the MLEOTC regarding what job-tasks police recruits should be prepared to perform at the job entry-level. It is the adequate preparation of recruits to perform the MLEOTC identified tasks which represents the intended training outcomes . The task listing is composed of the 304 task statements which were identified by the MLEOTC as being representative of "reality" pertaining to what worker requirements police recruits should be ready to encounter under actual working conditions. The tasks were identified by a job analysis project conducted by the MLEOTC. Hence, the task listing represents a powerful comprehensive framework of reality in terms of projecting the police recruits future job expectations and demands, as well as the basic training programs goal to prepare trainees to adequately perform the job of policing.

In order to measure congruence between intended training outcomes and actual behavioral outcomes of trainees, trainees did provide judgments regarding the training they received which should have adequately prepared them to perform the identified common and important tasks. These judgments serve as the observational data which Robert Stake calls for to determine congruence. The result of the statistical analysis will produce a rank-ordered listing of tasks which range from needing "improvement" to not needing

improvement. Such a listing satisfies the purpose of evaluation according to what Cronbach requests concerning identifying aspects within the curriculum which need improvement. In short, the literature does verify the methodological approach as being a reasonably productive one; however, there are still some limitations which need addressing.

Cronbach points out that follow-up evaluations are probably the best means to measure ultimate educational contributions, "but the completion of such a study is so far removed in time from the initial instruction that it is of minor value in improving the course or explaining its effects" (Cronbach, p. 326). This statement without doubt appears to be a pressing methodological problem. Cronbach adds,

> I would emphasize departures of attained results from the ideal, differences in apparent effectiveness of different parts of the course, and differences from item to item; all these suggest places where the course could be strengthened. But this view cannot be applied to the follow-up study, which appraises effects of the course as a whole and which has very little meaning unless outcomes can be compared with some sort of base rate (Ibid.).

Cronbach however does finally say although follow-up data does not indicate how to improve a course "such studies should have a place in research on the new curricula, whose national samples provide unusual opportunity for follow-up that can shed light on important questions" (Ibid.).

This research study counters Cronbach's parochial view

that follow-up studies have to be so narrow and cannot provide important information about the need for curricula improvement. If other follow-up studies are too general it may be that it is a problem of methodological design and development, rather than methodological approach (e.g. follow-up study). The task inventory follow-up approach does have some of the characteristics Cronbach expects from a methodology that will identify aspects in need of curriculum improvement. For example, a rank-ordered listing of tasks which need curriculum improvement does satisfy looking at particulars in a course as opposed to describing the general whole. In reference to the need of a base rate, actually other task ratings can serve as a base rate of comparison to indicate relative need for curriculum improvement. In addition, the mean judgment rating provided by the graduate indicating "satisfactorily prepared" can serve as an indicator of need for curriculum improvement. Finally, open ended questions were included which asked the graduate to indicate and describe weak areas within the curriculum, along with recommendations on how those weaknesses might be improved. These questions do enhance the value of follow-up study in providing findings which facilitate meaningful feedback about where to direct curriculum improvement efforts.

The job analysis technique has been found to be very pragmatic for designing training courses, determining training needs and identifying areas of job change (Prien and Ronan, 1971, pp. 371-96). Prien and Ronan suggest that

there are logical research extensions of the job analysis technique, but they either have not been reported, or they have not been investigated. The task inventory approach as a follow-up method to evaluate the adequacy of the training curriculum to prepare trainees to perform important tasks is certainly a logical extension of job analysis general methodology. It is only reasonable that a technique which has been used so successfully to describe jobs and design training can be used as a framework to evaluate those very same jobs.

There are some precautions one should keep in mind when using job analysis techniques. One is the question of reliability and validity of responses obtained from job incumbents which provide task ratings. Another is the possibility that a task statement is inadequately described to include important job elements in order to allow instructional designers, or those providing ratings, to understand critical distinctions and characteristics about that task in question which may affect the quality of analysis, or task ratings provided. And of course, it should be recognized that a task listing of supposedly all the important aspects of a job may falsely lead one to be over confident about the true comprehensiveness of the task listings reflecting the total job. Each task rarely stands alone, rather it overlaps with other tasks. Such overlap indicates certain interrelationships between tasks which cannot be so easily captured or analyzed by a single or even group of task factor ratings. Those interrelationships are

important to describing the job as well as critical to those who must design or evaluate a curriculum. The concept to keep humbly in mind when looking at task statistics is that the sum of the parts (police work) is indeed greater than the whole (all tasks). Hence, the job of policing is more complex than an extensive listing of task statements may indicate and therefore any statistical findings will only reflect superficial, but important, identification of curriculum weaknesses and strengths. Once the curriculum weaknesses are identified, intensive curriculum research (eg. task analysis) will have to be conducted before any definite conclusions should be made about "how" the curriculum should be revised.

The research study is confronted with some of the more common limitations found within such curriculum evaluation studies. Attrition is a likely problem since a number of subjects may discontinue work as police officers, or change agency of original employment. However, attrition was controlled for by selecting three basic academy sessions in order to increase the sample size and by sampling all the graduates for those sessions.

There is a very good probability that not enough officers will have performed all 304 job-tasks within the inventory. Hence, some tasks will not be able to be analyzed reliably because of insufficient data. However, if non-performer task ratings are found to be reliably consistent with performer ratings, then some reasonable inferences can be made about those tasks which few officers

have performed.

Another problem is that each OPA basic police training session is unique in some ways whether it be instructors, students, learning conditions, or historical variables which make up the learning environment. Because of these uniquenesses, there is always a validity question about combining similar, but unidentical, sessions and their subjects together as a single sample and then making inferences from that multivariable group about other sessions. In this case, the validity problem is less for making inferences about anticipated curriculum weaknesses and strengths concerning other future OPA sessions than it is for making inferences about other different police academy sessions. However, this validity problem is partially controlled.

The controls which offset the session uniqueness factor is that most instructors used in each OPA session are about constant. Few new instructors are used from one session to the next. Even when new instructors are used, they are all given a set of MLEOTC instructor guidelines for their area of instruction. Although these instructional guidelines are oftentimes vague and lack detail and subject matter substance, the guidelines still serve as an instructional parameter which aids in assuring some curriculum consistency.

Another offsetting control is that the OPA testing system is also quite constant from one academy session to the next. As a result, those graduating from OPA,

regardless of which session, have reached a very close minimum standard level of achievement. Lastly, computations of task training ratings for each task based on all subjects will indicate any excessive ranges of variance which will alert a possible validity problem. Such variances may occur if training in each sampled OPA session differed.

The research study findings can also be challenged because officers providing ratings are dissimilar since most work for different police agencies. The task performance requirements for police officers working at different agencies do meaningfully differ for certain tasks. Ideally with a large enough sample officer ratings could have been analyzed by agency type. However, the research sample size within the study does not permit such an analysis. The control embedded within the methodology to counter the noted problem is the task inventory itself and OPA program. According to MLEOTC findings, the task inventory represents a composite of core tasks which are common important entry-level work requirements found in traditional police agencies. Secondly, the OPA program is responsible for preparing recruits for various traditional police work responsibilities, not just one type of police agency.

OVERVIEW

The methodology which was utilized in the study has been explained in Chapter 3. The explanation addressed the evaluative concerns the curriculum evaluation study is directed at investigating and answering, as well as the population, sample, procedures, criterion, measures,

limitations and research considerations which are essential to understanding the rationale for the research approach and design. The methodology is intended to aid others in assessing the research study and to serve as a means of replication and methodology refinement for future curriculum research studies.

The actual research findings based on the analyses of data are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

SAMPLE OF POPULATION

Total Respondents

A total of sixty-two survey questionnaires were mailed to all Oakland Police Academy graduates who attended anyone of three academy sessions and were determined to be employed as police officers for approximately one to two years. Two questionnaires were returned undeliverable leaving the actual total sample of potential respondents as sixty. A follow-up postcard reminder was sent to those graduates who did not respond within two weeks of the first survey mailing. The analysis of results is based upon twenty-seven survey responses from OPA graduates which represents a return rate of 45% of the defined population. The findings of the study should be viewed with some scientific caution due to the return rate statistical strength.

Age

The average age of the sample was found to be 28.3 years old. However, the age of the sample does vary considerably as illustrated in Table 4-1.

Education and Background

The average amount of education attained by the sample was 13.6 years. Education level was obtained by reviewing basic police academy enrollment forms. Eighteen (66%) of the OPA graduates reported they had some law enforcement

related background before entering the OPA program. Thirteen (48%) had reserve police officer experience and six (22%) reported they had civilian employee experience with a public police agency. The other related backgrounds included security guard, correction officer, campus public safety, probation officer, military police and park ranger. Six (22%) of the graduates indicated they had more than one kind of police related background experience before attending OPA.

TABLE 4-1
AGE OF SAMPLE

Interval	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
18-20	1	3.7	3.7
21-23	6	22.2	25.9
24-26	10	37.0	63.0
27-29	2	7.4	70.4
30-32	2	7.4	77.8
33-35	1	3.7	81.5
36-38	0	.0	.0
39-41	2	7.4	88.9
42-44	2	7.4	96.3
45-47	1	3.7	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 27
MISSING CASES = 0

ABS FREQ = Absolute Frequency
REL FREQ = Relative Frequency
CUM FREQ = Cumulative Frequency

Race

The twenty-seven respondents indicated that twenty-six (96.3%) are caucasians and one (3.7%) is black. The sample is therefore predominantly caucasian.

Agency of Employment

The sample provided information pertaining to what type of police agency the graduates are presently employed with as illustrated in Table 4-2. Municipal, township and sheriff police agencies accounted for the majority (92.6%) of the employment of OPA sample graduates.

TABLE 4-2
RESPONDENTS'
AGENCY OF EMPLOYMENT

Agency	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
Municipal	10	37	37
Township	8	29	66.7
Sheriff	7	25	92.6
Urban	0	0.	92.6
Univ/College	1	3.7	96.3
State Police	0	0.	96.3
Other	1	3.7	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 27
MISSING CASES = 0

Patrol Area

The sample of OPA graduates performed their police responsibilities within diverse kinds of patrol areas. Although the largest proportion of graduates perform police work in suburban areas (37%), the overall distribution of patrol areas is broadly represented. A frequency distribution of patrol areas represented within the sample is provided in Table 4-3.

TABLE 4-3

PATROL AREAS REPRESENTED
WITHIN THE SAMPLE

Patrol Area	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
Urban	2	7.4	7.4
Suburban	10	37.0	44.4
Rural	4	14.8	59.3
Urban/Suburban	2	7.4	66.7
Suburban/Rural	5	18.5	85.2
Urban/Rural	0	0	85.2
Urb/Sub/Rural	4	14.8	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 27
MISSING CASES = 0

Patrol Officer Experience

The data analysis revealed twenty (74%) responding OPA graduates had between 14 to 24 months of patrol experience since graduation. The remaining seven respondents (26%) had approximately one year of experience. Aprroximately 82% (22) of the graduates reported they have formally completed probation.

Patrol Assignment

The sample reported information describing their general patrol assignment duty. The analysis produced findings which indicates that about 67% (18) of the officers perform their duties in a one person vehicle patrol assignment and approximately 26% (7) work two person vehicle assignments. The remainder of the officers (2) stated they performed other patrol related assignments.

OPA graduate sample responded that on the average they spent approximately 72% of their time working alone while on patrol. Only two respondents reported they spent any less than 50% of their time working alone on patrol. Table 4-4 illustrates the breakdown:

TABLE 4-4

TIME SPENT WORKING
ALONE ON PATROL

% Time Alone	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
0-9	1	3.7	4.
10-19	0	0	4.
20-29	0	0	4.
30-39	1	3.7	8.
40-49	0	0	8.
50-59	8	29.6	40.7
60-69	1	3.7	44.
70-79	1	3.7	48.
80-89	1	3.7	52.
90-99	12	44.4	100.

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 25
MISSING CASES = 2

Job Attitude

The sample was asked two questions for the purpose of gaining some insight about the graduates attitudes toward policing since completing the OPA program. Question one asked the officer how interesting s/he found the job. The analysis of responses indicate that on the average officers found police work to be fairly interesting to very interesting. There were not any sample responses declaring an OPA graduate thought police work was dull. The second

question asked the officer if the job utilized their natural talents. The sample generally reported that they found police work utilized their natural talents quite well to very well. Job attitude findings are illustrated in Table 4-5 and 4-6:

TABLE 4-5

SAMPLES'
JOB INTEREST

Interest	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
Very Dull	0	0	0
Fairly Dull	0	0	0
So-So	1	3.7	3.7
Fairly Interst.	9	33.3	37.0
Very Interst.	17	63	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 27
MISSING CASES = 0

TABLE 4-6

JOB UTILIZATION
OF SAMPLES' NATURAL TALENT

Utilizes	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
Not at all	0	0	0
Very little	1	3.7	3.7
Fairly well	5	18.5	22.2
Quite well	13	48.1	70.4
Very well	8	29.6	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27
VALID CASES = 27
MISSING CASES = 0

TRAINING EVALUATION

Overall OPA Training Rating

The sample provided an overall evaluation rating which allowed the sample to report how prepared they were to perform important tasks based upon the training they received. Approximately 70% (19) of the sample responded that training prepared them to perform patrol tasks quite well to very well. Table 4-7 frequency distribution of overall basic training ratings among the sample illustrates the findings.

TABLE 4-7

OVERALL BASIC TRAINING
ACADEMY RATING

Rating	ABS FREQ (N)	REL FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
1 Very Little	0	0	0
2 Fairly Well	8	29.6	29.6
3 Quite Well	14	51.9	81.5
4 Very Well	5	18.5	100.0

TOTAL CASES = 27 MEAN = 2.9
MISSING CASES = 0 S.D. = 0.7
VALID CASES = 27

Task Training Evaluation Ratings

OPA graduates rated 304 tasks regarding as to how adequately the basic police training program prepared them to perform each task. The job-tasks were classified by duty fields. The ordinal task training rating values which the

officers had to select from are: (1) Totally Inadequate; (2) Unsatisfactory; (3) Satisfactory; (4) Very Adequate; and, (5) Excellent. Mean and standard deviation scores were calculated for for each task among three categories which are listed in both Table 4-8 and 4-9. The first table category represents the consensus of computations for the entire sample (N=27). The second and third categories represent task performer and non-performer evaluation ratings for each subsample respectively. The number of OPA graduate respondents either who have, or have not, performed the task rated is provided for the second and third categories.

Table 4-8 findings are organized by rank ordering all tasks, whereas Table 4-9 and 4-10 presents the findings according to duty fields. Table 4-8 has a standard evaluation criterion dividing line at the 3.0 mean level for distinguishing those tasks which mean scores indicate the respondents cumulative agreement that a job-task was either adequately, or inadequately, addressed within the basic police training curriculum. Rank ordering of tasks is organized according to the consensus category first and by the performer category secondarily when and if an equal mean value was found within the consensus category for more than one task.

Tables 4-9 and 4-10 serve to organize the task training ratings by duty fields for the purpose of facilitating decision-making concerning the need for curriculum attention across and within the major work function level. Work

function areas generally translate within the curriculum as being major subject areas. Hence, the Tables provide an indicator which training subject areas, as opposed to individual tasks, possibly need the greater attention. The Tables should be especially helpful to instructors and specialized experts for reviewing their respective subject areas.

Table 4-10 is designed to compare and indicate which major work functions have a higher proportion of duty field tasks rated adequate, or inadequate. To explain the Table, column one states how many tasks are listed within that duty field. Column two displays how many of those duty field tasks were found to have mean ratings less than the acceptable training standard criterion. Column three expresses column two findings in terms of a percentage of tasks receiving inadequate training ratings for that independent duty field. Column four describes the impact of each independent duty field upon the total number tasks across all duty fields which were found to be rated below the standard criterion. Duty fields are rank ordered according to column four.

Findings

Table 4-8 rank ordering of task training evaluations indicates that 34% (102) of the 304 tasks listed received consensus category mean scores less than the 3.0 level. However, task performer ratings reveal some meaningful disagreement with non-performers for the 102 tasks. The performer mean ratings category indicates that performers

generally believe graduates received adequate preparatory training for 20 (7%:304) of those 102 tasks listed. On the other hand, only four (1%) tasks in the performers category were found to have mean values less than the criterion standard, which were not listed in the non-performers category as being substandard. In either case, a significant number of job-tasks were found to be below the adequate training standard evaluation criterion level.

Standard deviations of task mean scores for all three categorgies generally indicate a close range of task rating consensus among the sample. The standard deviation values rarely exceed much over one (1) in the consensus category and a little more than rarely in the performer category. However, the standard deviations evidenced more instability in the range of agreement among the non-performer sub-sample category since a considerable number (54) of standard deviations reached the value of three (3).

Table 4-9 is a task listing with data analysis findings according to duty field. A review of the findings by duty field demonstrates that certain duty fields received a greater proportion of task training ratings as being inadequate, or adequate, than other duty fields. Table 4-10 illustrates the differences of task training ratings among duty fields.

As Table 4-10 clearly displays the findings, seven duty fields were found not to have any task mean scores less than the criterion standard. Those duty fields are: (1) Conflict Mediation; (2) Emergency Preparedness - Disaster Control;

(3) Field Notetaking And Report Writing; (4) Fingerprinting & Palmprinting; (5) Firearms Training; (6) Latent Prints; and (7) Search & Seizure. However, the other duty fields did have task training mean scores below the standard criterion. Two duty fields which accumulated a significant higher proportion of tasks below the standard criterion were Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (12.8%; based on 102 substandard tasks) and Jail Operations (11.8%). Driving (7.8%), Criminal Investigation (7.8%), Case Prosecution (6.9%), Patrol Operations (6.9%), Traffic Control (5.9%) and Arrest & Detain (4.9%) were secondary duty fields receiving a greater proportion of substandard task training ratings. Fourteen of the remaining duty fields reported some substandard criterion training ratings.

Another finding is that every task within four duty fields was rated below the 3.0 standard criterion mean level. Those duty fields are: (1) Driving; (2) Miscellaneous; (3) Civil Process; and (4) Crime Prevention. Other duty fields having a disproportionate amount (50% or more) of duty field tasks rated as substandard are: Jail Operations (92%); Case Prosecution (88%), OUIL (80%); Office Clerical (67%); Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (59%); Crime Scene Search (57%); Civil Disorders (50%); and Police Communications (50%).

