

Field Training Officer Course (FTO)



**Texas Commission On Law Enforcement
Course Number 3702
Revised: September 2007**

(Change 1)

Hosted By



**Bexar County Constable's Office PCT#4
Constable Robert M. Blount**

Updated: 12/21/2013
Deputy Chief G.D. Little, C.C.P.S.
Sargent Mike Lacey



George D. Little, C.C.P.S. – TCOLE Advanced Certified Instructor

George D. Little has 43-years of diverse law enforcement experience, in which he has worked a myriad of assignments working literally in every aspect of law enforcement. He holds an Associate of Science Degree in Criminal Justice from Central Texas College, a Bachelor of Science in Occupational Education Criminology/Sociology from Wayland Baptist College and Associates of Science in Criminal Justice, a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice & Criminology and Master's degree in Criminology and Human Services and Counter-Terrorism from the University of the State of New York. In addition George received his Basic, Intermediate, Advanced and Masters (Peace Officer) Law Enforcement certifications from the Texas Commission On Law Enforcement (TCOLE). George is a retired U.S. Army Military Police (ABN) First Sergeant/E-8 who served his country from Vietnam through Desert Storm for 21-years of honorable service. During his active duty service George served as a Military Policeman (95BV5MXH3 MOS) Patrol, Traffic and Tactical operations. He is a former U.S. Army Criminal Investigations Division (CID) Special Agent and Section Chief Military Police Investigations (MPI). George worked as an under-cover Drug and Narcotics investigator with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (D.E.A.) overseas European operations. He is an experienced veteran Physical Security and Crime Prevention specialist with expertise in Force Protection, and Counter-Terrorism, in addition to being a MP Special Operations Operator (Counter-Terrorism for 1988 Olympics in Seoul South Korea) and a former Military Police School Drill Sergeant and Master Instructor. George served as a Deputy Provost Marshal USFK Area II, South Korea and as a First Sergeant for several MP units ending his military career as the Operations Sergeant (NCOIC) for the U.S. Army Joint Counter Drug Operations Element (JCOE) providing federal, state and local military assistance for an 8-state area of responsibility. He retired from the Bexar County Sheriff's Office San Antonio, Texas (2008) where he was a Deputy Sheriff, School Resource Officer and the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) Coordinator for Bexar County and was the 2004 National D.A.R.E. Officer-Of-The-Year (and former D.A.R.E. America- Texas D.A.R.E. State Coordinator). George has over 20 years veteran experience working in a school district environment. He has authored and co-authored numerous articles on Counter Terrorism and Law Enforcement serving as a college adjunct professor teaching criminal justice and counter-terrorism undergraduate courses. He has a passion for teaching; in addition to being a Texas Certified Crime Prevention Specialist (C.C.P.S.). George is the former Director of Institute for Criminal Justice Studies (ICJS) – Texas State University where he developed the first comprehensive School-Based Law Enforcement Officer (SBLE) holistic certified training program, a state-wide TCOLE certified Crime Prevention certification curriculum; as well as authored, researched and developed numerous state-of-the art, scientific and researched-based, "Best Practices" specialized law enforcement curriculums. He is currently the Deputy Chief for INTEL, Homeland Security and Training for the Bexar County Constable Office, PCT#4. George was the 2011 TCOLE Professional Achievement Award recipient, and has received numerous U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration Awards and recognitions; recipient of the Federal Bureau of Investigation - Directors Community Leadership Award; and American Society for Industrial Security – Business Crime Council Award. George is an appointed member of the U.S. Department of Justice – National Institute of Justice Technical Working Group for School Safety in addition to being a certified Honorary Tennessee and Kentucky Colonel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Purpose	iv
History	v
Learning Objectives	vi - viii
Unit 1 Training Methodology and Teaching Technique	1
1.1 Definition of a Learner (Adult vs. Youth	1
1.2 Learning Styles	3
1.3 Situational Leadership Model	3
1.4 Managerial Grid Leadership Model	6
1.5 Communication Process	7
1.6 Barriers to Communication	8
Unit 2 Counseling	10
2.1 What is counseling?	10
2.2 Approaches to counseling	11
2.3 Counseling procedures	12
2.4 Conducting counseling sessions	13
2.5 Characteristics of a counselor	13
2.6 Improving counseling techniques	13
Unit 3 Evaluation Process	15
3.1 Importance of standardized evaluation process	15
3.2 Reliability & Validity	15
3.3 Rating Errors	16
3.4 Standardized Evaluation Guidelines (SEG)	17
3.5 Scenarios & Role Play	22
3.6 Do (s) & Don't (s) of Scenario Training	23
3.7 Reality Base Training	23
Unit 4 Documentation	25
4.1 Seven Affirmative Links to Civil Liability	25
4.2 Qualified Immunity	25
4.3 Training Evaluation Reports	26
4.4 Subjective vs. Objective documents	27
4.5 Elements of documentation	28
4.6 Confidentiality of documents	28
4.7 Remedial Training Process	29
4.8 Release from Field Training Program	32
Appendix I (Synopsis of Case Laws)	34
Appendix II (Sample Evaluation Reports)	51
Resources	93
Reference Materials	94