TABLE 4-8

TASK RANK ORDERED
FROM INADEQUATE TO ADEQUATE

Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
87. Operate "breathalyzer" instrument to test blood alcohol content	1.74	.93	1.67	.94	3	2	.82	24
84. Escort emergency vehicles	2.07	1.09	2.31	1.26	16	1.73	.62	11
88. Testify in Secretary of State implied consent hearings	2.11	.92	2.07	.85	15	2.17	.99	12
85. Operate vehicle on dirt covered road	2.11	1.13	2.13	1.19	23	2	.71	4
81. Operate vehicle on ice covered road	2.15	1.15	2.2	1.17	25	1.5	.5	2
82. Operate vehicle on snow covered road	2.15	1.15	2.2	1.17	25	1.5	.5	2
41. Witness autopsies	2.19	.98	1.67	.75	6	2.33	.90	21
246. Perform duties while wearing heavy equipment (other than gun belt)	2.19	.77	2.17	.9	6	2.19	.73	21
83. Operate vehicle in driving rain	2.19	1.22	2.19	1.24	26	1.5	.5	2
80. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving off road	2.19	1.25	2.23	1.31	13	2.14	1.19	14
282. Clock vehicles using radar	2.22	.87	2.27	.91	22	2	.63	5
245. Wade through marshes, swamp land or waterways	2.26	.75	2.6	.49	5	2.18	.78	22
24. Communicate with management and labor over strike disturbances	2.30	.98	2.6	.80	5	2.23	.90	22
61. Review with medical examiner circumstances relating to a death	2.33	.77	2.1	.78	10	2.47	.78	17
78. Engage in high speed driving in congested area	2.33	1.36	2.44	1.50	18	2.11	.99	9
260. Operate LEIN terminal to update data	2.37	.91	2.29	1.16	14	2.46	.5	13
191. Schedule work assignments for other officers	2.37	.67	2.5	.5	4	2.35	.7	23
261. Operate LEIN terminal to check persons and property	2.41	.83	2.38	.99	16	2.45	.5	11
188. Prepare list of wanted persons for department use	2.41	.62	2.5	.5	2	2.4	.63	25
79. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving on open road	2.44	1.45	2.52	1.47	25	1.5	.50	2
114. Administer oxygen using oxygen supply device other than resuscitator	2.44	.83	2.6	.80	5	2.41	.83	22
187. Issue pick-up or wanted notices	2.44	.5	2.75	.43	4	2.39	.49	23
62. Conduct intelligence activities on known or suspected offenders	2.48	.74	2.44	.83	9	2.5	.69	18
8. Request bystanders to assist in an apprehension	2.48	.83	2.67	.94	6	2.43	.79	21
253. Crawl in confined areas (e.g., attics)	2.52	.79	2.41	.84	17	2.7	.64	10
140. Investigate injuries to prisoners	2.52	.69	2.5	.82	14	2.54	.5	13
259. Operate telephone console or switchboard	2.52	.92	2.53	1.09	17	2.5	.5	10
139. Record injuries to prisoners	2.52	.92	2.53	1.09	17	2.5	.5	10
77. Recruit confidential informants	2.52	.83	2.73	1.05	11	2.38	.60	16
11. Instruct suspect on process for obtaining an attorney	2.56	.99	2.57	1.09	21	2.5	.5	6
50. Search fire debris for evidence relating to the cause of the fire	2.56	.96	2.86	1.24	7	2.45	.80	20
144. Check legal status of the case of prisoners	2.59	.62	2.2	.60	10	2.82	.51	17
12. Prepare felony complaint forms for warrant authorization	2.59	.87	2.85	.86	13	2.36	.81	14

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
112. Administer oxygen using resuscitator	2.59	.95	2.86	1.25	7	2.5	.81	20
249. Pull self through openings	2.63	.73	2.63	.81	19	2.63	.48	8
148. Collect interim bond	2.63	.87	2.78	.92	18	2.33	.67	9
27. Serve probate orders (e.g., mentals, juveniles, adult offenders)	2.63	.73	2.8	.65	15	2.5	.65	12
73. Organize surveillance of individuals or locations	2.63	.67	2.86	.64	7	2.55	.67	20
14. Review warrants for completeness and accuracy	2.63	1.02	2.89	1.10	9	2.5	.96	18
15. Prepare misdemeanor complaint forms for warrant authorization	2.67	.94	2.56	1	16	2.82	.83	11
149. Answer inquiries concerning prisoner	2.67	.67	2.62	.72	21	2.83	.37	6
147. Book prisoners by completing arrest forms	2.67	.67	2.65	.65	20	2.71	.7	7
262. Check stolen status on property through LEIN	2.67	.98	2.65	1.11	20	2.71	.45	7
250. Climb up over obstacles	2.67	.82	2.68	.87	22	2.6	.49	5
57. Verify the identity of deceased persons	2.67	.67	2.7	.90	10	2.65	.48	17
247. Climb through openings (e.g., windows)	2.67	.77	2.71	.82	21	2.5	.5	6
251. Jump across obstacles	2.67	.82	2.71	.96	17	2.6	.49	10
137. Check weapons in and out of detention facility	2.67	.9	2.71	.93	21	2.5	.76	6
284. Direct traffic using flare pattern or traffic cone patterns	2.67	.67	2.75	.66	16	2.55	.66	11
383. Visually estimate speed of vehicles	2.67	.9	2.75	.92	24	2	3.16	3
48. Conduct community relations program (e.g. safety programs, crime prevention, tours, C.B. watch)	2.67	.98	3.57	.73	7	2.35	.73	20
35. Cast impressions at crime scene (e.g. plaster casts, silicone, etc.)	2.67	1.02	4	3.16	1	2.62	1	26
254. Stand continuously for more than one-half of the work shift (e.g., guard duty or point control)	2.7	.71	2.56	.79	16	2.91	.51	11
98. Arrange for obtaining blood or urine samples for sobriety tests	2.7	.94	2.63	1.17	16	2.82	.39	11
18. Issue citations for non-traffic offenses (e.g. appearance tickets, ordinance violations)	2.7	.68	2.67	.62	24	3	3.16	3
210. Investigate unusual odors	2.7	.81	2.75	.97	16	2.64	.48	11
243. Jump down from elevated surfaces	2.7	.81	2.75	.89	20	2.57	.49	7
248. Pull self up over obstacles	2.7	.66	2.75	.7	20	2.57	.49	7
13. Swear out complaints or warrants	2.7	.98	2.9	.89	20	2.14	.64	7
25. Patrol area containing labor pickets, marchers or demonstrators	2.7	.94	2.93	.93	15	2.42	.86	12
52. Participate in raids	2.7	.97	3.13	1.05	8	2.53	.88	19
199. Flush fuel spills	2.74	.93	2.4	.8	5	2.82	.94	22
56. Examine dead bodies for wounds and injuries	2.74	.84	2.6	1.02	15	2.92	.49	12
143. Check individual making bond for wants and warrants	2.74	.75	2.75	.9	16	2.73	.45	11
160. Evaluate citizen complaints regarding tickets or other minor offenses	2.74	.58	2.79	.56	14	2.69	.61	13
158. Test and evaluate police equipment	2.74	.8	2.81	.85	21	2.5	.5	6
54. Search dead bodies for personal property	2.74	.70	2.81	.73	16	2.64	.64	11
16. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney regarding warrant authorization	2.74	1	2.83	1.12	18	2.56	.68	9
28. Enforce court issued order (e.g. writs)	2.74	.70	2.93	.68	15	2.5	.65	12
135. Interrogate suspects or witness with use of polygraph results	2.78	.83	2.5	1.5	2	2.8	.75	25

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
145. Return prisoner's property	2.78	.74	2.76	.81	17	2.8	.60	10
285. Clock speed of vehicles using speedometer	2.78	.92	2.77	.93	26	3	3.16	1
146. Inventory prisoner's personal property	2.78	.68	2.79	.77	19	2.75	.43	8
252. Physically push movable objects	2.78	.79	2.79	.82	24	2.67	.47	3
42. Release confiscated property	2.78	.79	2.81	.57	11	2.75	.90	16
218. Perform first line maintenance on patrol vehicle	2.78	.87	2.91	.79	22	2.2	.98	5
69. Review crime lab reports to guide investigations	2.78	.79	3	1.07	7	2.7	.64	20
240. Break through door using force	2.81	.67	2.82	.83	11	2.81	.53	16
244. Jump over obstacles	2.81	.77	2.84	.87	19	2.75	.43	8
29. Serve subpoenas	2.81	1.06	2.94	1.14	16	2.64	.88	11
6. Take into custody person detained by citizen	2.81	.98	3.06	.97	18	2.33	.47	9
5. Plan strategy for making arrests	2.85	.76	2.89	.81	18	2.78	.63	9
142. Place holds on prisoners and notify department holding warrant	2.85	.85	2.9	.89	20	2.71	.7	7
55. Track person from scene (e.g., footprints in snow or mud)	2.85	.88	2.95	.76	19	2.63	.86	8
138. Guard prisoners detained outside jail	2.85	.85	2.95	.92	20	2.57	.49	7
276. Testify in liquor board hearings	2.85	.76	3	3.16	2	2.84	.78	25
189. Review other officers' incident reports for completeness and accuracy	2.85	.89	3.09	1.16	11	2.69	.58	16
23. Locate and observe crowd agitators	2.85	1.08	3.17	1.14	12	2.6	.95	15
300. Check railroad crossing for signal violations (e.g., going around gates, train blocking crossing)	2.85	.8	3.2	.87	10	2.65	.68	17
207. Comfort emotionally upset persons	2.89	.83	2.88	.85	26	3	3.16	1
178. Test operating condition of accident vehicle equipment	2.89	.83	3	.93	14	2.77	.7	13
286. Observe traffic control device to determine if functioning properly	2.89	.99	3.05	.98	22	2.2	.75	5
154. Conduct parent juvenile conferences	2.89	.87	3.4	.8	10	2.59	.77	17
159. Request equipment repair	2.93	.77	2.92	.78	26	3	3.16	1
47. Arraign defendant in court	2.93	.77	3	.97	15	2.83	.37	12
89. Administer roadside sobriety test	2.93	.98	3	1.02	23	2.5	.5	4
196. Transport mental patients	2.93	1.09	3	1.08	24	2.33	.94	3
282. Advise property owners or agents of potentially hazardous conditions	2.93	.9	3.06	1.03	18	2.67	.47	9
19. Discuss cases with prosecutors or city attorneys following legal proceedings	2.93	1.09	3.11	1.15	18	2.56	.83	9
17. Recommend the issuance of an arrest warrant	2.93	1.05	3.18	1.15	17	2.5	.67	10
211. Direct actions of public service personnel arriving to assist	2.96	.64	3	.73	19	2.88	.33	8
72. Conduct surveillance of individuals or locations	2.96	.74	3.06	.83	16	2.82	.57	11
226. Assist elderly or disabled persons with mobility problems	3	.67	3	.69	21	3	.58	6
275. Testify in parole or probation hearings	3	.86	3.43	1.05	7	2.85	.73	20
283. Remove vehicles obstructing traffic	3	.67	3	.69	25	3	3.16	2
46. Prepare witnesses for court testimony	3	.72	3.22	1.03	9	2.89	.46	18
63. Verify reliability and credibility of witnesses	3	.54	3	.55	13	3	.53	14
70. Determine whether recovered property is linked with a previous crime	3	.77	2.88	.83	17	3.2	.60	10
71. Trace stolen goods	3	.72	3.27	.75	11	2.81	.63	16

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
76. Talk with families of adult suspects or defendants (advise, inform, notify, counsel)	3	.77	3.05	.84	21	2.83	.37	6
22. Patrol riot stricken or civil disturbance areas	3	.82	3	.82	3	3	.82	24
216. Participate in large scale area search parties	3	.72	3.11	.87	9	2.94	.62	18
155. Confer with juvenile probate officer	3	.67	3	.89	10	3	.49	17
222. Prepare list of wanted persons or stolen vehicles for own use	3	.61	2.94	62	18	3.11	.57	9
136. Interview medical personnel to obtain specific information	3.04	.84	3.05	.94	19	3	.5	8
153. Counsel juveniles	3.04	.79	3.13	.78	16	2.19	.79	11
75. Analyze and compare incidents for similarity of modus operandi (M.O.)	3.04	.58	3.19	.63	16	2.82	.39	1
74. Utilize department records to assist in investigation	3.07	.77	3.14	.81	22	2.8	.40	5
221. Make entries in individual patrol log	3.07	.86	3.08	.91	24	3	3.16	3
156. Advise parents of children's violation of traffic laws	3.07	.77	3.31	.85	16	2.73	.45	11
176. Photograph accident scenes	3.07	.77	3.5	.81	10	2.82	.62	17
185. Investigate off road vehicle accidents	3.07	.81	2.92	.92	13	3.21	.67	14
192. Verify vehicle title information	3.07	.72	3.2	.75	20	2.71	.45	7
209. Escort money, valuables or people to provide security	3.07	.77	3.14	.83	21	2.83	.37	6
141. Process evidence seized at custodial search	3.07	.81	3.09	.85	22	3	.63	5
150. Place children in protective custody (e.g. child abuse)	3.07	.86	2.4	.49	10	3.47	.78	17
290. Advise appropriate agency of traffic engineering needs	3.07	.86	3.29	.96	17	2.7	.46	10
225. Establish field contacts (e.g., barmmers, taxi drivers, etc.)	3.11	.42	3.33	.47	12	2.93	.25	15
294. Remove hazards from roadway (e.g., dead animals, debris, etc.)	3.11	.79	3.12	.8	26	3	3.16	1
128. Transport injured persons	3.11	.99	3.08	.95	12	3.13	1.02	1
26. Control non-violent crowds	3.11	.87	3.17	.92	23	2.75	.43	1
241. Drag or pull heavy objects or persons	3.15	.89	3.28	1.04	18	2.89	.31	9
213. Patrol locations of beat which are potentially hazardous to citizens (e.g., construction site, attractive nuisance)	3.15	.7	3.28	.8	18	2.89	.31	9
288. Notify public agencies or utilities of damage to their equipment	3.11	.74	3.12	.77	25	3	3.16	2
200. Check conditions and status of assigned patrol equipment and vehicle	3.11	.74	3.12	.77	25	3	3.16	2
190. Take custody of lost and found property	3.11	.63	3.32	.57	19	2.63	.48	8
242. Run up stairs	3.15	.65	3.14	.71	21	3.17	.37	6
227. Transport persons needing assistance	3.15	.65	3.15	.65	27	-	-	-
215. Advise victims of the procedures to prosecute	3.15	.85	3.24	.81	25	2	3.16	2
256. Receive and evaluate telephone requests for police service	3.15	.76	3.26	.74	23	2.5	.5	4
299. Inspect private vehicle for conformance with vehicle code	3.15	.65	3.33	.67	18	2.78	.42	9
301. Check vehicles for proper registration (e.g. snowmobiles, off road vehicles, etc.)	3.15	.89	3.2	.91	24	2.67	.47	3
91. Search for bombs	3.15	.52	2.83	.69	6	3.24	.43	21
92. Evacuate persons from dangerous area	3.15	.65	3.38	.70	8	3.05	.60	19

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
66. Review records and pictures to identify suspects	3.15	.70	3.33	.70	15	2.92	.64	12
238. Pickup and carry heavy objects or persons	3.19	.86	3.27	.91	22	2.8	.4	5
239. Lift heavy objects or persons	3.19	.86	3.27	.91	22	2.8	.4	5
291. Direct pedestrian traffic	3.19	.72	3.25	.83	20	3	3.16	7
295. Assist stranded motorists	3.19	.67	3.19	.67	27	-	-	-
304. Determine status of auto insurance	3.19	.77	3.26	.79	23	2.75	.43	4
212. Secure house or property (e.g., lock, close doors and windows etc.)	3.19	.72	3.2	.75	25	3	3.16	2
232. Check individuals/businesses for compliance with licensing requirements (e.g., hunting, liquor, dance permit, vendors, etc.)	3.19	.98	3.26	1.07	19	3	.71	8
53. Plan strategy for conducting searches	3.19	.77	3.45	.78	11	3	.71	16
59. Conduct on-the-scene suspect identifications (e.g. show-ups)	3.19	.55	3.29	.57	17	3	.45	10
60. Organize and conduct photo line-ups	3.19	.72	3	.76	7	3.25	.70	20
93. Secure accident and disaster scenes	3.19	.61	3.27	.68	15	3.08	.49	12
21. Control hostile groups (e.g., demonstrators, rioters, bar patrons)	3.22	.79	3.39	.89	18	2.89	.31	94
51. Determine need for specialized assistance at a crime scene	3.26	.84	3.28	.87	18	3.22	.79	9
58. Locate witness to crime	3.26	.58	3.33	.64	21	3	3.16	6
223. Patrol on foot	3.22	.68	3.3	.78	20	3	3.16	7
220. Investigate unusual sounds	3.22	.63	3.23	.64	26	3	3.16	1
206. Review information on criminal activity in area	3.22	.79	3.28	.78	25	2.5	.5	2
203. Follow suspicious vehicles (e.g., suspects, suspicious person, operator under the influence)	3.22	1.03	3.23	1.05	26	3	3.16	1
201. Direct actions of officer(s) arriving to assist	3.26	.89	3.32	.97	22	3	3.16	5
67. Participate in investigations with other law enforcement agencies	3.22	.74	3.3	.78	20	3	.53	7
95. Prepare criminal case summary sheet for prosecutor	3.26	.70	3.43	.73	14	3.08	.62	13
98. Complete OUIL arrest reports	3.26	1.14	3.25	1.20	24	3.33	.47	3
292. Follow suspect vehicle to observe traffic violations	3.26	.8	3.28	.83	25	3	3.16	2
273. Present evidence in legal proceedings	3.26	1	3.27	1.06	15	3.25	.92	12
236. Physically restrain crowds	3.26	.93	3.5	1.19	12	3.07	.57	15
231. Notify citizens of damage to their property	3.22	.57	3.24	.59	25	3	3.6	2
184. Review accidents with accident investigators	3.26	.75	3.33	.88	18	3.11	.31	9
186. Remove debris from accident scene	3.22	.74	3.18	.78	22	3.4	.49	5
3. Transport prisoners	3.33	.94	3.35	.96	26	3	3.16	1
18. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney prior to testimony regarding case	3.33	.94	3.48	.93	23	2.5	.50	4
20. Confront, in a riot formation, groups of agitated people	3.33	.77	3.2	.75	5	3.36	.77	22
34. photograph crime scenes	3.33	.86	3.45	.89	11	3.25	.83	16
64. Establish modus operandi (M.O.) of a suspect	3.33	.61	3.33	.58	18	3.33	.67	9
86. Arrest OUIL suspects	3.33	1.05	3.33	1.11	24	3.33	.47	3
100. Collect incident reports by checking off boxes or filling in blanks	3.30	1.05	3.4	1.16	20	3	.53	7
115. Apply first aid to treat for poisoning	3.37	.78	3	3.16	4	3.43	.82	23
119. Apply first aid to treat for diabetic reaction	3.30	.76	3	.63	5	3.36	.77	22
151. Apprehend juvenile offenders	3.33	.72	3.35	.76	23	3.25	.43	4

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
171. Direct activities at scenes of accident investigations	3.37	.73	3.42	.75	19	3.25	.66	8
175. Locate witnesses to traffic accidents	3.33	.67	3.36	.69	25	3	3.16	2
280. Direct traffic using flashlight or illuminated baton	3.33	.94	3.36	.97	25	3	3.16	2
287. Issue traffic citations	3.37	.95	3.44	.94	25	2.5	.5	2
288. Record circumstances regarding traffic citation	3.3	.94	3.32	.97	25	3	3.16	2
296. Explain state vehicle laws and procedures to citizens	3.37	.73	3.38	.74	26	3	3.16	1
297. Monitor traffic for violations	3.37	.67	3.38	.68	26	3	3.16	1
183. Follow-up extent of personal injuries resulting from traffic accident	3.3	.81	3.24	.87	21	3.5	.5	6
120. Apply first aid to treat for stroke	3.33	.77	3.29	1.03	7	3.35	.65	20
219. Respond to general information questions from the public	3.37	.73	3.37	.73	27	-	-	-
228. Deliver emergency messages (e.g., injuries, death)	3.3	.76	3.39	.77	23	2.75	.43	4
255. Request verification of warrants before service	3.3	.81	3.32	.84	25	3	3.16	24
272. testify in criminal cases	3.3	1.05	3.38	1.13	21	3	.58	6
279. Evaluate driver's capability to operate vehicle	3.37	.82	3.38	.84	26	3	3.16	1
44. Mediate civil disputes	3.44	.79	3.46	.88	26	3	3.16	1
45. Obtain search warrants and/or make proper return	3.41	.99	3.8	.98	10	3.18	.92	17
9. Explain nature of complaints to offenders	3.41	.83	3.41	.83	27	-	-	-
121. Apply first aid to treat for heat stroke	3.44	.87	3.25	1.30	4	3.48	.77	23
124. Apply first aid to treat for heat prostration	3.41	.91	4.33	.94	3	3.29	.84	24
127. Apply first aid to treat for seizure	3.48	.74	3.33	.79	15	3.67	.62	125
113. Apply first aid to treat for electric shock	3.41	.91	3	3.16	1	3.42	.93	26
99. Type incident reports	3.44	1.07	3.75	.99	20	2.57	.73	7
170. Investigate traffic accident scene to identify point(s) of impact	3.41	.87	3.4	.92	20	3.43	.73	7
172. Search accident scenes for physical evidence	3.44	.83	3.48	.91	21	3.33	.47	6
230. Check parks and school grounds	3.48	.57	3.48	.57	27	-	-	-
237. Run after fleeing suspects	3.48	.92	3.6	1.02	20	3.14	.35	7
257. Inform dispatcher by radio as to your status	3.44	.92	3.44	.94	25	3.5	.5	2
278. Cite or arrest reckless drivers	3.41	1.19	3.7	.71	20	2.57	1.76	7
298. Explain legal procedures to traffic violators	3.41	.78	3.52	.7	25	2	3.16	2
173. Take coordinate measures of traffic accident scenes (e.g., triangulation)	3.41	.87	3.41	1.03	17	3.4	.49	10
174. Identify persons involved in traffic accident	3.44	.79	3.48	.81	25	3	3.16	2
197. Describe persons to other officers (e.g., suspects, missing persons)	3.44	.92	3.44	.92	27	-	-	-
214. Secure vehicles	3.41	.62	3.46	.64	24	3	3.16	3
152. Talk with families of juvenile suspects or defendants (advise, inform, notify, counsel)	3.41	.62	3.44	.64	25	3	3.16	2
157. Dust and lift latent prints	3.41	.78	3.33	.82	9	3.44	.76	18
166. Determine fault in a traffic accident	3.44	.79	3.45	.84	22	3.4	.49	5
181. Inspect vehicle for fresh damage	3.48	.83	3.48	.88	23	3.5	.5	4
193. Inspect patrol vehicle for weapons and contraband	3.48	.88	3.52	.9	25	3	3.16	2
224. Physically examine and test doors and windows of dwellings and businesses	3.44	.92	3.46	.93	26	3	3.16	1
229. Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	3.48	.74	3.48	.74	27	-	-	-
68. Exchange necessary information with other law enforcement officials	3.48	.69	3.6	.64	23	2.75	.43	41

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
43. Mediate family disputes	3.52	.92	3.6	.89	25	2.5	.50	2
111. Apply first aid to treat for gunshot wounds	3.52	.74	3.33	.47	6	3.57	.79	21
117. Apply first aid to treat for overdose	3.52	.83	3.57	1.05	7	3.5	.74	20
109. Apply first aid to treat for amputations	3.52	.74	4	3.16	1	3.5	.75	26
258. Check for wants/warrants on persons through LEIN	3.52	.83	3.58	.86	24	3	3.16	3
281. Direct traffic using hand signals	3.52	.74	3.54	.75	26	3	3.16	1
177. Measure skid marks	3.52	.83	3.6	1.02	15	3.42	.49	12
126. Apply first aid to treat for eye injuries	3.52	.83	3.67	1.11	6	3.48	.73	21
204. Investigate suspicious vehicle	3.52	.83	3.5	.84	26	4	3.16	1
133. Record confessions in writing	3.56	.87	3.5	1.05	14	3.62	.62	13
40. Transport property or evidence	3.56	.79	3.52	.81	25	4	3.16	2
198. Search unlocked businesses and dwellings for signs of illegal entry	3.56	.87	3.54	.89	26	4	3.16	1
302. Issue verbal warnings to traffic violators	3.56	.68	3.58	.69	26	3	3.16	14
217. Talk with people on the beat to establish rapport	3.56	.87	3.65	.87	23	3	.71	4
125. Apply first aid to treat for convulsions	3.56	.74	3.7	.98	10	3.47	.61	17
164. Determine contributing factors to an accident	3.59	.73	3.59	.72	22	3.6	.8	5
169. Diagram accident scenes	3.59	.91	3.62	1	21	3.5	.5	6
233. Subdue attacking persons	3.59	.83	3.62	.84	21	3.5	.76	6
205. Interview suspicious persons	3.59	.91	3.64	.89	25	3	1	2
101. Fingerprint prisoners	3.59	.73	3.67	.82	18	3.44	.5	9
168. Protect traffic accident physical evidence for collection	3.59	.83	3.68	.8	19	3.38	.86	8
289. Inspect operator's license	3.63	.78	3.63	.78	27	-	-	-
39. Package evidence or personal property	3.63	.82	3.67	.85	24	3.33	.47	3
180. Identify owner of vehicles involved in accident	3.63	.82	3.68	.84	25	3	3.16	2
163. Request emergency assistance for traffic accident (e.g. wrecker, ambulance , salt truck)	3.63	.73	3.68	.73	25	3	3.16	2
179. Interview persons involved in traffic accident	3.63	.78	3.68	.79	25	3	3.16	2
161. Take precautions to prevent additional accidents at accident scene	3.63	.67	3.71	.68	24	3	3.16	3
271. Impound property	3.63	.91	3.72	.87	25	2.5	.5	2
265. Search premises or property in hot pursuit situations	3.63	.99	3.82	1.04	17	3.3	.78	10
131. Interrogate suspects	3.67	.82	3.63	.81	24	4	.82	3
7. Make custodial traffic arrest	3.67	.98	3.74	1.03	23	3.25	.43	4
266. Search premises or property with warrant	3.67	.77	3.79	.77	14	3.54	.75	13
132. Interview complainants, witnesses, etc.	3.7	1.05	3.7	1.05	27	-	-	-
274. Review reports and notes for court testimony	3.7	.81	3.75	.83	24	3.33	.47	3
235. Handcuff suspects or prisoners	3.7	1.08	3.76	1.11	25	3	3.16	2
194. Request back-up assistance	3.7	.9	3.79	.91	24	3	3.16	3
94. Summarized in writing the statement of witnesses and complainants	3.74	.84	3.77	.85	26	3	3.16	1
65. Determine whether incidents are criminal or civil matters	3.74	.80	3.8	.80	25	3	3.16	2
162. Collect physical evidence from accident scenes	3.74	.64	3.86	.64	21	3.33	.47	6
118. Apply first aid to treat for burns	3.74	.84	4	.82	9	3.61	.83	18
38. Recover and inventory stolen property	3.77	.68	3.77	.73	22	3.8	.40	5
269. Search movable automobile under independent probable cause	3.78	.96	3.7	.95	23	4.25	.83	4
33. Examine evidence and personal property from crime scenes	3.78	.74	3.78	.78	23	3.75	.43	4

Table 4-8 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
293. Inspect for vehicle identification number	3.78	.83	3.81	.83	26	3	3.16	1
123. Apply first aid to treat for puncture wounds	3.78	.87	3.9	.83	10	3.71	.89	17
37. Diagram crime scenes	3.78	.92	3.92	.86	12	3.67	.94	15
122. Apply first aid to treat for broken bones	3.81	.86	3.63	.78	16	4.09	.98	11
277. Stop vehicles to investigate, cite or arrest occupants	3.81	.77	3.81	.77	27	-	-	-
234. Subdue subject resisting arrest	3.81	.86	3.83	.87	23	3.75	.83	4
165. Set priorities for action at accident scene	3.81	.86	3.83	.85	24	3.67	.94	3.
97. Write narrative reports	3.81	1.09	3.85	1.1	26	3	3.16	1
129. Apply first aid to treat for lacerations	3.85	.85	3.85	.85	20	3.86	.83	7
2. Arrest persons without warrant	3.85	.70	3.88	.70	26	3	3.2	1
270. Search premises or property with consent	3.85	.85	3.91	.85	22	3.6	.8	5
268. Seize contraband	3.85	.85	3.92	.84	25	3	3.16	2
267. Search premises or property incident to arrest	3.89	.87	4.05	.84	21	3.33	.75	6
4. Arrest persons with a warrant	3.89	.98	3.91	.97	23	3.75	.83	4
130. Apply first aid to treat for abrasions	3.89	.87	3.95	.89	19	3.75	.83	8
96. Transcribe field notes for reports	3.89	.79	3.88	.77	25	4	1	2
36. Tag evidence and confiscated properties	3.89	.92	3.88	.91	25	4	1	2
49. Search crime scenes for physical evidence	3.89	.79	4	.76	24	3	3.16	3
134. Take statements of witnesses	3.93	.81	3.93	.81	27	-	-	-
105. Clean and inspect weapons	3.96	1.14	4.04	1.15	25	3	3.16	2
102. Discharge firearm at person	3.96	.88	4.4	.80	5	3.86	.87	22
108. Apply first aid to treat for heart attacks	4	.82	4	.68	13	4	.93	14
103. Draw weapon	4.04	.92	4.05	.93	22	4	.89	5
116. Apply first aid to treat for shock	4.04	.84	4.36	.72	14	3.69	.82	13
32. Record location of physical evidence at scene	4.07	.98	4.04	.92	25	4.5	.58	2
30. Document chain of custody for evidence	4.07	.86	4.05	.88	22	4.2	.75	5
31. Collect evidence and personal property from crime scenes	4.07	.77	4.13	.78	24	3.67	.47	3
1. Advise persons of constitutional rights	4.07	.98	4.13	.97	24	3.67	.94	3
167. Complete the standard traffic accident report form (UD-10)	4.07	.98	4.16	.97	25	3	3.16	2
264. Conduct frisk patdown	4.15	.76	4.15	.76	27	-	-	-
263. Conduct field search of arrested persons	4.15	.8	4.19	.79	26	3	3.16	1
104. Participate in firearms training	4.15	.89	4.2	.89	25	3.5	.5	2
106. Administer cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR)	4.15	.88	4.2	.75	15	4.08	.86	12
107. Administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation	4.15	.76	4.23	.78	13	4.07	.80	14
110. Apply first aid to control bleeding	4.15	.76	4.29	.76	21	3.67	.47	6

TABLE 4-9

ADEQUACY OF TASK
BY DUTY FIELD

Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
ARREST & DETAIN								
1. Advise persons of constitutional rights	4.07	.98	4.13	.97	24	3.67	.94	3
2. Arrest persons without warrant	3.85	.70	3.88	.78	26	3	3.2	1
3. Transport prisoners	3.33	.94	3.35	.96	26	3	3.16	1
4. Arrest persons with a warrant	3.89	.98	3.91	.97	23	3.75	.83	4
5. Plan strategy for making arrests	2.85	.76	2.89	.81	18	2.78	.63	9
6. Take into custody person detained by citizen	2.81	.90	3.06	.97	18	2.33	.47	9
7. Make custodial traffic arrest	3.67	.98	3.74	1.03	23	3.25	.43	4
8. Request bystanders to assist in an apprehension	2.48	.83	2.67	.94	6	2.43	.79	21
9. Explain nature of complaints to offenders	3.41	.83	3.41	.83	27	-	-	-
10. Issue citations for non-traffic offenses (e.g. appearance tickets, ordinance violations)	2.7	.60	2.67	.62	24	3	3.16	3
11. Instruct suspect on process for obtaining an attorney	2.56	.99	2.57	1.09	21	2.5	.5	6
CASE PROSECUTION								
12. Prepare felony complaint forms for warrant authorization	2.59	.87	2.85	.86	13	2.36	.81	14
13. Swear out complaints or warrants	2.7	.90	2.9	.89	20	2.14	.64	7
14. Review warrants for completeness and accuracy	2.63	1.02	2.89	1.10	9	2.5	.96	18
15. Prepare misdemeanor complaint forms for warrant authorization	2.67	.94	2.56	1	16	2.82	.83	11
16. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney regarding warrant authorization	2.74	1	2.83	1.12	18	2.56	.68	9
17. Recommend the issuance of an arrest warrant	2.93	1.05	3.18	1.15	17	2.5	.67	10
18. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney prior to testimony regarding case	3.33	.94	3.48	.93	23	2.5	.50	4
19. Discuss cases with prosecutors or city attorneys following legal proceedings	2.93	1.09	3.11	1.15	18	2.56	.83	9
CIVIL DISORDERS								
20. Confront, in a riot formation, groups of agitated people	3.33	.77	3.2	.75	5	3.36	.77	22
21. Control hostile groups (e.g., demonstrators, rioters, bar patrons)	3.22	.79	3.39	.89	18	2.89	.31	94
22. Patrol riot stricken or civil disturbance areas	3	.82	3	.82	3	3	.82	24
23. Locate and observe crowd agitators	2.85	1.08	3.17	1.14	12	2.6	.95	15
24. Communicate with management and labor over strike disturbances	2.30	.90	2.6	.80	5	2.23	.90	22
25. Patrol area containing labor pickets, marchers or demonstrators	2.7	.94	2.93	.93	15	2.42	.86	12
26. Control non-violent crowds	3.11	.87	3.17	.92	23	2.75	.43	1

Table 4-9 Cont. Tasks	Consensus		performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
CIVIL PROCESS								
27. Serve probate orders (e.g., mentals, juveniles, adult offenders)	2.63	.73	2.8	.65	15	2.5	.65	12
28. Enforce court issued order (e.g. writs)	2.74	.70	2.93	.68	15	2.5	.65	12
29. Serve subpoenas	2.81	1.06	2.94	1.14	16	2.64	.88	11
COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE								
30. Document chain of custody for evidence	4.07	.86	4.05	.88	22	4.2	.75	5
31. Collect evidence and personal property from crime scenes	4.07	.77	4.13	.78	24	3.67	.47	3
32. Record location of physical evidence at scene	4.07	.90	4.04	.92	25	4.5	.50	2
33. Examine evidence and personal property from crime scenes	3.78	.74	3.78	.78	23	3.75	.43	4
34. Photograph crime scenes	3.33	.86	3.45	.89	11	3.25	.83	16
35. Cast impressions at crime scene (e.g. plaster casts, silicone, etc.)	2.67	1.02	4	3.16	1	2.62	1	26
36. Tag evidence and confiscated properties	3.89	.92	3.88	.91	25	4	1	2
37. Diagram crime scenes	3.78	.92	3.92	.86	12	3.67	.94	15
38. Recover and inventory stolen property	3.77	.68	3.77	.73	22	3.8	.40	5
39. Package evidence or personal property	3.63	.78	3.64	.83	22	3.6	.49	5
40. Transport property or evidence	3.56	.79	3.52	.81	25	4	3.16	2
41. Witness autopsies	2.19	.90	1.67	.75	6	2.33	.90	21
42. Release confiscated property	2.78	.79	2.81	.57	11	2.75	.90	16
CONFLICT MEDIATION								
43. Mediate family disputes	3.52	.92	3.6	.89	25	2.5	.50	2
44. Mediate civil disputes	3.44	.79	3.46	.88	26	3	3.16	1
COURT FUNCTIONS								
45. Obtain search warrants and/or make proper return	3.41	.99	3.8	.98	10	3.18	.92	17
46. Prepare witnesses for court testimony	3	.72	3.22	1.03	9	2.89	.46	18
47. Arraign defendant in court	2.93	.77	3	.97	15	2.83	.37	12
CRIME PREVENTION								
48. Conduct community relations program (e.g. safety programs, crime prevention, tours, C.B. watch)	2.67	.90	3.57	.73	7	2.35	.73	20
CRIME SCENE SEARCH								
49. Search crime scenes for physical evidence	3.89	.79	4	.76	24	3	3.16	3
50. Search fire debris for evidence relating to the cause of the fire	2.56	.96	2.86	1.24	7	2.45	.80	20
51. Determine need for specialized assistance at a crime scene	3.26	.84	3.28	.87	18	3.22	.79	9
52. Participate in raids	2.7	.97	3.13	1.05	8	2.53	.88	19
53. Plan strategy for conducting searches	3.19	.77	3.45	.78	11	3	.71	16
54. Search dead bodies for personal property	2.74	.70	2.81	.73	16	2.64	.64	1
55. Track person from scene (e.g., footprints in snow or mud)	2.85	.88	2.95	.76	19	2.63	.86	8
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION								
56. Examine dead bodies for wounds and injuries	2.74	.84	2.6	1.02	15	2.92	.49	12
57. Verify the identity of deceased persons	2.67	.67	2.7	.90	10	2.65	.48	17

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
58. Locate witness to crime	3.26	.58	3.33	.64	21	3	3.16	6
59. Conduct on-the-scene suspect identifications (e.g. show-ups)	3.19	.55	3.29	.57	17	3	.45	10
60. Organize and conduct photo line-ups	3.19	.72	3	.76	7	3.25	.70	20
61. Review with medical examiner circumstances relating to a death	2.33	.77	2.1	.70	10	2.47	.78	17
62. Conduct intelligence activities on known or suspected offenders	2.48	.74	2.44	.83	9	2.5	.69	18
63. Verify reliability and credibility of witnesses	3	.54	3	.55	13	3	.53	14
64. Establish modus operandi (M.O.) of a suspect	3.33	.61	3.33	.58	18	3.33	.67	9
65. Determine whether incidents are criminal or civil matters	3.74	.80	3.8	.80	25	3	3.16	2
66. Review records and pictures to identify suspects	3.15	.70	3.33	.70	15	2.92	.64	12
67. Participate in investigations with other law enforcement agencies	3.22	.74	3.3	.78	20	3	.53	7
68. Exchange necessary information with other law enforcement officials	3.48	.69	3.6	.64	23	2.75	.43	41
69. Review crime lab reports to guide investigations	2.78	.79	3	1.07	7	2.7	.64	20
70. Determine whether recovered property is linked with a previous crime	3	.77	2.88	.83	17	3.2	.60	10
71. Trace stolen goods	3	.72	3.27	.75	11	2.81	.63	16
72. Conduct surveillance of individuals or locations	2.96	.74	3.06	.83	16	2.82	.57	11
73. Organize surveillance of individuals or locations	2.63	.67	2.86	.64	7	2.55	.67	20
74. Utilize department records to assist in investigation	3.07	.77	3.14	.81	22	2.8	.40	5
75. Analyze and compare incidents for similarity of modus operandi (M.O.)	3.04	.58	3.19	.63	16	2.82	.39	1
76. Talk with families of adult suspects or defendants (advise, inform, notify, counsel)	3	.77	3.05	.84	21	2.83	.37	6
77. Recruit confidential informants	2.52	.83	2.73	1.05	11	2.38	.60	16
DRIVING								
78. Engage in high speed driving in congested area	2.33	1.36	2.44	1.50	18	2.11	.99	9
79. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving on open road	2.44	1.45	2.52	1.47	25	1.5	.50	2
80. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving off road	2.19	1.25	2.23	1.31	13	2.14	1.19	14
81. Operate vehicle on ice covered road	2.15	1.15	2.2	1.17	25	1.5	.5	2
82. Operate vehicle on snow covered road	2.15	1.15	2.2	1.17	25	1.5	.5	2
83. Operate vehicle in driving rain	2.19	1.22	2.19	1.24	26	1.5	.5	2
84. Escort emergency vehicles	2.07	1.09	2.31	1.26	16	1.73	.62	11
85. Operate vehicle on dirt covered road	2.11	1.13	2.13	1.19	23	2	.71	4
OUIL ENFORCEMENT								
86. Arrest OUIL suspects	3.33	1.05	3.33	1.11	24	3.33	.47	3
87. Operate "breathalyzer" instrument to test blood alcohol content	1.74	.93	1.67	.94	3	2	.82	24
88. Testify in Secretary of State implied consent hearings	2.11	.92	2.07	.85	15	2.17	.99	12
89. Administer roadside sobriety test	2.93	.98	3	1.02	23	2.5	.5	4
90. Arrange for obtaining blood or urine samples for sobriety tests	2.7	.94	2.63	1.17	16	2.82	.39	11

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS-DISASTER CONTROL								
91. Search for bombs	3.15	.52	2.83	.69	6	3.24	.43	21
92. Evacuate persons from dangerous area	3.15	.65	3.38	.78	8	3.05	.60	19
93. Secure accident and disaster scenes	3.19	.61	3.27	.68	15	3.08	.49	12
FIELD NOTETAKING AND REPORT WRITING								
94. Summarized in writing the statement of witnesses and complainants	3.74	.84	3.77	.85	26	3	3.16	1
95. Prepare criminal case summary sheet for prosecutor	3.26	.78	3.43	.73	14	3.08	.62	13
96. Transcribe field notes for reports	3.89	.79	3.88	.77	25	4	1	2
97. Write narrative reports	3.81	1.09	3.85	1.1	26	3	3.16	1
98. Complete OUIL arrest reports	3.26	1.14	3.25	1.20	24	3.33	.47	3
99. Type incident reports	3.44	1.07	3.75	.99	20	2.57	.73	7
100. Collect incident reports by checking off boxes or filling in blanks	3.30	1.05	3.4	1.16	20	3	.53	7
FINGERPRINTING & PALMPRINTING								
101. Fingerprint prisoners	3.59	.73	3.67	.82	18	3.44	.5	9
FIREARMS TRAINING								
102. Discharge firearm at person	3.96	.88	4.4	.80	5	3.86	.87	22
103. Draw weapon	4.04	.92	4.05	.93	22	4	.89	5
104. Participate in firearms training	4.15	.89	4.2	.89	25	3.5	.5	2
105. Clean and inspect weapons	3.96	1.14	4.04	1.15	25	3	3.16	2
FIRST AID								
106. Administer cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR)	4.15	.80	4.2	.75	15	4.08	.86	12
107. Administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation	4.15	.76	4.23	.78	13	4.07	.80	14
108. Apply first aid to treat for heart attacks	4	.82	4	.68	13	4	.93	14
109. Apply first aid to treat for amputations	3.52	.74	4	3.16	1	3.5	.75	26
110. Apply first aid to control bleeding	4.15	.76	4.29	.76	21	3.67	.47	6
111. Apply first aid to treat for gunshot wounds	3.52	.74	3.33	.47	6	3.57	.79	21
112. Administer oxygen using resuscitator	2.59	.95	2.86	1.25	7	2.5	.81	20
113. Apply first aid to treat for electric shock	3.41	.91	3	3.16	1	3.42	.93	26
114. Administer oxygen using oxygen supply device other than resuscitator	2.44	.83	2.6	.80	5	2.41	.83	22
115. Apply first aid to treat for poisoning	3.37	.78	3	3.16	4	3.43	.82	23
116. Apply first aid to treat for shock	4.04	.84	4.36	.72	14	3.69	.82	13
117. Apply first aid to treat for overdose	3.52	.83	3.57	1.05	7	3.5	.74	20
118. Apply first aid to treat for burns	3.74	.84	4	.82	9	3.61	.83	18
119. Apply first aid to treat for diabetic reaction	3.30	.76	3	.63	5	3.36	.77	22
120. Apply first aid to treat for stroke	3.33	.77	3.29	1.03	7	3.35	.65	20
121. Apply first aid to treat for heat stroke	3.44	.87	3.25	1.30	4	3.48	.77	23
122. Apply first aid to treat for broken bones	3.81	.86	3.63	.78	16	4.09	.90	11
123. Apply first aid to treat for puncture wounds	3.78	.87	3.9	.83	10	3.71	.89	17
124. Apply first aid to treat for heat prostration	3.41	.91	4.33	.94	3	3.29	.84	24
125. Apply first aid to treat for convulsions	3.56	.74	3.7	.90	10	3.47	.61	17
126. Apply first aid to treat for eye injuries	3.52	.83	3.67	1.11	6	3.48	.73	21
127. Apply first aid to treat for seizure	3.48	.74	3.33	.79	15	3.67	.62	125
128. Transport injured persons	3.11	.99	3.08	.95	12	3.13	1.02	1
129. Apply first aid to treat for lacerations	3.85	.85	3.85	.85	20	3.86	.83	7
130. Apply first aid to treat for abrasions	3.89	.87	3.95	.89	19	3.75	.83	8