Acknowledgement

Whether the student is a peace officer, jailer/corrections officer, telecommunication officer or a public safety officer the process for training and evaluating newly hired employees is invariable. The Field Training Officer (FTO) Course is written for all disciplines in law enforcement regardless of the agency size.

The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) and the following contributors developed this course for presentation to the Texas law enforcement community.

Lieutenant Gary Clark, Killeen Police Department, Chairman
Sergeant Al A. Baker, Houston Police Department
Sergeant Patrick Boone, Killeen Police Department
Detective Richard Buchanan, Bexar County Sheriff's Office
Sergeant Michael Davenport, Hays County Sheriff's Office
Lieutenant Eric Gilbert, Texas Department of Public Safety
Mr. Mike Gomez Jr., Texas Municipal Police Association
Mr. Jim Koca, Concho Valley Council of Governments
Sergeant Dustin Lee, Austin Police Department (Non-Voting)
Sergeant Andrew Michael, Austin Police Department
Lieutenant Steven Mida, San Angelo Police Department
Lieutenant Rick Pippins, Odessa Police Department
Janice M. Robert-Washington, Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
Captain Mark Schauer, Corpus Christi Police Department
Sergeant Kary Shaffer, Texas A&M Police Department
Lieutenant Jonathan Timpf, Irving Police Department
Lieutenant Richard Whitehead, Travis County Sheriff's Office
Deputy Chief George D. Little, C.C.P.S., , Bexar County Constable's Office
PCT#4
Captain Arthur Neal Burford - , Bexar County Constable's Office PCT#4
Deputy Constable Roland Berg, Bexar County Constable's Office PCT#4

Abstract

This course teaches instructors how to provide supervised field training for new recruits in any law enforcement discipline. The goal is to transition the recruit from a classroom setting to an actual hands-on assignment. The course includes training in instructional techniques, coaching and evaluation, remedial training and record keeping.

The course is designed to provide training guidance and training aspects to future Field Training Officers in the area of law enforcement, including peace officers, jailers, telecommunication operators, correction officers, public service officers, etc.

This course also introduces and teaches the student the History and Purpose of Field Training, Training Methodologies and Techniques, Counseling, the Evaluation Process, and the importance of Documentation. Each student must demonstrate (evaluated at the end of the course) the basic knowledge required to effectively apply all applications of the training.

Note to the Training Providers:

The TCLEOSE curriculum for the Field Training Officer Course (FTO) is the instructor's resources guide. A ***PowerPoint presentation, sample test questions and DVD videos (visual aid) are available upon request.*** Instructors do have the option to use additional training material in presenting this course. The incorporation of scenarios and role-play is highly recommended to facilitate learning the material. In this text "he/his" is not gender specific.

It is the responsibility of the training provider to ensure individual copies of the course are current. This may be done by checking the website at www.tcleose.state.tx.us.

If an individual attends the FTO course, they can not apply for the TCLEOSE Basic Instructor Proficiency unless they attend a Basic Instructor Course.

Target Populations: Personnel working in any area of law enforcement

Pre-Requisites: None

Length of Course: Minimum of 24 hours required

Instructional Material: Computer, projector, VCR, TCLEOSE Curriculum, PowerPoint Presentation, end-of-course exam w/answer key, and any appropriate student handout.

Certification

Requirements: Must hold a minimum of a Basic Proficiency Certification

Facility Requirements: Standard classroom environment

Evaluation Process and Procedures: Classroom interaction with instructor and other students, scenarios, role-play, post-examination and end-of-course critique.

Purpose

The 59th Texas Legislature legally established TCLEOSE in 1965 with funding for the commission appropriated two years later. Its current mission is “to ensure a Texas where people are served by highly trained and ethical law enforcement and corrections personnel through screening, developing, and monitoring resources and setting standards.” TCLEOSE adopted numerous rules and has mandated numerous training classes with the salient goal being enhanced professionalism and effectiveness of criminal justice occupations. The result of requiring each Field Training Officer (FTO) to attend a mandatory “Field Training Officer Course” is to provide the individual with teaching and supervisory skills necessary to assist the new employee in making a successful transition from classroom instruction to field work.