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
INTERVIEW & INTERROGATION								
131. Interrogate suspects	3.67	.82	3.63	.81	24	4	.82	3
132. Interview complainants, witnesses, etc.	3.7	1.05	3.7	1.05	27	-	-	-
133. Record confessions in writing	3.56	.87	3.5	1.05	14	3.62	.62	13
134. Take statements of witnesses	3.93	.81	3.93	.81	27	-	-	-
135. Interrogate suspects or witness with use of polygraph results	2.78	.83	2.5	1.5	2	2.8	.75	25
136. Interview medical personnel to obtain specific information	3.04	.84	3.05	.94	19	3	.5	8
JAIL OPERATIONS								
137. Check weapons in and out of detention facility	2.67	.9	2.71	.93	21	2.5	.76	6
138. Guard prisoners detained outside jail	2.85	.85	2.95	.92	20	2.57	.49	7
139. Record injuries to prisoners	2.52	.92	2.53	1.09	17	2.5	.5	10
140. Investigate injuries to prisoners	2.52	.69	2.5	.82	14	2.54	.5	13
141. Process evidence seized at custodial search	3.07	.81	3.09	.85	22	3	.63	5
142. Place holds on prisoners and notify department holding warrant	2.85	.85	2.9	.89	20	2.71	.7	7
143. Check individual making bond for wants and warrants	2.74	.75	2.75	.9	16	2.73	.45	11
144. Check legal status of the case of prisoners	2.59	.62	2.2	.60	10	2.82	.51	17
145. Return prisoner's property	2.78	.74	2.76	.81	17	2.8	.60	10
146. Inventory prisoner's personal property	2.78	.68	2.79	.77	19	2.75	.43	8
147. Book prisoners by completing arrest forms	2.67	.67	2.65	.65	20	2.71	.7	7
148. Collect interim bond	2.63	.87	2.78	.92	18	2.33	.67	9
149. Answer inquiries concerning prisoner	2.67	.67	2.62	.72	21	2.83	.37	6
JUVENILE PROCESS								
150. Place children in protective custody (e.g. child abuse)	3.07	.86	2.4	.49	10	3.47	.78	17
151. Apprehend juvenile offenders	3.33	.72	3.35	.76	23	3.25	.43	4
152. Talk with families of juvenile suspects or defendants (advise, inform, notify, counsel)	3.41	.62	3.44	.64	25	3	3.16	2
153. Counsel juveniles	3.04	.79	3.13	.78	16	2.19	.79	11
154. Conduct parent juvenile conferences	2.89	.87	3.4	.8	10	2.59	.77	17
155. Confer with juvenile probate officer	3	.67	3	.89	10	3	.49	17
156. Advise parents of children's violation of traffic laws	3.07	.77	3.31	.85	16	2.73	.45	11
LATENT PRINTS								
157. Dust and lift latent prints	3.41	.78	3.33	.82	9	3.44	.76	18
MISCELLANEOUS								
158. Test and evaluate police equipment	2.74	.8	2.81	.85	21	2.5	.5	6
159. Request equipment repair	2.93	.77	2.92	.78	26	3	3.16	1
160. Evaluate citizen complaints regarding tickets or other minor offenses	2.74	.58	2.79	.56	14	2.69	.61	13
MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION								
161. Take precautions to prevent additional accidents at accident scene	3.63	.67	3.71	.68	24	3	3.16	3
162. Collect physical evidence from accident scenes	3.74	.64	3.86	.64	21	3.33	.47	6

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
163. Request emergency assistance for traffic accident (e.g. wrecker, ambulance , salt truck)	3.63	.73	3.68	.73	25	3	3.16	2
164. Determine contributing factors to an accident	3.59	.73	3.59	.72	22	3.6	.8	5
165. Set priorities for action at accident scene	3.81	.86	3.83	.85	24	3.67	.94	3
166. Determine fault in a traffic accident	3.44	.79	3.45	.84	22	3.4	.49	5
167. Complete the standard traffic accident report form (UD-10)	4.07	.98	4.16	.97	25	3	3.16	2
168. Protect traffic accident physical evidence for collection	3.59	.83	3.68	.8	19	3.38	.86	8
169. Diagram accident scenes	3.59	.91	3.62	1	21	3.5	.5	6
170. Investigate traffic accident scene to identify point(s) of impact	3.41	.87	3.4	.92	20	3.43	.73	7
171. Direct activities at scenes of accident investigations	3.37	.73	3.42	.75	19	3.25	.66	8
172. Search accident scenes for physical evidence	3.44	.83	3.48	.91	21	3.33	.47	6
173. Take coordinate measures of traffic accident scenes (e.g., triangulation)	3.41	.87	3.41	1.03	17	3.4	.49	10
174. Identify persons involved in traffic accident	3.44	.79	3.48	.81	25	3	3.16	2
175. Locate witnesses to traffic accidents	3.33	.67	3.36	.69	25	3	3.16	2
176. Photograph accident scenes	3.07	.77	3.5	.81	10	2.82	.62	17
177. Measure skid marks	3.52	.83	3.6	1.02	15	3.42	.49	12
178. Test operating condition of accident vehicle equipment	2.89	.83	3	.93	14	2.77	.7	13
179. Interview persons involved in traffic accident	3.63	.78	3.68	.79	25	3	3.16	2
180. Identify owner of vehicles involved in accident	3.63	.82	3.68	.84	25	3	3.16	2
181. Inspect vehicle for fresh damage	3.48	.83	3.48	.88	23	3.5	.5	4
182. Issue citation(s) in traffic accident	3.63	.82	3.67	.85	24	3.33	.47	3
183. Follow-up extent of personal injuries resulting from traffic accident	3.3	.81	3.24	.87	21	3.5	.5	6
184. Review accidents with accident investigators	3.26	.75	3.33	.88	18	3.11	.31	9
185. Investigate off road vehicle accidents	3.07	.81	2.92	.92	13	3.21	.67	14
186. Remove debris from accident scene	3.22	.74	3.18	.78	22	3.4	.49	5
OFFICE AND CLERICAL								
187. Issue pick-up or wanted notices	2.44	.5	2.75	.43	4	2.39	.49	23
188. Prepare list of wanted persons for department use	2.41	.62	2.5	.5	2	2.4	.63	25
189. Review other officers' incident reports for completeness and accuracy	2.85	.89	3.09	1.16	11	2.69	.58	16
190. Take custody of lost and found property	3.11	.63	3.32	.57	19	2.63	.48	8
191. Schedule work assignments for other officers	2.37	.67	2.5	.5	4	2.35	.7	23
192. Verify vehicle title information	3.07	.72	3.2	.75	20	2.71	.45	7
PATROL OPERATIONS								
193. Inspect patrol vehicle for weapons and contraband	3.48	.88	3.52	.9	25	3	3.16	2
194. Request back-up assistance	3.7	.9	3.79	.91	24	3	3.16	3
195. Identify wanted vehicles or persons	3.63	.82	3.65	.83	26	3	3.16	1
196. Transport mental patients	2.93	1.09	3	1.08	24	2.33	.94	3
197. Describe persons to other officers (e.g., suspects, missing persons)	3.44	.92	3.44	.92	27	-	-	-
198. Search unlocked businesses and dwellings for signs of illegal entry	3.56	.87	3.54	.89	26	4	3.16	1
199. Flush fuel spills	2.74	.93	2.4	.8	5	2.82	.94	22

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Conseasus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
200. Check conditions and status of assigned patrol equipment and vehicle	3.11	.74	3.12	.77	25	3	3.16	2
201. Direct actions of officer(s) arriving to assist	3.26	.89	3.32	.97	22	3	3.16	5
202. Advise property owners or agents of potentially hazardous conditions	2.93	.9	3.06	1.03	18	2.67	.47	9
203. Follow suspicious vehicles (e.g., suspects, suspicious person, operator under the influence)	3.22	1.03	3.23	1.05	26	3	3.16	1
204. Investigate suspicious vehicle	3.52	.83	3.5	.84	26	4	3.16	1
205. Interview suspicious persons	3.59	.91	3.64	.89	25	3	1	2
206. Review information on criminal activity in area	3.22	.79	3.28	.78	25	2.5	.5	2
207. Comfort emotionally upset persons	2.89	.83	2.88	.85	26	3	3.16	1
208. Notify public agencies or utilities of damage to their equipment	3.11	.74	3.12	.77	25	3	3.16	2
209. Escort money, valuables or people to provide security	3.07	.77	3.14	.83	21	2.83	.37	6
210. Investigate unusual odors	2.7	.81	2.75	.97	16	2.64	.48	11
211. Direct actions of public service personnel arriving to assist	2.96	.64	3	.73	19	2.88	.33	8
212. Secure house or property (e.g., lock, close doors and windows etc.)	3.19	.72	3.2	.75	25	3	3.16	2
213. Patrol locations of beat which are potentially hazardous to citizens (e.g., construction site, attractive nuisance)	3.15	.7	3.28	.8	18	2.89	.31	9
214. Secure vehicles	3.41	.62	3.46	.64	24	3	3.16	3
215. Advise victims of the procedures to prosecute	3.15	.85	3.24	.81	25	2	3.16	2
216. Participate in large scale area search parties	3	.72	3.11	.87	9	2.94	.62	18
217. Talk with people on the beat to establish rapport	3.56	.87	3.65	.87	23	3	.71	4
218. Perform first line maintenance on patrol vehicle	2.78	.87	2.91	.79	22	2.2	.98	5
219. Respond to general information questions from the public	3.37	.73	3.37	.73	27	-	-	-
220. Investigate unusual sounds	3.22	.63	3.23	.64	26	3	3.16	1
221. Make entries in individual patrol log	3.07	.86	3.08	.91	24	3	3.16	3
222. Prepare list of wanted persons or stolen vehicles for own use	3	.61	2.94	62	18	3.11	.57	9
223. Patrol on foot	3.22	.68	3.3	.78	20	3	3.16	7
224. Physically examine and test doors and windows of dwellings and businesses	3.44	.92	3.46	.93	26	3	3.16	1
225. Establish field contacts (e.g., barowners, taxi drivers, etc.)	3.11	.42	3.33	.47	12	2.93	.25	15
226. Assist elderly or disabled persons with mobility problems	3	.67	3	.69	21	3	.58	6
227. Transport persons needing assistance	3.15	.65	3.15	.65	27	-	-	-
228. Deliver emergency messages (e.g., injuries, death)	3.3	.76	3.39	.77	23	2.75	.43	4
229. Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	3.48	.74	3.48	.74	27	-	-	-
230. Check parks and school grounds	3.48	.57	3.48	.57	27	-	-	-
231. Notify citizens of damage to their property	3.22	.57	3.24	.59	25	3	3.6	2
232. Check individuals/businesses for compliance with licensing requirements (e.g., hunting, liquor, dance permit, vendors, etc.)	3.19	.98	3.26	1.07	19	3	.71	8

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
PHYSICAL TRAINING AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS								
233. Subdue attacking persons	3.59	.83	3.62	.84	21	3.5	.76	6
234. Subdue subject resisting arrest	3.81	.86	3.83	.87	23	3.75	.83	4
235. Handcuff suspects or prisoners	3.7	1.08	3.76	1.11	25	3	3.16	2
236. Physically restrain crowds	3.26	.93	3.5	1.19	12	3.07	.57	15
237. Run after fleeing suspects	3.48	.92	3.6	1.02	20	3.14	.35	7
238. Pickup and carry heavy objects or persons	3.19	.86	3.27	.91	22	2.8	.4	5
239. Lift heavy objects or persons	3.19	.86	3.27	.91	22	2.8	.4	5
240. Break through door using force	2.81	.67	2.82	.83	11	2.81	.53	16
241. Drag or pull heavy objects or persons	3.15	.89	3.28	1.04	18	2.89	.31	9
242. Run up stairs	3.15	.65	3.14	.71	21	3.17	.37	6
243. Jump down from elevated surfaces	2.7	.81	2.75	.89	20	2.57	.49	7
244. Jump over obstacles	2.81	.77	2.84	.19	2.75	.43	8	
245. Wade through marshes, swamp land or waterways	2.26	.75	2.6	.49	5	2.18	.78	22
246. Perform duties while wearing heavy equipment (other than gun belt)	2.19	.77	2.17	.9	6	2.19	.73	21
247. Climb through openings (e.g., windows)	2.67	.77	2.71	.82	21	2.5	.5	6
248. Pull self up over obstacles	2.7	.66	2.75	.7	20	2.57	.49	7
249. Pull self through openings	2.63	.73	2.63	.81	19	2.63	.48	8
250. Climb up over obstacles	2.67	.82	2.68	.87	22	2.6	.49	5
251. Jump across obstacles	2.67	.82	2.71	.96	17	2.6	.49	10
252. Physically push movable objects	2.78	.79	2.79	.82	24	2.67	.47	3
253. Crawl in confined areas (e.g., attics)	2.52	.79	2.41	.84	17	2.7	.64	10
254. Stand continuously for more than one-half of the work shift (e.g., guard duty or point control)	2.7	.71	2.56	.79	16	2.91	.51	11
POLICE COMMUNICATIONS								
255. Request verification of warrants before service	3.3	.81	3.32	.84	25	3	3.16	24
256. Receive and evaluate telephone requests for police service	3.15	.76	3.26	.74	23	2.5	.5	4
257. Inform dispatcher by radio as to your status	3.44	.92	3.44	.94	25	3.5	.5	2
258. Check for wants/warrants on persons through LEIN	3.52	.83	3.58	.86	24	3	3.16	3
259. Operate telephone console or switchboard	2.52	.92	2.53	1.09	17	2.5	.5	10
260. Operate LEIN terminal to update data	2.37	.91	2.29	1.16	14	2.46	.5	13
261. Operate LEIN terminal to check persons and property	2.41	.83	2.38	.99	16	2.45	.5	11
262. Check stolen status on property through LEIN	2.67	.98	2.65	1.11	20	2.71	.45	7
SEARCH & SEIZURE								
263. Conduct field search of arrested persons	4.15	.8	4.19	.79	26	3	3.16	1
264. Conduct frisk patdown	4.15	.76	4.15	.76	27	-	-	-
265. Search premises or property in hot pursuit situations	3.63	.99	3.82	1.04	17	3.3	.78	10
266. Search premises or property with warrant	3.67	.77	3.79	.77	14	3.54	.75	13
267. Search premises or property incident to arrest	3.89	.87	4.05	.84	21	3.33	.75	6
268. Seize contraband	3.85	.85	3.92	.84	25	3	3.16	2
269. Search movable automobile under independent probable cause	3.78	.96	3.7	.95	23	4.25	.83	4
270. Search premises or property with consent	3.85	.85	3.91	.85	22	3.6	.8	5
271. Impound property	3.63	.91	3.72	.87	25	2.5	.5	2
TESTIFYING IN COURT AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS								
272. Testify in criminal cases	3.3	1.05	3.38	1.13	21	3	.58	6
273. Present evidence in legal proceedings	3.26	1	3.27	1.06	15	3.25	.92	12

Table 4-9 cont. Tasks	Consensus		Performers			Non-Performers		
	X	SD	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
274. Review reports and notes for court testimony	3.7	.81	3.75	.83	24	3.33	.47	3
275. Testify in parole or probation hearings	3	.86	3.43	1.05	7	2.85	.73	20
276. Testify in liquor board hearings	2.85	.76	3	3.16	2	2.84	.78	25
277. Stop vehicles to investigate, cite or arrest occupants	3.81	.77	3.81	.77	27	-	-	-
278. Cite or arrest reckless drivers	3.41	1.19	3.7	.71	20	2.57	1.76	7
279. Evaluate driver's capability to operate vehicle	3.37	.82	3.38	.84	26	3	3.16	1
TRAFFIC CONTROL								
280. Direct traffic using flashlight or illuminated baton	3.33	.94	3.36	.97	25	3	3.16	2
281. Direct traffic using hand signals	3.52	.74	3.54	.75	26	3	3.16	1
282. Clock vehicles using radar	2.22	.87	2.27	.91	22	2	.63	5
283. Remove vehicles obstructing traffic	3	.67	3	.69	25	3	3.16	2
284. Direct traffic using flare pattern or traffic cone patterns	2.67	.67	2.75	.66	16	2.55	.66	11
285. Clock speed of vehicles using speedometer	2.78	.92	2.77	.93	26	3	3.16	1
286. Observe traffic control device to determine if functioning properly	2.89	.99	3.05	.98	22	2.2	.75	5
287. Issue traffic citations	3.37	.95	3.44	.94	25	2.5	.5	2
288. Record circumstances regarding traffic citation	3.3	.94	3.32	.97	25	3	3.16	2
289. Inspect operator's license	3.63	.78	3.63	.78	27	-	-	-
290. Advise appropriate agency of traffic engineering needs	3.07	.86	3.29	.96	17	2.7	.46	10
291. Direct pedestrian traffic	3.19	.72	3.25	.83	20	3	3.16	7
292. Follow suspect vehicle to observe traffic violations	3.26	.8	3.28	.83	25	3	3.16	2
293. Inspect for vehicle identification number	3.78	.83	3.81	.83	26	3	3.16	1
294. Remove hazards from roadway (e.g., dead animals, debris, etc.)	3.11	.79	3.12	.8	26	3	3.16	1
295. Assist stranded motorists	3.19	.67	3.19	.67	27	-	-	-
296. Explain state vehicle laws and procedures to citizens	3.37	.73	3.38	.74	26	3	3.16	1
297. Monitor traffic for violations	3.37	.67	3.38	.68	26	3	3.16	1
298. Explain legal procedures to traffic violators	3.41	.78	3.52	.7	25	2	3.16	2
299. Inspect private vehicle for conformance with vehicle code	3.15	.65	3.33	.67	18	2.78	.42	9
300. Check railroad crossing for signal violations (e.g., going around gates, train blocking crossing)	2.85	.8	3.2	.87	10	2.65	.68	17
301. Check vehicles for proper registration (e.g. snowmobiles, off road vehicles, etc.)	3.15	.89	3.2	.91	24	2.67	.47	3
302. Issue verbal warnings to traffic violators	3.56	.68	3.58	.69	26	3	3.16	14
303. Visually estimate speed of vehicles	2.67	.9	2.75	.92	24	2	3.16	3
304. Determine status of auto insurance	3.19	.77	3.26	.79	23	2.75	.43	4

TABLE 4-10

DIFFERENCES OF TASK TRAINING RATINGS
RANK ORDERED AMONG DUTY FIELDS:

DUTY FIELD	Total Number of Tasks	< 3.0 Tasks N	Duty Field Tasks % < 3.0	All Tasks % < 3.0
Physical Training & Defensive Tactics	22	13	59.1	12.8
Jail Operations	13	12	92.3	11.8
Driving	8	8	100.0	7.8
Criminal Investigation	22	8	36.4	7.8
Case Prosecution	8	7	87.5	6.9
Patrol Operations	40	7	17.5	6.9
Traffic Control	25	6	24.0	5.9
Arrest & Detention	11	5	45.5	4.9
OUIL Enforcement	5	4	80.0	3.9
Office & Clerical	6	4	66.7	3.9
Crime Scene Search	7	4	57.1	3.9
Civil Disorders	8	4	50.0	3.9
Police Communications	8	4	50.0	3.9
Miscellaneous	3	3	100.0	2.9
Preservation of Evid.	13	3	23.1	2.9
Civil Process	2	2	100.0	2.0
First Aid	25	2	8.0	2.0
Crime Prevention	1	1	100.0	1.0
Court Functions	3	1	33.3	1.0
Interview & Interro.	6	1	16.7	1.0
Juvenile Process	7	1	14.3	1.0
Testifying In Court & Admin. Hearings	8	1	12.5	1.0
Motor Vehicle Accident Investigation	26	1	3.9	1.0
Collection & Conflict Mediation	2	0	0.0	0.0
Emergency Preparedness - Disaster Control	3	0	0.0	0.0
Field Notetaking And Report Writing	7	0	0.0	0.0
Fingerprinting & Palmprinting	1	0	0.0	0.0
Firearms Training	4	0	0.0	0.0
Latent Prints	1	0	0.0	0.0
Search & Seizure	9	0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL TASKS	304	102		100 %

Driving

The driving duty field received poor task training evaluative mean scores when calculated for all 27 sample respondents. In fact, consensus, performer, and non-performer category findings displayed that every driving duty field task was rated below the standard criterion; however, a special data analysis was conducted for the driving duty field since OPA provided a new driving training program for one of the three basic police academy sessions included within the sample.

Table 4-11 illustrates the difference in task training ratings for those graduates who were not provided the new OPA driving training program and for those that were. The findings are indeed significant. The graduate group who did receive the new program rated the driving training for seven out of the eight (88%) duty field tasks as being adequate for job preparation, whereas the other group not receiving the program provided extremely poor task training ratings for all 8 tasks.

TABLE 4-11

DRIVING DUTY FIELD:
COMPARISON OF GRADUATES RECEIVING
TRAINING WITH GRADUATES WHO DID NOT

DUTY FIELD TASKS	Previous Training Program (N = 17) X	SD	New Training Program (N = 10) X	SD
Engage in high speed driving in congested area	1.41	.60	3.9	.70
Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving on open road	1.47	.70	4.1	.70
Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving off road	1.53	.70	3.3	1.20
Operate vehicle on ice covered road	1.47	.61	3.3	.90
Operate vehicle on snow covered road	1.47	.61	3.3	.90
Operate vehicle in driving rain	1.53	.70	3.3	1.10
Escort Emergency vehicles	1.59	.60	2.9	1.22
Operate Vehicle on dirt covered road	1.53	.61	3.1	1.34

Graduate Comments and Recommendations

The sample provided sixty-seven written responses pertaining to tasks which in their judgment need the most improvement and/or attention within the OPA training program. The responses were organized by duty field and can be found in Appendix B. A content analysis was performed which resulted in both quantitative and qualitative findings. Twenty-two duty fields received task training comments or recommendations. One unclassifiable duty field comment was made about job-stress. Of the sixty-seven responses, 22% (14) of the statements addressed tasks which were not included in the 102 tasks found to have mean scores

below the standard criterion level.

The two duty fields receiving the greater number of graduate critiques were Driving (56%) and Physical Training and Defensive Tactics (33%). The remaining duty fields grouped in four statistical bands according to the number of graduates providing critiques per duty field. Case Prosecution, OUIL, and Patrol Operations each received written responses from 15% of the graduates. Field Notetaking and Report Writing, Police Communications, and Traffic Control each received 11%, whereas Arrest & Detain, Civil Disorders, Collection and Preservation of Evidence, Conflict Mediation, Crime Scene Search, Criminal Investigation, and Jail Operations accounted for 7% of the sample responding. The remaining seven duty fields receiving critiques were at the 4% response level. A summary of quantitative findings are found in Table 4-12.

TABLE 4-12

PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE
INDICATING NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT
BY WRITTEN RESPONSE FOR DUTY FIELDS

DUTY FIELD	Percent %	Sample N=27
DRIVING	.56	15
PHYSICAL TRAINING AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS	.33	9
OUIL ENFORCEMENT	.15	4
PATROL OPERATIONS	.15	4
CASE PROSECUTION	.11	3
FIELD NOTETAKING AND REPORT WRITING	.11	3
POLICE COMMUNICATIONS	.11	3
TRAFFIC CONTROL	.11	3
ARREST & DETAIN	.07	2
CIVIL DISORDERS	.07	2
COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE	.07	2
CONFLICT MEDIATION	.07	2
CRIME SCENE SEARCH	.07	2
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION	.07	2
JAIL OPERATIONS	.07	2
CIVIL PROCESS	.04	1
CRIME PREVENTION	.04	1
FINGERPRINTING & PALMPRINTING	.04	1
FIREARMS TRAINING	.04	1
LATENT PRINTS	.04	1
SEARCH & SEIZURE	.04	1
TESTIFYING IN COURT AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS	.04	1
OTHER: STRESS ON AND OFF JOB	.04	1
COURT FUNCTIONS	0	0
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS-DISASTER CONTROL	0	0
FIRST AID	0	0
INTERVIEW & INTERROGATION	0	0
JUVENILE PROCESS	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0
MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION	0	0
OFFICE AND CLERICAL	0	0
Total Response		66

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative value of the comments and recommendations provided by the sample should be considered according to their own merit and in consideration of other supportive data. The comments and recommendations are organized by duty field and are reported in Appendix B for independent review and evaluation. The statements provided by the sample were derived by asking OPA graduates:

> What needs to be improved in the basic police academy program in order to adequately prepare recruits to perform this task? In answering this question, please consider the adequacy of the following factors: quality of instruction, subject matter/course content, learning conditions, facilities, written resource material, etc.

The majority of responses focused on specific tasks with some responses addressing tasks more generally within an overall duty field.

Many written responses had important similarities worth noting. For example, the graduates provided training feedback by making direct reference to a particular police experience they encountered. Those experiences apparently presented occupational challenges the officer believed the training did not adequately prepare him/her to satisfy. Criticisms centered around two primary deficiencies which are, the basic police training failing to provide adequate job knowledges and job skills that are essential to successful police performance. Recommendations followed suit by asking to increase training time for certain subjects and the need to incorporate additional practical training

exercises to help develop basic police skills. Training content and different instructional approaches and techniques for correcting the training deficiencies were often recommended. The training feedback as a whole provided by the graduates was given in a positive constructive spirit.

Summary

The analysis of results is based upon a sample of twenty-seven OPA graduates who received a questionnaire by mail and responded. Of sixty OPA graduates receiving a questionnaire, 45% responded. The sample can be described as varying in age considerably with the average age being 28.3 years old. The sample is predominantly caucasian (96%) and 66% of the sample reported they had some law enforcement related experience before entering the OPA program. The average educational level of the sample is 13.6 years.

The patrol assignment and experience of the sample was measured in several ways for descriptive purposes. The majority of OPA graduates were employed with either a municipal (37%), township (29)%, or sheriff (25%) law enforcement agency with 37% of the total sample performing their police responsibilities in a suburban patrol area. The distribution of types of patrol areas overall were broadly represented within the sample. Most (74%) graduates had between 14 to 24 months of patrol experience since graduation with the remainder having approximately one year experience. OPA graduates reported that 67% of them work one person vehicle assignments and 27% work two person

vehicle assignments. The sample on the average works alone on patrol approximately 72% of the time with only two respondents reporting they worked any less than 50% of their time alone on patrol.

OPA graduates job attitudes were found to be very favorable. All but one graduate reported they found police work to be either fairly interesting (33%) to very interesting (63%). The analysis further established that the respondents believed their police employment utilized their natural talent from fairly to very well, with most reporting quite well (48%), or very well (30%). One respondent did answer that his job utilized his natural talent very little.

The collection and analysis of training evaluations from the sample began by asking for general evaluative judgments and ending with very specific and detailed judgments. The majority (70%) of the sample rated the overall basic police training program prepared them to perform patrol tasks from quite well to very well. The remaining 30% rated the overall training no less than fairly well. However, as the respondents were requested to provide more specific task training ratings, the findings revealed many potential curriculum inadequacies. In fact, 102 (34%) of the 304 tasks rated by the total sample resulted in mean scores below the adequate training standard criterion level.

Task training evaluations were ranked ordered to prioritize potential curriculum inadequacies. The task training evaluations were ranked ordered by three

categories: consensus, task performers and task non-performers. As implied, the consensus category represent evaluative mean scores calculated for the entire sample. Task performer category represent mean scores calculated for those in the sample reporting they had performed the task, whereas non-performer category respondents had never performed the task. A comparison of the latter two categories resulted in some meaningful differences. The task performers reported an overall higher confidence in the OPA training program by rating 20 (20%) of the 102 tasks found inadequate by the non-performers as being adequate. Task performers further disagreed by indicating four other additional tasks should be rated inadequate which were held to be adequate by non-performers. In either case, a significant number of tasks received substandard criterion ratings suggesting insufficient training is being provided for many important police duty field areas.

Although seven duty fields were found not to have any task mean scores below the criterion standard, twenty-three (77%) duty fields did have tasks which fell below the standard. Two duty fields which had a significant higher proportion of tasks below the standard criterion are Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (12.8%; based on 102 substandard tasks) and Jail Operations (11.8%). Driving (7.8%), Criminal Investigation (7.8%), Case Prosecution (6.9%), Patrol Operations (6.9%), Traffic Control (5.9%) and Arrest & Detain (4.9%) were secondary duty fields receiving

a large proportion of substandard task training ratings. Fourteen of the remaining duty fields reported some substandard criterion training ratings.

Four duty fields were rated below the standard criterion level for every task within their field. Those duty fields are: (1) Driving; (2) Miscellaneous; (3) Civil Process; and (4) Crime Prevention. Other duty fields having a disproportionate amount (50% or more) of duty field tasks rated as substandard are: Jail Operations (92%); Case Prosecution (88%); OUIL (80%); Office Clerical (67%); Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (59%); Crime Scene Search (57%); Civil Disorders (50%); and Police Communications (50%).

A special analysis was conducted for the driving duty field since OPA provided a new driving program for one of the three basic police academy sessions within the sample. A comparison of evaluative mean scores across eight tasks revealed that those graduates (10) who had been trained under the new driving program rated seven (88%) of the eight tasks as being above the standard criterion. The subsample (17) attending the previous training program indicated they were significantly less prepared to perform each of the eight driving tasks and the training received for each task was inadequate.

Graduates provided sixty-seven written responses about duty field tasks which need the most improvement in the police academy program. Written responses were generally supported by other findings, however it was found that 22%

of the responses were not included within the 102 rank ordered tasks listed for inadequate task training. The qualitative findings were noted in summative terms. Remarks often critiqued the training for not providing certain essential job knowledges and skills necessary for satisfactory police performance. Recommendations frequently called for increases in training for certain subject areas and additional practical training exercises. Some recommendations proposed suggestions about changing, or adding, new training techniques and subject matter to improve the OPA basic training program.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

Purpose

Basic recruit curricula are vulnerable to becoming outdated, unrealistic and ineffective. The rapid occupational changes, combined with the apparent absence of systematic comprehensive curriculum evaluation methods designed specifically for the police occupation, have resulted in much criticism and uncertainty about the actual effectiveness of recruit training in preparing the new officer to adequately perform realistic police work. The relevancy of the police recruit curricula have traditionally been developed, monitored and maintained by subjective professional judgment in a piecemeal fashion. The need to systematically and comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of recruit training to protect against curriculum slippage and obsolescence is indeed evident. The potential personal and social cost possibly resulting from ineffectively preparing officers to perform important police work has to be considered too critical to be either ignored, or neglected.

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the Oakland Police Academy (OPA) basic training curriculum to determine if recruits are being effectively prepared to adequately perform important entry-level patrol officer job-tasks. The

evaluation is a curriculum product assessment. The study findings were used to identify and prioritize potential curriculum strengths and weaknesses in order to facilitate curriculum planning and change for OPA program improvement.

The research is directed at answering the following evaluation research questions:

1. Does the OPA curriculum in reality effectively prepare police officers to adequately perform important entry-level job-tasks?
2. Which job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than others for the purpose of determining which tasks need additional curriculum attention and consideration?
3. What recommendations can be suggested by OPA graduates concerning how the curriculum can be improved for the purpose of increasing the training programs effectiveness to prepare recruits for realistic police work?

Method

A sample of OPA basic recruit training graduates were selected by surveying all graduating recruits from three different OPA basic training sessions who had experience working as a police officer. The basic recruit sessions were selected so as to provide a sample of officers who have a similar recruit training program of study and have a reasonable amount of experience working as patrol officers from which to evaluate the effectiveness of the training to prepare them to adequately perform important entry-level job-tasks. Twenty-seven recruits responded accounting for a

45% return rate. The follow-up survey instrument collected information pertaining to the respondent's related biography, general job attitude, evaluative task training ratings for 304 tasks, along with written comments and recommendations about what needs to be improved within the OPA basic training program.

Quantitative and qualitative variables were measured mainly by frequency counts. Task training evaluation ratings were organized and rank ordered by duty fields and individually by mean scores for the purpose of prioritizing potential curriculum weaknesses. Evaluation ratings were further analyzed by categorizing and comparing task mean scores by primarily three ways: (1) entire sample; (2) those officers who have performed the task rated; and (3) those officers who have never performed the task rated. An adequate training standard criterion level was established to determine which tasks are receiving insufficient training in the academy and therefore need curriculum attention. A general content analysis of written responses was conducted with the specific content being organized by duty fields and reported in detail for independent evaluation.

Results

The majority (70%) of the sample (N=27) rated the overall basic police training program prepared graduates to perform patrol tasks from quite well to very well. The remaining 30% rated the overall training no less than fairly well. However, when the respondents were requested to provide more specific task training ratings, the findings

revealed that many potential curriculum inadequacies existed. When calculated for the entire sample, of the 304 entry-level tasks rated, 102 (34%) resulted in mean scores below the adequate training standard criterion level. A comparison of task training mean scores between respondents who have performed the task and those who have not, disclosed some meaningful differences. Task performers reported an overall higher confidence in the OPA training program by rating 20% of the 102 tasks found inadequate by the non-performers as being adequate. Task performers further disagreed by indicating four additional tasks should be rated inadequate, which were held to be adequate by non-performers. In either case, a significant number of tasks received substandard criterion ratings suggesting insufficient training is being provided for many important police duty field areas.

Seven duty fields were found not to have any task training mean scores below the standard criterion. Twenty-three (77%) of the duty fields did have task mean scores which fell below the standard. Two duty fields which had a significant higher proportion of tasks receiving substandard mean ratings are Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (12.8%; based on 102 substandard tasks) and Jail Operations (11.8%). Driving (7.8%), Criminal Investigation (7.8%), Case Prosecution (6.9%), Traffic Control (5.9%) and Arrest & Detain (4.9%) were secondary duty fields having a large proportion of substandard task training ratings. Fourteen of the remaining duty fields reported some

substandard criterion training ratings.

Four duty fields were rated below the standard criterion level for every task within their duty field. Those duty fields are: (1) Driving; (2) Miscellaneous; (3) Civil Process; and (4) Crime Prevention. Additional duty fields receiving a disproportionate amount (50% or more) of duty field tasks rated as substandard are: Jail Operations (92%); Case Prosecution (88%); OUIL (80%); Office Clerical (67%); Physical Training & Defensive Tactics (59%); Crime Scene Search (57%); Civil Disorders (50%); and Police Communications (50%). The driving duty field established a case of remittance as being a serious training problem duty field because of a special analysis. The analysis revealed a subgroup of graduates (10) participating in a new OPA driving program rated 88% of the Driving duty field tasks above the adequate training criterion level.

An analysis of sixty-seven written responses indicating which tasks need the most improvement in the police academy program disclosed that 22% of the responses did not match with the 102 tasks which were identified as receiving inadequate training. Remarks by graduates often critiqued the training program for not providing certain essential job knowledges and skills which are necessary for satisfactory police performance. Recommendations frequently called for increasing training for certain subject areas and additional practical training exercises to develop basic police skills. Some recommendations included suggestions about changing, or adding, new training techniques and subject matter to

improve the OPA basic training program.

CONCLUSIONS

As result of the analysis, certain important conclusions can be made about the OPA graduate population and the evaluative concerns the study has researched. However, the conclusions should be viewed with some scientific caution due to the samples' return rate statistical strength being 45%.

Population

1. The population age ranges considerably with most (74%) officers being 24 years and older in age.
2. The population is fairly well educated with most officers having some college education.
3. A substantial proportion (66%) of OPA graduates reported they have had some law enforcement related experience before entering the basic police program.
4. OPA graduates work in diverse types of patrol areas (urban, suburban, rural, or some combination) with a substantial proportion (67%) working alone on patrol most of the time.
5. A pronounced number of OPA graduates have favorable job attitudes. They found police work to be fairly to very interesting and believed the occupation made good use of their natural talents.

Training Evaluation

1. A substantial majority (70%) of graduates gave an overall OPA evaluation rating indicating that the training they received prepared graduates to perform

patrol tasks from "quite well" to "very well."

2. When rating tasks independently, graduates reported that the basic police training received was less than effective for adequately preparing them to perform a significant proportion (102) of the 304 important entry-level job-tasks listed.
3. The findings clearly identified that many job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than other job-tasks.
4. Task performer and non-performer training evaluation ratings did differ considerably concerning the recruit training effectiveness to prepare officers to adequately perform police job-tasks. However, it was generally found that task performer ratings indicated a higher confidence in the training program effectiveness to provide adequate job preparatory training.
5. Seven duty fields were found not to have any task training mean scores below the adequate training standard criterion. Those duty fields are: Conflict Mediation; Emergency Preparedness - Disaster Control; Field Notetaking And Report Writing; Fingerprinting & Palmprinting; Firearms Training; Latent Prints; and Search & Seizure.
6. A substantial majority (77%) of the 30 duty field categories were found to have at least some curriculum weakness.
7. Several duty fields were identified as having apparent curriculum weaknesses. Physical Training & Defensive

Training Tactics and Jail Operations duty fields experienced a higher proportion of the 102 tasks below the adequate training standard criterion level within their duty field than any other duty fields. Other duty fields receiving a relatively large proportion of substandard task training ratings are: Driving; Criminal Investigation; Case Prosecution; Patrol Operations; Traffic Control; and Arrest & Detain. Every task within four duty fields was rated below the adequate training standard criterion level. Those duty fields are: Driving; Miscellaneous; Civil Process; and Crime Prevention. Other duty fields identified as having a disproportionate amount (50% or more) of duty field tasks rated as substandard are: Jail Operations; Case prosecution; OUIL; Office Clerical; Physical Training & Defensive Tactics; Crime Scene Search; Civil Disorders; and Police Communications.

Written comments and recommendations identified several duty fields which a greater number of graduates reported tasks needed improvement and/or attention. Those duty fields are: Driving, Physical Training and Defensive Tactics, Case Prosecution, OUIL, Patrol Operations, Field Notetaking and Report Writing, Police Communications, Traffic Control, Arrest & Detain, Civil Disorders, Collection and Preservation of Evidence, Conflict Mediation, Crime Scene Search, Criminal Investigation, and Jail Operations.

8. The new OPA recruit driving program was found to be a very meaningful improvement over the preexisting driving program for preparing graduates to adequately perform police driving tasks.
9. Written comments and recommendations indicate curriculum weaknesses may extend beyond those tasks evaluated below the adequate training standard criterion level. A meaningful proportion (22%) of OPA graduate written comments and recommendations pertaining to tasks which in their judgment need the most improvement and/or attention addressed tasks other than the 102 receiving substandard training ratings.
10. Written remarks often critiqued the training for not providing certain essential job knowledges and skills necessary for satisfactory police performance.
11. Recommendations indicate a need for an increase in training for certain subject areas and additional practical exercises to develop basic police job performance skills.

It is apparent from the findings derived by the study that three key evaluation research questions were satisfactorily answered. Those questions were:

1. Does the OPA curriculum in reality effectively prepare police officers to adequately perform important entry-level job-tasks?
2. Which job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than other job-tasks for the purpose of determining which tasks need additional curriculum attention and consideration?
3. What recommendations can be suggested by OPA

graduates concerning how the OPA curriculum can be improved for the purpose of increasing the training programs effectiveness to adequately prepare recruits for realistic police work?

In brief summation, the OPA curriculum in reality does effectively prepare police officers to adequately perform a majority (202) of entry-level job-tasks; however, for approximately 34% (102) of the important job-tasks officers may have to perform, graduates responding reported they were not adequately prepared by the basic training academy program to do so. The study did rank order job-tasks to identify which job-tasks are addressed by the curriculum more or less effectively than other job-tasks. Finally, graduates recommendations were recorded concerning how the OPA curriculum might be improved for future academy sessions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study has resulted in the development of several recommendations which address potential applications of the research findings and the need to do further related research. Ultimately the pragmatic value of this study will be measured by its contribution to discovering more effective ways to comprehensively evaluate police training programs for the purpose of improving patrol officer performance.

1. Oakland Police Academy should begin improving their recruit training program by doing additional curriculum research and planning for those duty field tasks which were ranked below the adequate training standard. To

do this, OPA must determine for themselves which tasks are most critical for needing curriculum improvement. It is suggested that the inadequate task training rank ordered list (Table 4-8) be used as a curriculum improvement priority indicator. Written comments and recommendations can provide enlightening supplemental quantitative and qualitative information for consideration. The MLEOTC's job analysis study rank ordered listing of tasks according to their "consequence of inadequate performance" rating can be used as another key resource.

Once tasks are prioritized and finalized for curriculum research, OPA should conduct a task analysis for each task and develop performance objectives. Performance objectives should reflect the adequate task performance proficiency level the recruit should be able to demonstrate before graduating from the academy.

2. OPA should utilize the the findings of the study as baseline data to be compared to future curriculum evaluation findings for measuring program improvement. However, OPA must be willing to conduct another task inventory follow-up study after implementing the curriculum revisions responsive to correcting the training deficiencies noted in this study. As a result, OPA can determine if the curriculum changes were effective in correcting past deficiencies and identify if any new curriculum deficiencies exist. An

ongoing systematic evaluation process will safeguard the integrity of the program to provide competent police officers and will protect against serious curriculum slippage due to continual changes in job performance requirements.

3. OPA/MLEOTC should develop a suggested probationary officer curriculum outline for field training officers (FTO) responsible for training and developing rookie officers fresh out of the police academy. The FTOs' should be provided information about which entry-level job-tasks rookie patrol officers have the most difficulty performing. Such a curriculum outline will prevent rookies from learning primarily by trial and error/success, but will instead encourage FTOs' to provide on the job training targeted at developing many necessary entry-level competencies not likely provided by the basic police academy program. The fulfillment of the recommendation will enhance the fundamental importance of the FTO program's role and capability to provide a competent, proficient and effective work force.

4. Each Michigan basic police training program, including college preservice programs, should conduct a task inventory follow-up curriculum evaluation study in order to collectively share their findings with other basic police programs for the purpose of improving the

overall training system. Certainly each basic police training program has curriculum strengths and weaknesses that are not similar to other programs. Each program is unique in some meaningful way. If each basic training program conducted a follow-up study they could document their curriculum strengths and weaknesses for the purpose of program comparison and improvement. The comparison could serve as a means to identify which basic training program best prepares recruits to perform particular duty field tasks. Those programs having specific subject area strengths could share their curriculum strengths with other basic programs. Such a cross-pollination of curriculum strengths would benefit the entire basic police training system, the police profession and the public they serve.

As an added note, the MLEOTC should be the agency spearheading the training evaluation effort for the purpose of improving the state's basic police training system's effectiveness to produce competent police officers. However, if the MLEOTC is disinterested in earnestly evaluating the effectiveness of the MLEOTC curriculum, it is recommended that the basic police training coordinators collectively take on the responsibility for actively evaluating and improving the basic police training system.

5. MLEOTC should evaluate the effectiveness of their

current basic recruit curriculum before making new curriculum revisions. The findings of the study clearly indicate that much of the current MLEOTC curriculum operating within the OPA program does not need any revision. This is very likely true for much of the MLEOTC curriculum across all basic police academies. Hence, to subjectively expend valuable limited resources to revise areas within the curriculum which actually need little if any revision would be fiscally negligent. Fiscal and personnel resources should first be directed at those areas within the curriculum which need the most immediate and critical attention.

6. Additional research should be conducted to compare the differences of training effectiveness for the MLEOTC recruit academy curriculum to prepare officers to meet entry-level performance requirements among different types of police agencies. Such research may reveal that the curriculum effectiveness is inadequate for certain types of agencies, but not for other types. Hence, the possibility does exist that there is a need to provide additional and/or specialized training for agencies which have important unique duties and responsibilities which are not being adequately addressed within the basic academy system. For example, sheriff deputies may have to be provided specialized training for civil process procedures and jail

operations, whereas municipal and township officers do not. It is very possible small police agencies need patrol officers which are more adept than large agency officers in performing criminal investigations. Small agencies tend to be less specialized and therefore often require patrol officers to conduct crimimal investigations beyond the preliminary report stage. Many other important entry-level training requirement differences need to be explored.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Results

The findings of the investigation suggest that the OPA basic training curriculum does not effectively prepare new officers to adequately perform a significant proportion of important entry-level police job-tasks. However, the study findings infer far more meaningful implications than a list of identified and prioritized training deficiencies. More importantly, the findings suggest that the traditional police practice which primarily utilizes subjective professional judgments for developing and maintaining a basic recruit training curriculum is generally ineffective and unreliable in preparing rookie officers to adequately perform realistic entry-level patrol work. As a result, there is a definite need for developing and applying analytical follow-up curriculum evaluation techniques to ensure that sufficiently effective job preparatory recruit training is being provided and maintained.

One goal of the study has been to bring about improvement over past curriculum evaluation models and methodologies which have been used to assess police curriculas. This has been reasonably accomplished. Previous studies have suffered in pragmatic quality. When studies have identified curriculum deficiencies they have described the deficiencies only in the most general terms (major work functions). When deficiencies are stated in the most general terms, those responsible for making curriculum modification decisions are not certain exactly where to begin. Out of their frustration, they may not do anything. The problem is compounded since past studies have consistently failed to give a sense of relative priority as to where the limited training resources would best be applied to revise the curriculum. The evaluation methodology utilized within this study does prioritize curriculum deficiencies and identifies them more precisely for decision-makers.

The findings derived from the study have surfaced evidence that the task inventory follow-up curriculum evaluation methodology can be extremely useful. The instrument efficiently collected task training evaluation ratings for 304 tasks categorized within 30 duty fields. The methodology is quite comprehensive. Tasks were easily rank ordered according to their training evaluation ratings for prioritizing training deficiencies. Instead of only relying on the graduate's recall ability, the methodology takes

advantage of the graduate's task recognition which enhances the instrument's comprehensiveness, reliability and validity. The specificity of the task listing safeguards against the incumbent providing over generalizations about the quality of the training received. In addition, incumbent job experience, as well as analyzing task training ratings by task performers, counteracts the likelihood of obtaining naive evaluative judgments which may be misleading. The methodology is therefore considered a valuable curriculum product evaluation tool worthy of further research development and use.

The special analysis of the driving duty field illustrated the potential benefit for continually using the methodology for measuring changes in job performance resulting from curriculum revisions. The instrument collected information from two subsamples which differed regarding driving training. One group was provided classroom training, while the second group was provided classroom training plus actual practical driving exercises in order to develop driver skills. The analysis demonstrated that the methodology was able to reliably collect and convey that those recruits receiving some additional training and practical exercises were better prepared to perform patrol driving tasks. The findings indicate the instrument and methodology has validity in identifying and discerning training differences among groups receiving similar but unequal training. Such a quality of evaluation discernment is fundamental for accurately

measuring the impact of curriculum changes.

Some precautionary factors need to be considered relating to the tasks identified as receiving insufficient training in the OPA program. One is that many of the tasks rated inadequately have not been part of the MLEOTC mandatory curriculum requirements. The MLEOTC has yet to totally revise the curriculum since conducting the first phase of the job analysis study in 1981. OPA cannot therefore be held accountable for many of the training deficiencies identified. In addition, the MLEOTC mandatory curriculum generally does not have clearly stated performance objectives to help guide basic police academy administrators and trainers to assess if their recruit training is adequately meeting the minimum job performance requirements. Basic police academies must therefore continue to operate their programs with considerable uncertainty about what level of job skills and knowledges they need to inculcate within recruits to adequately prepare them to perform police work.

This researcher believes that many of the training deficiencies identified within the OPA program can be found within other Michigan basic police academy programs. That is not to say that exactly all the same deficiencies exist within other recruit programs, rather generally the same deficiencies probably do exist to a reasonable degree. The predominant reason is that all academies are required to comply with the MLEOTC by incorporating their state mandated basic recruit curriculum. The research findings have

probably identified training deficiencies as much within the MLEOTC recruit curriculum as it has within the OPA police recruit program. Each basic police academy program suffers to some equal degree from the inherent weaknesses embedded within the MLEOTC curriculum.

When interpreting the data, it is important to keep in mind that tasks are rarely if ever totally independent of other tasks. Many tasks require the same basic performance skills and knowledges as other similar tasks. In certain instances the successful performance of one or more tasks is a prerequisite condition to the successful performance of another task. These performance interrelationships among tasks have some positive and negative ramifications for curriculum planning and improvement. For example, improving the curriculum for one task which results in satisfactory performance may also improve the performance for other related tasks. On the other hand, improving the training for a single task, without giving due consideration for the need to improve training for the prerequisite tasks, may result in the continuation of inadequate performance despite the positive curriculum adjustment. Hence, tasks identified within the study as receiving insufficient training oftentimes reflect more than simplistic curriculum problems which can be easily corrected. The performance interrelationships among related tasks must therefore be thoroughly considered and planned for when revising the curriculum.

Certain study findings about the population raise some

striking questions and concerns. For example, it appears most OPA graduates work alone on patrol most of the time after a relatively short period following graduation from the academy. If this is true, the implication is clear that rookie officers have to be prepared to competently perform entry-level patrol tasks upon graduation, since it is unlikely they will have the guidance and company of a seasoned officer to assist them on many occasions. Perhaps it is a great and dangerous myth that most police departments today make sure they keep the rookie officer under a seasoned officer's wing until s/he is ready to fly on their own. Instead, most rookies may be forced out of the nest before they are ready to solo in the real world of policing. This may account for why so many OPA graduates reported they were ill prepared to perform such a large proportion of patrol officer tasks. The finer and most critical points of police performance may not be learned by structured apprenticeship, rather by trial and error/success. The potential consequences identify the need to research thoroughly the integration and probationary process the rookie officer undergoes to become an independently operating patrol officer. The findings from such research would help provide information about how to develop effective field training officer programs.

The police occupation can benefit from follow-up analytic curriculum evaluation studies. Such studies will help assure a competent and effective work force by safeguarding against curriculum obsolescence resulting from

occupational and social changes influencing police performance requirements. The falsely practiced traditions, notions and myths about how to effectively prepare police to perform their work will unfortunately pervade, unless those responsible for providing police training have the courage to seriously evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their programs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OAKLAND POLICE ACADEMY PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

OAKLAND POLICE ACADEMY
PROGRAM OF STUDY

	MLEOTC MANDATED HOURS	OPA HOURS
ADMINISTRATION SECTION		
Program Orientation	1	5
Classroom Notetaking	1	3
Examinations	6	10
Examination Review	3	8
Director's Time	2	2
MLEOTC Administrative	2	6
LEGAL SECTION		
Introduction to Constitutional Law	1	1
Law of Arrest	4	4
Detention and Custody	2	2
Admissions and Confessions	3	4
Search and Seizure	8	8
Court Function	10	10
Law of Evidence	10	10
Criminal Law	14	15
Juvenile Law	2	2
INVESTIGATION SECTION		
Criminal Investigation	10	10
Vice Investigation	2	3
Narcotic and Dangerous Drugs	4	5
Crime Scene Search	6	6
Collection and Preservation of Evidence	6	6
Interview and Interrogation	3	4
Fingerprinting and Palmprinting	4	4
Latent Print	4	4
Mock Crime Scene	6	6
Stolen Motor Vehicle	2	2
SPECIAL SUBJECT SECTION		
Human Relations	8	8
Police Courteous and Ethics	4	4
Handling Abnormal People	2	4
Social Services	2	3
EXTERNAL RELATIONS SECTION		
Jurisdiction of Federal Law Enforcement Agencies	2	2
Michigan Corrections/Parole/Probation	3	3

GENERAL POLICE SECTION		
History and Philosophy of Law Enforcement	2	2
Juvenile Offender	4	4
Firearms	28	30
Police First Aid	14	18
Field Notetaking and Report Writing	4	6
Blockade and Roadblock Procedure	1	1
Radio Communication	2	2
LEIN and Other Systems	2	2
Patrol Techniques	10	14
Civil Disorder	9	9
Mechanics of Arrest and Detention	4	4
Domestic Complaints	3	4
State Liquor Law Enforcement	3	3
Emergency Preparedness - Disaster Control	3	4
Stopping Vehicle and Occupant Control	6	6
Physical Training and Defensive Tactics	38	42
TRAFFIC SECTION		
Motor Vehicle Law	10	10
Driver License	2	3
OUIL	2	3
Motor Vehicle Accident Investigation	18	18
Traffic Direction and Control	2	2
Techniques and Methods of Traffic Enforcement	2	4
OPTIONAL	14	
Driver's Training ***	0	12
Tracking Dogs'	0	3
Role of the Social Worker	0	1
Stress Seminar	0	3
	320	374

*** Only one OPA session received the practical driver's training program.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

Officer Alfred J. Brauns
Belleville, Police Department
6 Main St.
Belleville, MI 48111

August 1, 1983

Dear Officer Brauns:

As a graduate of the Oakland Police Academy you are one of our most valuable sources for evaluating and improving our basic police program. We sincerely need your help to assist us in making our police training program the very best it can be for future police recruits and the public they will serve.

Officer Brauns, would you please help us in our endeavor by taking the time to diligently complete and prudently return the enclosed training evaluation instrument? We need your professional input. We have enclosed a stamped envelope for your convenience and we need your response no later than September 1st, 1983. However, please complete and return the evaluation instrument as soon as possilbe. Thank you.

Please be assured that all the information you provide will be held in confidence.

I would like to thank you in advance for your important cooperation and contributions which will make this project a worthy success.

Sincerely,

Joel Allen
Director
Oakland Police Academy

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS POLICE TRAINING EVALUATION?

A. This study will collect professional judgments regarding the adequacy of the basic police training program to prepare recruits to perform important entry-level police job tasks. The purpose of the study is to identify the strengths and weaknesses within the training curriculum so the curriculum can be improved in order to better prepare future police recruits for police work.

Q. WHO IS ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS?

A. The Oakland Police Academy - (Why?) Because we care about the quality of training we provide to police recruits, police agencies and the public they serve!

Q. OK, HOW DO I ANSWER THE QUESTIONS?

A. The evaluation instrument is divided into three sections: (1) Background Information, (2) Task Training Rating, and (3) Training Recommendations. Detailed instructions are provided at the beginning of each section. Start at the beginning by reading all instructions carefully, working from section to section, and respond to the items with your best professional judgment.

Q. IS ALL THIS REALLY NECESSARY?!

A. You bet! This is the opportunity for you to tell Oakland Police Academy how adequately you were prepared to perform common and important entry-level police work. Now that you have police experience you can provide valuable feedback regarding how well trained you were for meeting the police job conditions and requirements you have experienced since your academy graduation. The information you supply will assure future police officers will receive the training they need to perform the professional duties and responsibilities of a police officer.

Q. HOW LONG DO I HAVE TO COMPLETE THE EVALUATION?

A. Please complete the evaluation promptly as possible so that your responses will be part of our analysis and final report. The evaluation should be mailed no later than August 8th.

Q. WHAT DO I DO WITH THE EVALUATION WHEN I AM FINISHED?

A. Place the evaluation in the envelope provided, seal it, and then mail. Your responses will remain confidential.

SECTION ONE
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

NAME _____

NAME OF YOUR AGENCY _____

TELEPHONE # WHERE YOU CAN BE REACHED: _____

DIRECTIONS : Write the appropriate response to each question.

1. YOUR PRESENT AGE _____

2. YOUR SEX (check one) Male _____ Female _____

3. YOUR EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION CATEGORY

(please check)
_____ American Indian
_____ Black
_____ Caucasion (white)
_____ Oriental
_____ Spanish Surname
_____ Other

4. YOUR AGENCY IS: (please check)

_____ Municipal
_____ Township
_____ Sheriff
_____ University/College
_____ State Police
_____ Other

5. YOUR PRESENT JOB TITLE IS: _____

6. DO YOU WORK WITH THE FULL AUTHORITY OF A POLICE OFFICER?

(please check)
_____ yes
_____ no

7. WHAT TYPE OF PATROL AREA DO YOU WORK IN? (Which best describes?)

Urban= inner city (high population)
Suburban= residential (moderate population density)
Rural= agricultural/forest (low population density)

(please check)
_____ Urban
_____ Suburban
_____ Rural
_____ Urban/Suburban
_____ Suburban/Rural
_____ Urban/Rural
_____ Urban/Suburban/Rural

8. MONTHS OF EXPERIENCE AS A POLICE PATROL OFFICER _____

9. HAVE YOU COMPLETED PROBATION? (check one) Yes _____ No _____

10. YOUR PRESENT TYPE OF PATROL ASSIGNMENT IS? (Check most appropriate)

_____ One Person Vehicle
_____ Two Person Vehicle
_____ Motorcycle
_____ Foot
_____ Other (specify) _____

11. PERCENT OF TIME YOU SPEND WORKING BY YOURSELF ON PATROL: _____ %

12. CHECK THE BOX(ES) THAT DESCRIBE YOUR PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY(IES) IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS:

_____ Patrol
_____ Criminal Investigation
_____ Traffic Enforcement
_____ Accident Investigation
_____ Community Relations
_____ Warrant Service
_____ Evidence & Property Control
_____ Civil Processes
_____ Dispatching
_____ Identification
_____ Bailiff/Court Officer
_____ Vice Investigation
_____ Narcotics Investigation
_____ Marine
_____ Other (specify) _____

13. YOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE **BEFORE** BEING TRAINED AT OCC POLICE ACADEMY

_____ Forest or Park Ranger
_____ Game Warden
_____ Security Guard
_____ Military Police
_____ Municipal/Township Police
_____ Police Reserve
_____ Private Investigation
_____ Sheriff's Department
_____ State Police
_____ Railroad
_____ Airport
_____ Other (specify) _____
_____ NONE

THE FOLLWING RELATE TO YOUR OVERALL FEELINGS ABOUT YOUR JOB IN GENERAL

14. I find my job:

_____ Very dull
_____ Fairly dull
_____ So-So
_____ Fairly interesting
_____ Very interesting

15. My job utilizes my natural talents:

_____ Not at all
_____ Very little
_____ Fairly well
_____ Quite well
_____ Very well

16. Overall, the basic police training I received at Oakland Police Academy prepared me to perform important tasks at my job site:

_____ Very litte
_____ Fairly well
_____ Quite well
_____ Very well

****

SECTION TWO
TASK TRAINING RATING

DIRECTIONS

Simply check if you have ever performed the task in the space provided. If you have NEVER performed the task, DO NOT check. Next, provide a training evaluation rating which best indicates how adequately OCC Basic Police Academy prepared you to perform this task at the entry-level. Entry-Level means the level of performance that is expected by your employer for a NEW EMPLOYEE (Police Rookie).

MAKE SURE YOU PROVIDE TASK EVALUATION RATINGS FOR EVERY TASK - EVEN IF YOU HAVEN'T EVER PERFORMED THE TASK !!!

READ THE KEY CAREFULLY AND DO BOTH STEP ONE AND STEP TWO FOR EVERY TASK!!!

CHARGE !!

Step 1 Check Tasks Performed	Step 2 FIELD PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCALE In preparing me to perform this task, the basic police training recieved was: 1 Totally Inadequate 2 Unsatisfactory 3 Satisfactory 4 Very Adequate 5 Excellent	Check If Performed	Training Evaluation Rating
	ARREST & DETAIN		
	1. Advise persons of constitutional rights		
	2. Arrest persons without warrant		
	3. Transport prisoners		
	4. Arrest persons with a warrant		
	5. Plan strategy for making arrests		
	6. Take into custody person detained by citizen		
	7. Make custodial traffic arrest		
	8. Request bystanders to assist in an apprehension		
	9. Explain nature of complaints to offenders		
	10. Issue citations for non-traffic offenses (e.g. appearance tickets, ordinance violations		
	11. Instruct suspect on process for obtaining an attorney		
	CASE PROSECUTION		
	12. Prepare felony complaint forms for warrant authorization		
	13. Swear out complaints or warrants		
	14. Review warrants for completeness and accuracy		
	15. Prepare misdemeanor complaint forms for warrant authorization		
	16. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney regarding warrant authorization		
	17. Recommend the issuance of an arrest warrant		
	18. Confer with prosecutor or city attorney prior to testimony regarding case		
	19. Discuss cases with prosecutors or city attorneys following legal proceedings		
	CIVIL DISORDERS		
	20. Confront, in a riot formation, groups of agitated people		
	21. Control hostile groups (e.g., demonstrators, rioters, bar patrons)		
	22. Patrol riot stricken or civil disturbance areas		
	23. Locate and observe crowd agitators		
	24. Communicate with management and labor over strike disturbances		
	25. Patrol area containing labor pickets, marchers or demonstrators		
	26. Control non-violent crowds		
	CIVIL PROCESS		
	27. Serve probate orders (e.g., mentals, juveniles, adult offenders)		
	28. Enforce court issued order (e.g. writs)		
	29. Serve subpoenas		
	COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE		
	30. Document chain of custody for evidence		
	31. Collect evidence and personal property from crime scenes		
	32. Record location of physical evidence at scene		
	33. Examine evidence and personal property from crime scenes		
	34. Phototgraph crime scenes		
	35. Cast impressions at crime scene (e.g. plaster casts, silicone, etc.)		
	36. Tag evidence and confiscated properties		

37. Diagram crime scenes.....
38. Recover and inventory stolen property.....
39. Package evidence or personal property.....
40. Transport property or evidence.....
41. Witness autopsies.....
42. Release confiscated property.....

CONFLICT MEDIATION

43. Mediate family disputes.....
44. Mediate civil disputes.....

COURT FUNCTIONS

45. Obtain search warrants and/or make proper return.....
46. Prepare witnesses for court testimony.....
47. Arraign defendant in court.....

CRIME PREVENTION

48. Conduct community relations program (e.g. safety programs, crime prevention, tours, C.B. watch).....

CRIME SCENE SEARCH

49. Search crime scenes for physical evidence.....
50. Search fire debris for evidence relating to the cause of the fire.....
51. Determine need for specialized assistance at a crime scene.....
52. Participate in raids.....
53. Plan strategy for conducting searches.....
54. Search dead bodies for personal property.....
55. Track person from scene (e.g., footprints in snow or mud).....

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION

56. Examine dead bodies for wounds and injuries.....
57. Verify the identity of deceased persons.....
58. Locate witness to crime.....
59. Conduct on-the-scene suspect identifications (e.g. show-ups).....
60. Organize and conduct photo line-ups.....
61. Review with medical examiner circumstances relating to a death.....
62. Conduct intelligence activities on known or suspected offenders.....
63. Verify reliability and credibility of witnesses.....
64. Establish modus operandi (M.O.) of a suspect.....
65. Determine whether incidents are criminal or civil matters.....
66. Review records and pictures to identify suspects.....
67. Participate in investigations with other law enforcement agencies.....
68. Exchange necessary information with other law enforcement officials...
69. Review crime lab reports to guide investigations.....
70. Determine whether recovered property is linked with a previous crime..
71. Trace stolen goods.....
72. Conduct surveillance of individuals or locations.....
73. Organize surveillance of individuals or locations.....
74. Utilize department records to assist in investigation.....
75. Analyze and compare incidents for similarity of modus operandi (M.O.).
76. Talk with families of adult suspects or defendents (advise, inform, notify, counsel).....
77. Recruit confidential informants.....

DRIVING

78. Engage in high speed driving in congested area.....
79. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving on open road.....
80. Engage in high speed pursuit or response driving off road.....
81. Operate vehicle on ice covered road.....
82. Operate vehicle on snow covered road.....
83. Operate vehicle in driving rain.....
84. Escort emergency vehicles.....

85. Operate vehicle on dirt covered road.....

OUIL ENFORCEMENT

86. Arrest OUIL suspects.....
87. Operate "breathalyzer" instrument to test blood alcohol content.....
88. Testify in Secretary of State implied consent hearings.....
89. Administer roadside sobriety test.....
90. Arrange for obtaining blood or urine samples for sobriety tests.....

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS-DISASTER CONTROL

91. Search for bombs.....
92. Evacuate persons from dangerous area.....
93. Secure accident and disaster scenes.....

FIELD NOTETAKING AND REPORT WRITING

94. Summarized in writing the statement of witnesses and complainants.....
95. Prepare criminal case summary sheet for prosecutor.....
96. Transcribe field notes for reports.....
97. Write narrative reports.....
98. Complete OUIL arrest reports.....
99. Type incident reports.....
100. Collect incident reports by checking off boxes or filling in blanks..

FINGERPRINTING & PALMPRINTING

101. Fingerprint prisoners.....

FIREARMS TRAINING

102. Discharge firearm at person.....
103. Draw weapon.....
104. Participate in firearms training.....
105. Clean and inspect weapons.....

FIRST AID

106. Administer cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR).....
107. Administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.....
108. Apply first aid to treat for heart attacks.....
109. Apply first aid to treat for amputations.....
110. Apply first aid to control bleeding.....
111. Apply first aid to treat for gunshot wounds.....
112. Administer oxygen using resuscitator.....
113. Apply first aid to treat for electric shock.....
114. Administer oxygen using oxygen suppy device other than resuscitator..
115. Apply first aid to treat for poisoning.....
116. Apply first aid to treat for shock.....
117. Apply first aid to treat for overdose.....
118. Apply first aid to treat for burns.....
119. Apply first aid to treat for diabetic reaction.....
120. Apply first aid to treat for stroke.....
121. Apply first aid to treat for heat stroke.....
122. Apply first aid to treat for broken bones.....
123. Apply first aid to treat for puncture wounds.....
124. Apply first aid to treat for heat prostration.....
125. Apply first aid to treat for convulsions.....
126. Apply first aid to treat for eye injuries.....
127. Apply first aid to treat for seizure.....
128. Transport injured persons.....
129. Apply first aid to treat for lacerations.....
130. Apply first aid to treat for abrasions.....

INTERVIEW & INTERROGATION

131. Interrogate suspects.....
132. Interview complainants, witnesses, etc.....
133. Record confessions in writing.....

134. Take statements of witnesses.....
135. Interrogate suspects or witness with use of polygraph results.....
136. Interview medical personnel to obtain specific information.....

JAIL OPERATIONS

137. Check weapons in and out of detention facility.....
138. Guard prisoners detained outside jail.....
139. Record injuries to prisoners.....
140. Investigate injuries to prisoners.....
141. Process evidence seized at custodial search.....
142. Place holds on prisoners and notify department holding warrant.....
143. Check individual making bond for wants and warrants.....
144. Check legal status of the case of prisoners.....
145. Return prisoner's property.....
146. Inventory prisoner's personal property.....
147. Book prisoners by completing arrest forms.....
148. Collect interim bond.....
149. Answer inquiries concerning prisoner.....

JUVENILE PROCESS

150. Place children in protective custody (e.g. child abuse).....
151. Apprehend juvenile offenders.....
152. Talk with families of juvenile suspects or defendants (advise, inform, notify, counsel).....
153. Counsel juveniles.....
154. Conduct parent juvenile conferences.....
155. Confer with juvenile probate officer.....
156. Advise parents of children's violation of traffic laws.....

LATENT PRINTS

157. Dust and lift latent prints.....

MISCELLANEOUS

158. Test and evaluate police equipment.....
159. Request equipment repair.....
160. Evaluate citizen complaints regarding tickets or other minor offenses.....

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

161. Take precautions to prevent additional accidents at accident scene...
162. Collect physical evidence from accident scenes.....
163. Request emergency assistance for traffic accident (e.g. wrecker, ambulance , salt truck).....
164. Determine contributing factors to an accident.....
165. Set priorities for action at accident scene.....
166. Determine fault in a traffic accident.....
167. Complete the standard traffic accident report form (UD-10).....
168. Protect traffic accident physical evidence for collection.....
169. Diagram accident scenes.....
170. Investigate traffic accident scene to identify point(s) of impact....
171. Direct activities at scenes of accident investigations.....
172. Search accident scenes for physical evidence.....
173. Take coordinate measures of traffic accident scenes (e.g., triangulation).....
174. Identify persons involved in traffic accident.....
175. Locate witnesses to traffic accidents.....
176. Photograph accident scenes.....
177. Measure skid marks.....
178. Test operating condition of accident vehicle equipment.....
179. Interview persons involved in traffic accident.....
180. Identify owner of vehicles involved in accident.....

181. Inspect vehicle for fresh damage.....
182. Issue citation(s) in traffic accident.....
183. Follow-up extent of personal injuries resulting from traffic accident.....
184. Review accidents with accident investigators.....
185. Investigate off road vehicle accidents.....
186. Remove debris from accident scene.....

OFFICE AND CLERICAL

187. Issue pick-up or wanted notices.....
188. Prepare list of wanted persons for department use.....
189. Review other officers' incident reports for completeness and accuracy.....
190. Take custody of lost and found property.....
191. Schedule work assignments for other officers.....
192. Verify vehicle title information.....

PATROL OPERATIONS

193. Inspect patrol vehicle for weapons and contraband.....
194. Request back-up assistance.....
195. Identify wanted vehicles or persons.....
196. Transport mental patients.....
197. Describe persons to other officers (e.g., suspects, missing persons).....
198. Search unlocked businesses and dwellings for signs of illegal entry..
199. Flush fuel spills.....
200. Check conditions and status of assigned patrol equipment and vehicle.
201. Direct actions of officer(s) arriving to assist.....
202. Advise property owners or agents of potentially hazardous conditions.
203. Follow suspicious vehicles (e.g., suspects, suspicious person, operator under the influence).....
204. Investigate suspicious vehicle.....
205. Interview suspicious persons.....
206. Review information on criminal activity in area.....
207. Comfort emotionally upset persons.....
208. Notify public agencies or utilities of damage to their equipment.....
209. Escort money, valuables or people to provide security.....
210. Investigate unusual odors.....
211. Direct actions of public service personnel arriving to assist.....
212. Secure house or property (e.g., lock, close doors and windows etc.)..
213. Patrol locations of beat which are potentially hazardous to citizens (e.g., construction site, attractive nuisance).....
214. Secure vehicles.....
215. Advise victims of the procedures to prosecute.....
216. Participate in large scale area search parties.....
217. Talk with people on the beat to establish rapport.....
218. Perform first line maintenance on patrol vehicle.....
219. Respond to general information questions from the public.....
220. Investigate unusual sounds.....
221. Make entries in individual patrol log.....
222. Prepare list of wanted persons or stolen vehicles for own use.....
223. Patrol on foot.....
224. Physically examine and test doors and windows of dwellings and businesses.....
225. Establish field contacts (e.g., barowners, taxi drivers, etc.).....
226. Assist elderly or disabled persons with mobility problems.....

227. Transport persons needing assistance.....
228. Deliver emergency messages (e.g., injuries, death).....
229. Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation.....
230. Check parks and school grounds.....
231. Notify citizens of damage to their property.....
232. Check individuals/businesses for compliance with licensing requirements (e.g., hunting, liquor, dance permit, vendors, etc.)....

PHYSICAL TRAINING AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS

233. Subdue attacking persons.....
234. Subdue subject resisting arrest.....
235. Handcuff suspects or prisoners.....
236. Physically restrain crowds.....
237. Run after fleeing suspects.....
238. Pickup and carry heavy objects or persons.....
239. Lift heavy objects or persons.....
240. Break through door using force.....
241. Drag or pull heavy objects or persons.....
242. Run up stairs.....
243. Jump down from elevated surfaces.....
244. Jump over obstacles.....
245. Wade through marshes, swamp land or waterways.....
246. Perform duties while wearing heavy equipment (other than gun belt)...
247. Climb through openings (e.g., windows).....
248. Pull self up over obstacles.....
249. Pull self through openings.....
250. Climb up over obstacles.....
251. Jump across obstacles.....
252. Physically push movable objects.....
253. Crawl in confined areas (e.g., attics).....
254. Stand continuously for more than one-half of the work shift (e.g., guard duty or point control).....

POLICE COMMUNICATIONS

255. Request verification of warrants before service.....
256. Receive and evaluate telephone requests for police service.....
257. Inform dispatcher by radio as to your status.....
258. Check for wants/warrants on persons through LEIN.....
259. Operate telephone console or switchboard.....
260. Operate LEIN terminal to update data.....
261. Operate LEIN terminal to check persons and property.....
262. Check stolen status on property through LEIN.....

SEARCH & SEIZURE

263. Conduct field search of arrested persons.....
264. Conduct frisk patdown.....
265. Search premises or property in hot pursuit situations.....
266. Search premises or property with warrant.....
267. Search premises or property incident to arrest.....
268. Seize contraband.....
269. Search movable automobile under independent probable cause.....
270. Search premises or property with consent.....
271. Impound property.....

TESTIFYING IN COURT AND ADMINSTRATIVE HEARINGS

272. Testify in criminal cases.....
273. Present evidence in legal proceedings.....
274. Review reports and notes for court testimony.....
275. Testify in parole or probation hearings.....
276. Testify in liquor board hearings.....

TRAFFIC CONTROL

277. Stop vehicles to investigate, cite or arrest occupants.....
278. Cite or arrest reckless drivers.....
279. Evaluate driver's capability to operate vehicle.....
280. Direct traffic using flashlight or illuminated baton.....
281. Direct traffic using hand signals.....
282. Clock vehicles using radar.....
283. Remove vehicles obstructing traffic.....
284. Direct traffic using flare pattern or traffic cone patterns.....
285. Clock speed of vehicles using speedometer.....
286. Observe traffic control device to determine if functioning properly..
287. Issue traffic citations.....
288. Record circumstances regarding traffic citation.....
289. Inspect operator's license.....
290. Advise appropriate agency of traffic engineering needs.....
291. Direct pedestrian traffic.....
292. Follow suspect vehicle to observe traffic violations.....
293. Inspect for vehicle identification number.....
294. Remove hazards from roadway (e.g., dead animals, debris, etc.).....
295. Assist stranded motorists.....
296. Explain state vehicle laws and procedures to citizens.....
297. Monitor traffic for violations.....
298. Explain legal procedures to traffic violators.....
299. Inspect private vehicle for conformance with vehicle code.....
300. Check railroad crossing for signal violations (e.g., going around gates, train blocking crossing).....
301. Check vehicles for proper registration (e.g. snowmobiles, off road vehicles, etc.).....
302. Issue verbal warnings to traffic violators.....
303. Visually estimate speed of vehicles.....
304. Determine status of auto insurance.....

****

SECTION THREE
TRAINING RECOMMENDATIONS

DIRECTIONS:

GOOD WORK! This is the last section for you to complete and this is what you are to do. Select three tasks from Section II which you believe need the most improvement in the basic police academy. After you have selected the tasks, list them on the following outlines and provide the information requested for each task. Be as brief and to the point as possible. If you need more space to make your comments you can make your comments on another sheet of paper and enclose them in the envelope. Make sure you appropriately label your answers on any additional sheets of paper inserted.

Once you have completed this section and you still have some additional information you want to provide regarding the basic police training you have received please feel free to comment. Enclose a letter or whatever else is necessary to express your thoughts.

OAKLAND POLICE ACADEMY THANKS YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION WHICH WILL DEFINITELY ASSIST US IN PROVIDING THE VERY BEST POLICE TRAINING POSSIBLE!!!

KEEP AT IT YOUR ALMOST DONE!!!

TASK SELECTED _____

TASK NUMBER# _____

What needs to be improved in the basic police academy program in order to adequately prepare recruits to perform this task? In answering this question, please consider the adequacy of the following factors: quality of instruction, subject matter/course content, learning conditions, facilities, written resource material, etc.

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ARREST & DETAIN

TASK 7: Make custodial traffic arrest

(1)

In my job, making an arrest during a traffic stop is the most common arrest situation; however, during the academy we had only one night of actual training in making traffic stops and arrests. Much more time is needed on this subject. Traffic stops are common, but each one is different. A little old lady who is stopped for a defective taillight may turn into a monster if not handled correctly. And when an officer has to make an arrest of the driver when there are four passengers inside the car, the officer better know what he is doing.

TASK 10: Issue citation for non-traffic offenses (appearance ticket)

(1)

The academy needs to cover the step by step process for issuing appearance tickets. The student should be shown a ticket and demonstrated how to complete it. The appearance ticket judicial process needs explanation. Do you need a prosecution report? Can you hold the person to fingerprint on an appearance ticket? Is an appearance ticket an arrest? All these questions and related areas of concern I was unsure of when I graduated from the academy.

TASK 12-19: CASE PROSECUTION

(1)

No commentary provided.

(2)

Not much was was covered as far as how to obtain warrants. I have found that it is a big part of what we do as patrol officers. For me it was learning by mistakes in writing the report and going to the prosecutors office for a warrant.

(3)

Tasks 13, 14, 16 and 19. Especially emportant if in a small department where they do not have designated officers to follow up reports by obtaining warrants. Should know what information prosecutor needs to issue warrnat; how to swear out a warrant in court; what witnesses and/or evidence will

be needed for prelimnary exam and trial; and, preparing a case for court. Should include practical as as theoretical exercises.

TASK 12: Prepare felony complaint forms for warrant authorization

(1)

The instructors covering the subject were quite good. They seemed to impress upon you the importance of getting a warrant, but didn't go into detail about how to obtain one. They basically stated the process you go through to obtain a warrant, but did not really say what you, as a police officer, had to do to prepare yourself for each of these steps. The cases I was involved in were usually turned over to the detective bureau. The urgency of some cases require my personal and imediate action. When these cases came up I usually found myself stumbling through the process and constantly needing help. After a few cases I did learn the ropes.
I think some of this trial and error learning could be avoided by using a hypothetical case and having the recruit simulate going through the warrant process.

TASK 20-26: CIVIL DISORDERS

(1)

More time is needed for instructon. Too much emphasis was given by the instructor on cracking heads together. What is needed is more information on the basics; marching around outside wasn't much help.

(2)

I list this topic only because my class spent only about 3-4 hours on it. Actually, with society going through the economic and politicla adjustments at present, I don't see much need for this kind of training. The political and economic climate is far from what it was like in the 1960's and 70's; therefore the training we recieved was adequate. If things do change, I see the plice officer facing a different kind of civil disturbance. Today's police officer will be facing terrorist groups which have evolved from groups like the SLA. There will not be campus riots, but there will be nuclear extortion. There will be groups who will poison water supplies, plant bombs, conduct kidnaapings and many other terrorist activities. Unlike Europe and Latin America, so far the U.S. has escaped much of this activity. I do belived the police officer should be prepared for these kind of activities in the future.

TASK 27-29: CIVIL PROCESS

(1)

Basic Instruction of this Subject:

A. What is a warrant, summons, subpoena, etc.
B. What are the various types.
C. Who can serve them.
D. When can they be served.
E. Who are process servers and what is their authority and function.

All officers will sooner or later come into cotact with civil process and therefore they should have a fundamental understanding of the subject. Other examples are custody papers, court orders, etc.

COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE

TASK 41: Witness Autopsies

(1)

I feel that students should observe an autopsy, narrated by a medical examiner. I believe this is necessary to expose students to a dead body (I was a bit shocked my first time). Also, a body can be the most important piece of evidence in an investigation. It would help a the student to know what can be expected from an autopsy.

(2)

An autopsy was not witnessed by our class. I realize that it is not terribly important, but it is interesting.

TASK 43-44: CONFLICT MEDIATION

(1)

Although the profession is law enforcement, all police officers find themselves engaged in many more activities than "crushing crime." It would therefore be helpful to expose the recruitss to some of these situations they are likely to encounter. Ther experience of the veteran officers and the "classic cases" should be presented to the students. Experienced actors or officers could role play the various situations placing the rookies in the position of the responding officer(s). These include husband-wife disputes, landlord-tenant disputes, neighbor vs. neighbor, intoxicated subject or confused senior citizen, etc. The student will find this method of instruction more helpful and he will retain more learning this way as opposed to reading, viewing a film, or discussing the situations. The

actors/officers can "throw a curve" now and then to keep the recruit on his toes. (see Task 43)

TASK 43: Mediation of Family Disputes

(1)

I feel that for a recruit to be successful at the start of his job with a police department he must be able to use the medium of verbal communication and make it work in any type of situation. Regarding the task that was selected above I recall that the instruction was there but it did not go into the situation deep enough. I fell that the only way for a recruit to get a handle on what it would take to mediate a family dispute would be having academy students play act a situation involving a dispute between family members and have one or two of the recruits act as police officers and mediate the sutuation. Other students in the class would watch and see what they would do in the given situation and then constructively criticize what the "officers" did wrong, or did right.
Talking about the handling of family disputes would give the recruit a basic knowledge of what to do, but the acting out of the situation would give a quasi "hands on training."
Also a good aspect to include in this block of training would be the civil aspects of these situations because most often the family trouble situation is totally civil in nature. There is no way to say that this should be done in a family situaition or that should be done in family situaition. The situation itself dictates as to what should be done.
Included also would be instruction in what types of social agencies could be recommended to the family in order to receive help if special help is needed (i.e. shelters for battered wives, AA, Alanon, County centers for alchohol or substance abuse, county family crises centers).

COURT FUNCTIONS

CRIME PREVENTION

TASK 48: Conduct community relations

(1)

The academy did not provide any information, or materials, about how to start neighborhood watches, crime prevention, etc. Although academy class time would not be necessary to cover the topic, handouts could be provided for reference.

TASK 59-55: CRIME SCENE SEARCH

(1)

Need more practical exercises in search methods.

TASK 50: Search fire debris for evidence

(1)

Some procedures or tactics to use to investigate automobile arson should be provided.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION

TASK 65: Determine whether incidents are criminal/civil

(1)

Many of the complaints I've handeled, or assited in handling have involved recently decriminalized matters, or in the case of spouse abuse, have involved criminalized matters. Family fights, spouse abuse, civil/criminal matters. I feel how to determine if matters are civil or criminal should be covered in more detail and the should be given more information on where to obtain up-to-date written material about changes in this area.

TASK 77: Recruit confidential informants

(1)

The outcome of certain situations is usually the result of a citizen's action. Since my hiring, I have seen the verteran officers break a case by relying on a confidential informant; however, it is difficult for one to recruit a confidential informant if the person does not know how to go about it correctly. Just with a few hours of training an officer how to recruit a confidential informant may be very helpful in an officers future; it would not only help the officer solve cases, but it would also make the officer look good.

TASK 78-85: DRIVING

(1)

I realize that resources and facilities are limited in training recruits driving skills they will need as a police officer, but I feel more training is needed as a large portion of an officers work is done in and with an automobile.

(2)

Take more than one day for this subject. So much of the officers work is with the patrol vehicle. Have a chapter on when to engage in high speed pursuits and when to know to terminate them.

(3)

I have been in five (5) high speed pursuits since I have been on the department. I have not crashed as of yet, but I sure wish the extra week of pursuit driving that is offered at Macomb Police Academy was offered at OCC. Most of my time is spent driving around the township, and although I think I'm a good driver, it would have been good to have a driving program.

(4)

I would add at least three (3) days to the academy schedule to instruct recruits on high speed driving. With the current publicity on police accidents it is my belief that this subject should be demonstrated in the field and not in the class room. While I realize that there is a budget problem in this type of training, I still believe that it should be included, if not made mandatory, in all police academy classes.

(5)

A driving course should be part of the academy training.

(6)

At the time I attended O.P.A., the facilities were limited and it was impossible to adequately cover the topic of high-speed driving. This has been a controversial topic and there are more and more suits going through the courts involving police officers and high-speed crashes. Because of this I believe there should be more time devoted to high-speed driving, both in an urban setting and rural setting. All cadets should be exposed to high-speed chase situations where they are subject to the stresses resulting from keeping contact with the fleeing vehicle, the distraction of the emergency equipment, remaining in radio contact with the base and avoiding the other traffic. This could be done both in the daylight and night. It could also be done on a skid pad to simulate icy or wet pavement. When my class (81-2) attended O.P.A. the problems and the liability were covered, but there was no actual "hands-on" experience. If this could be overcome, it would in my opinion, be very helpful to rookies.

(7)

My first medical emergency run was a medical emergency (lady in labor). I have driven fast before, but never with lights and siren. It was January and the roads were slick. I was going South, hit a patch of ice and ended up going North. I would like to see a pursuit driving course initiate into the basic police academy. I drive what I call common sense - defensive driving. You can't help anyone if you fail to get to the scene.

(8)

Need a defensive driving program for the academy.

(9)

Unfortunately we did not have any kind of driving when I attended the police academy. There are driving techniques pertaining to felony stops which I had to learn and which I do not consider just common sense. Proper techniques used during a felony stop may save a life. The importance of advising dispatch of the stop, requesting proper back-up assistance, proper positioning of the vehicle and officer, utilizing the P.A. and microphone, and giving orders must be practiced. I found that many of the tactics shown at the academy did not allow the student to practice as part of the training. I found by doing the tactic myself, I was better able to comprehend and for a longer duration.

(10)

Need practicla driving exercises, especialy pursuit tactics and options.

(11)

Our academy did not have an actual driving exercise in the driving class. Precision driving is a very important police need which is not being currently met. Emphasis should be placed on calmness and not killing yourself because your so wrapped up in the chase. One must consider the risks and dangers of losing their own life as well as others. (See TASK 79)

<u>TASK 79: Engage in high speed driving in congested area</u>

(1)

I now understand that an additional week has been added to the basic acdemy for driving. This is something that we should not have missed. I understand that there may not have been adequate materials and time for previous classes. Since one officer has been involved in a tragic accident which resulted in a double fatality our officers would just

as son not bother chasing a vehicle that would require a high speed pursuit.

(2)

Need actual hand on performance driving training; especially pertaining to accident avoidance. Advice on hihg speed driving should be patterened after Shoot - Don't Shoot (eg. Fast Pursuit - Not Fast).

(3)

Practice is required, without it high speed driving is too dangerous; especially the first chase.

(4)

If it wasn't for military police experience I would have had no experience or idea how to drive in a pursuit situation. If possible a course in pursuit driving would be extremely helpful.

TASK 86-90: O.U.I.L. ENFORCEMENT

(1)

Recruits should be instructed about giving tests. Also, proper report writing pertaining to O.U.I.L. arrests should address notations about road conditions, lighting conditions, suspect appearence and weather conditions. The classic examples illustrating a vehicle being operated by an intoxicated driver should be covered.

(2)

Need more training in identifying OUILs'. There are some good films available. More field test training is needed. P.B.T. instruction can be learned in 30 minutes.

TASK 86: Arrest O.U.I.L. suspect

(1)

Officer should be able to identify the O.U.I.L. offender from the non-offender. The officer needs to know more than the fact that someone may be O.U.I.L. at any time of the day. You need to have some information about what you should do once you have identified an O.U.I.L. driver. Case reports are important and you should be able to document what happened prior to driving and after the arrest.

Information should be given on how to develop and perform the arrest (i.e. account for person, car, speach, odors, and general non-verbal clues). The officer needs help with being provided some kind of plan before conducting the

arrest. Officer needs to understand liquor law violations as they relate to traffic stops. Also, how does an officer deal with the O.U.I.L. driver who doesn't cooperate? My first incident was totally different from what I expected. There is more to an O.U.I.L. stop than meets the eye. For example, the possible ramifications of letting the O.U.I.L. driver go might result in a person injury. Officer needs to know how to use his discretion.

TASK 87: Operate breathalyzer

(1)

With the new laws it would be easier and better if each officer did conduct his own test for court.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS-DISASTER CONTROL

FIELD NOTETAKING AND REPORT WRITING

TASK 94: Summarize in writing the statements of witnesses and complainants

(1)

Not enough can be said about the importance of being able to condense witneess and complainants statements into complete and to the point paragraphs. Report writing is probably one of the most important aspects of an officers job. Everything that transpires during a tour of duty goes down on paper and if the officer is unable to satisfactorily complete his paperwork he will be lost later when he must refer back to his report for information needed for court, etc.
The instruction received in the academy was satisfactory but I feel quite a bit more time should be spent on this task. The importance of the written report should be drilled into the recruits mind. Instruction stressing the fact that all elements of the crime (situation) should be included in the report. Their report should have exact statements for witnesses and complainants, but sometimes the witness or complainant rambles on and on about a situation which if written in a report would be wortheless statements. The old adage "just the facts ma'am" most times can be applied to the written report.
The instruction was there but just covered the basics when the subject could have been developed more deeply without being an advanced class.

TASK 97 Write narrative reports

(1)

More actual basic report writing addressing content, form and clarity.

(2)

This subject is crucial. Many rookies at our department have lost their jobs because they could not grasp report writing. Most of our writing deals with interviews and investigations, not fill in the blank type reports. Report writing speed and detailed content is very important. Proper academy training will aid rookies in that they will not have to spend so much time on the job trying to write satisfactory reports. However, the writing problem may only be at my police agency.

FINGERPRINTING & PALMPRINTING

TASK 101: Fingerprinting prisoners

(1)

Fingerprinting prisoners was a problem area for me since on occasion I had to print a prisoner 2 or 3 times until I obtained a full set of readable prints. Of course this is sometimes expected with uncooperative or intoxicated prisoners, but I even had problems with the very cooperative prisoners. When I was required to print these people again, I felt embarrassed and unprofessional.
As you know some people are easier to print than others due to their flexibility, finger size, etc. I think you should be able to find recruits in the class that print differently and then use these recruits as printees. Another factor is that the equipment our department has is different than what the academy uses. This usually caused under inking or over inking of the finger. This is one adjustment made by the recruit upon reaching his department.

TASK 102-105: FIREARMS TRAINING

(1)

Need to change entire firearms program. Need different instructors.

TASK 104: Participate in firearms training

(1)

The survival vs. survival would be good for the basic academy. For right now the only officer able and willing to take the course are those who are truly concerned about their own survival and the welfare to the citizen. Of course some offices are not given time off from their work to attend any class beyond basic academy. It would be a decent idea to have all officers take this course in order to find out what their reactions may be like in a firefight situation.

FIRST AID

INTERVIEW & INTERROGATION

TASK 137-149: JAIL OPERATIONS

(1)

The running of our jail is very interesting. There was a lot of information that was passed over.

(2)

Most important factors:

A. NO weapons in jail
B. Medical care obtaine BEFORE lodging subjects
C. Record all injuries and care rendered
D. Checking for warrants and pending cases before releasing subjects
E. Filling out arrest forms for EACH charge
F. THOROUGHLY search subjects before lodging - can be done at jail before entering main area. I have found the following contraband: several knives, drugs in containers and sewn in clothing and guns (seldom).
G. Signing out prisoners for court
H. Returning prisoners with court paperwork EVERY time - even if nothing happened.

(2)

Did not explain jail operations well enough. Need an experienced jail officer to instruct this section of the program.

TASK 157: Dusting and lifting latent prints

(1)

When I first started my job, I felt inadequate in my latent print abilities. I usually ended up requesting another officer to come to the crime scene to dust and lift the prints that I had found. Not knowing how the case may evolve, I was afraid that if I tried to lift the print I may ruin it. If the case did develop to the stage where there was a suspect, this one print may prove all important. I did not want to take this risk, so I called for assistance. After this happened a few times I finally decided that I would do some training on my own. I spent several hours dusting and lifting prints from different locations and objects. Only after the extra trainng did I feel sufficient in dusting and lifting prints.
If I recall correctly we only had the opportunity to lift one print while in the academy. I believe maybe requiring

the recruit to lift at least 5 prints from different objects and surfaces would greatly improve the recruits proficiency.

JUVENILE PROCESS

LATENT PRINTS

MISCELANEOUS

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

OFFICE AND CLERICAL

TASK 193-232: PATROL OPERATIONS

(1)

Overall I felt that almost all topics were covered quite well; however, I think the program would improve in areas like patrol operations, traffic stops, arresting of persons, etc. if there was more hands on activity. Time permitting, training should cover step by step the mechanics of searching a fresh breaking and entering of a business when only two (2) or four (4) officers are available to investigate and secure a building.

TASK 195: (Identify wanted vehichles or people) When recieveing the description of a perpetrator or wanted vehicle it should be emphasized in the academy what information is important and what information is not needed.

Patrol operations should include different methods (pros & cons) of response to various kinds of crimes.

TASK 196: Transport Mental Patients

(1)

Advise the recruits of how these people often react -- that their actions are usually extreme. In my opinion they should be handcuffed and watched very carefully.

TASK 207: Comfort Emotionally Upset Persons

(1)

This task was not covered at all. Sometimes you've just got to let the emotionally upset people cry on your shoulder, etc.

TASK 229: Warning offenders

A good deal of time was spent on telling officers that most tasks are dictated by department policy. I believe a little

more information should be provided as to just how much discretion officers have. Although teaching discretion is difficult, and much of it is common sense, instruction should provide some practical choices for officers instead of having them wonder about what can they do? This was never addressed.

The legal section of the academy is very good. Continue with the teaching method which gets all involved by direct questioning of each student. Keep them alert as well as making them continually think about, "How would I answer that question?" Not every offender should be issued a violation. Show how a warning may be more appropriate.

TASK 233-254: PHYSICAL TRAINING AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS

(1)

I believe the physical training and defensive tactics training was excellent, as well as the instructors. However, some of the tasks covered in the survey were not covered at all in the academy such as: climbing, pulling objects, etc. It would be helpful to have these things into the program.

(2)

I would like to see the Lamb method of defense brought into the program. I have not had to use it much but the time I did it worked well. Takedowns and alot of other defensive moves were not practiced and have been rarely used.

(3)

At our police department the most common way of subduing prisoners who resist is the carotid restraint hold. I did not recieve any training on this hold at the academy.

(4)

An obstacle course which required climbing, balance, etc. would be a good confidence builder for the academy and recruits.

TASK ***: Disarming Suspects

(5)

This wasn't included in the training. What do you do with people threatening sucide, or kids with knives -- it certainly doesn't do any good to shoot them! Also, weapon retention was not covered!!!

TASK ***: Physical Combat

(6)

Physical combat is another area which is weak. I believe the inservice eight hour Suvival course could satisfy the academy as a good standard for students.

TASK 235: Handcuff suspects or prisoners

(1)

More emphasis is needed for actually apprhension of suspects. Not enough handcuffing techniques covered. I found if you don't subdue someone properly your handcuffs can become a weapon used against you.

(2)

Obviously, handcuffing is an often used procedure by an officer. An officer will seldom, if ever, feel secure until a criminal is correctly handcuffed. In the academy, very little time was spent on this subject. I believe much more time is needed, along with a close eye on each officers movements.

(3)

More emphasis should be placed on handcuffing prisoners. Speed, proper safety techniques and position of the handcuffs in case are all important. The training at the acadey was too brief.

POLICE COMMUNICATIONS

TASK 257: Inform dispatch by radio as to your status

(1)

As both a dispatch and police officer I have often witnessed police officers, including veterans, conduct a traffic stop without calling it in and advising on status. Sometimes this happens even during priority runs, which result in a second car being dispatched when it is unnecessary.

TASK 261: Operating LEIN

(1)

While the classroom information on the uses and capabilities of LEIN is good, I think some practical use should be provided. LEIN is such a utilized instrument that better knowing how it works and performs would enable the officer to know what to ask for while on steet patrol. Many smaller departments use their personnel to peform many functions and therefore they would benefit from officers being able to

operate the LEIN terminal. Need hands on experience.

(2)

At the time of the academy I felt the LEIN training was a waste of time. After having the opportunity to work inside the communications rooms several days I realized the importance of the computerized system. Now I appreciate the information that can be obtained. I believe that a bit more time on what information can be obtained through LEIN, and maybe how to obtain the information, needs to be stessed in the academy more stringently.

SEARCH & SEIZURE

TASK 263: Conduct field search of arrested persons

When students team up with partners during physical training, have partners search one another while they are in street clothes or their uniforms. Let the searches try to hide numberous simulated guns or knives on their person and see how many searches miss or recover placed items. The instructor could also serve as the searchee.
You can also take this idea one step further and hide guns in the passenger area of a vehicle and let students search the vehicle within a given time limit.

TESTIFYING IN COURT AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

TASK 272: Testify in criminal case

(1)

More actual role play is needed with cross examination by a lawyer. Do this in a class session with all students participating as "officer" at least once.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

TASK 277: Stop vehicles to investigate, cite or arrest occupants

(1)

The instruction given along the lines of this topic was right on target with the mock traffic stops and arrests. The only thing that could be improved at the present is a wider variety of stop situations and allow each recruit to act out each situation.

TASK 282: Clock vehicle using radar

(1)

Since traffic is a large portion of police work and because most agencies use the radar instrument, I believe that to be trained and certified in the use of radar would be greatly beneficial to the new officer. I understand that the actual classroom instruction is not too lengthy and much of the certification requirements is based on time spent using the radar unit on patrol. If this could be taught near the end of the training program it could be completed after a short period of time working on the road. I have been working on patrol for one and a half years now and have yet to have been certified for radar. Working and other obligations often make it difficult to get to the training programs.

TASK 303: Visually estimate speed of vehicles

(1)

Since my department spends much of its time on park patrol on Oakland County Parks we are expected to enforce the posted spped limit of 15 MPH. We do not have radar and must rely on our vehicle speedometer. It is relatively easy to visually estimate whether an automobile is traveling at 15 MPH or 30 MPH. The problem that exists is whether a police officerf can legally judge the speed of a moving vehicle with out any mechanical assistance?
I have stopped vehicles that I judged were speeding. I based my estimate of speed on: (1) Trail of dust; (2) stones being tossed up by the tires; (3) the amount of bouncing the tires do as the vehicle travels over the gravel road; and, (4) sound. Yet, I have not issued a citation to anyone I stopped based on visual estimate. Each time the driver admitted to speeding at least 5 MPH over the posted limit. Is my method of determining the speed correct? Can a police officer issue a traffic citation bsed on visual estimation? How accurate is visual estimations? Are certain speeds easire to estimate than other speeds? What type of training is necessary in order to visually estimate speeds?

OTHER

TASK N/A: Stess - on and off the job

(1)

Stress today is at a all time high. More classes and job awareness programs would be helpful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Ammerman, Harry L. and Pratzner, Frank C. Performance Content for Job Training . Vol.2. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, March, 1977.

Bloom, B. S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives , cited by Lee J. Cronbach, "Course Improvement Through Evaluation". Curriculum and Evaluation , pp. 319-333. Edited by Arno A. Bellack and Herbert M. Kliebard. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Blum, Richard H. Police Selection . Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Cronbach, Lee J. "Course Improvement Through Evaluation". Curriculum and Evaluation , pp.319-333. Edited by Arno A. Bellack and Herbert M. Kliebard. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Earl, Howard H. Police recruit training Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Gammage, Allen Z. Police Training in the United States . Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1963.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "The Tyler Rationale". Curriculum and Evaluation , pp. 56-67. Edited by Arno A. Bellack and Herbert M. Kliebard. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Project STAR: Role Performance and the Criminal Justice System . Vol. II. Santa Cruz, California: Anderson - Davis Publishing Co., 1976.

Parker, Alfred E. Crime Fighter: August Vollmer . New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Roberg, R. Changing Police Role . San Jose, California: Justice Systems Development, Inc., 1976.

Saunders, Charles B., Jr. Upgrading the American Police . Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1970.

Seitzinger, Jack. An Evaluation of the Development and Implementation of a Systemic Analysis and Decision Making Model for Law Enforcement Training . Wayne State University, Ph.D., 1974.

Stake, Robert E. "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation". Curriculum and Evaluation , pp. 372-90. Edited by Arno A. Bellack and Herbert M. Kliebard. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

B. ARTICLES

Prien, Erich P., and Ronan, William W. "Job Analysis: A Review of Research Findings." Personnel Psychology , Vol.24, 1971, pp. 371-396.

Terman, Lewis M. "A Trial of Mental and Pedagogical Tests in a Civil Service Examination for Policemen and Firemen". Journal of Applied Psychology . (March 1917), pp.17-29.

C. STATE ACTS

Michigan. Michigan Law Enforcement Training Council Act No. 203 . Statutes . (1965).

D. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT

Bolinger, et.al. "Police Training Evaluation: A systemic approach." Toledo/Lucas County Criminal Justice Supervisory Council, 1975.

Kuhn, Bern J., et.al. "Composite Report of Administrative Procedures, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Program Development Study, A Report to the Michigan Law Emforcement Training Council", Grant #177 from U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of L.E.E.A., March, 1968.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council, "Michigan Patrol Officer Selection and Training Standards." State of Michigan, 1981.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council, "Statewide Job Analysis of the Police Patrol Officer Position." State of Michigan, 1979.

Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, Proceedings of the National Symposium on Job-Task Analysis in Criminal Justice . U.S. Government: Washington D.C., 1978.

E. UNPUBLISHED REPORTS AND PAPERS

Houghtaling, Timothy C. "A Review of the College Law Enforcement Pre-Employment Training Program in Michigan." Michigan State University, 1976.

Moore, Brian E. "Occupational Analysis for Human Resource Development: A Review of Utility of the Task Inventory," Research Report No, 25, ONR Contract No. N-00014-75-00616 with the University of Texas, 1976.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council, "Law Enforcement Training in the United States: A Survey of State Law Enforcement Training Commissions." State of Michigan, 1972.

Van Beveren, Leslie letter to Michigan Basic Police Academy Coordinators. October 19, 1983, MLEOTC, Lansing, Michigan.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council, "Project COSTER, Phase I Report", 1975.

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers' Training Council, Unpublished Staff Report, 1976.

Plog, Deborah M. "Assessment of Michigan's Basic Police Training System." State of Michigan, 1981.