Academic courses are required for TCLEOSE-regulated occupations. However, a natural progression of learning is to ensure that academic principles are properly applied in the field. Properly administered field-training programs ensure that law enforcement and corrections professionalism continues to evolve. A well-trained FTO, operating within a functional field-training program, has a better chance of teaching a new employee how to successfully apply classroom knowledge in a “real-life, real-time” environment.

An FTO who learns different training and teaching methods and supervisory principles is more likely to recognize an employee whose performance is substandard and will take steps necessary to either provide remedial training or document unsatisfactory performance for termination from the program. Another goal is to provide standardized training within an agency so all affected new employees are exposed to the procedures most important to that agency.

History

The first recognized Field Training Program was established, in San Jose, California, in 1972. It originated as a direct consequence of a 1970 traffic accident in which a passenger in the other vehicle was killed and the recruit seriously injured. The City of San Jose fired the recruit. However, a review of the officer's personnel file demonstrated serious deficiencies in both training and evaluation procedures. (Field Training for Police Officer: State of the Art, Michael S. McCampell, National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief, November 1986.) Contemporary FTO Programs follow the San Jose model (in part or in whole), although the National Institute of Justice advocates the "Police Training Officer" (PTO) model that was initially tested in Reno, Nevada. This program teaches more problem solving skills than are required in a traditional community-policing environment.

Although all large and medium-sized law enforcement agencies within Texas administer some type of formal field training program for officers, jailers, corrections and emergency telecommunication operators some smaller agencies do not. The new TCLEOSE policy seeks to remedy this and ensure that all Field Training Officers (FTO) are taught basic teaching and supervisory principles. An FTO has a tremendous impact on a new employee's development and the professionalism of these criminal justice occupations cannot continue to improve without functional field training programs. Enhanced professionalism, job skills and ethical standards are direct results of good field training programs.

The Field Training Officer (FTO) curriculum was revised by TCLEOSE in 2007 to provide a model curriculum to help law enforcement agencies establish a functional field training program for training peace officers, jailers, corrections, emergency telecommunication operators, public safety officers, etc. in field applications of learned knowledge. The ultimate goal is to develop a well-trained employee who will successfully and ethically apply classroom knowledge to field applications.

The FTO curriculum stresses training methods and teaching techniques, the evaluation process and the importance of documentation. It is important that an FTO possess leadership and communication skills, emotional intelligence and supervisory skills. These skills are paramount for an FTO to possess regardless of whether the FTO's agency employs several, or several thousand, law enforcement personnel.

The FTO curriculum is designed to develop excellent teaching skills while allowing each agency to design its own training program for the various disciplines (peace officers, jailer, corrections, emergency telecommunication operators, public safety offices, etc.). Each agency should design its own standardized field training program model in which new employees are trained and evaluated during the field-training program.

- 1.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to the different learning styles, theories of leadership, teaching techniques and the communication process. The student will demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of the different training methodologies.
- 1.1 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to define learner and classify characteristics of youth and adult learners.
- 1.2. **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list and explain the three learning styles.
- 1.3 **Learning objective:** Given characteristics of a particular learner the student will in each case identify the learner developmental level and the appropriate leadership style according to the Situational Leadership Model.
- 1.4 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list the four leadership styles of the Managerial Grid Leadership Model and classify the characteristics of each.
- 1.5 **Learning objective:** Given the characteristics of a particular step in the communication process, the student could be asked to list the steps in the communication process
- 1.6 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to identify the barriers to communication.
- 2.0 **Functional Area:** The student will be able to describe and define the various aspects and techniques involved in being an effective counselor.
- 2.1 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to define counseling and identify the roles of an FTO as a counselor.
- 2.2 **Learning objective:** Given the description of one of the three approaches to counseling, the student could be asked to identify the approach in each case.
- 2.3 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to describe the counseling procedures.
- 2.4 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list the two factors that should be considered when conducting a counseling session.
- 2.5 **Learning Objective:** Given a list of characteristics of a counselor, the student could be asked to identify at least three characteristics.
- 2.6 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list three of the 16 ways to improve your counseling.

- 3.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to the evaluation process which includes grading errors, standardized evaluation guidelines and practical application communication skills. The student will be able to demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of the evaluation process.
- 3.1 **Learning Objective:** Describe and list the importance of standardized evaluation process.
- 3.2 **Learning Objectives:** Given examples of reliability and validity as it relates to grading errors, the student could be asked to distinguish and explain which applies in each case
- 3.3 **Learning objective:** In a given situation the student could be asked to evaluate the given information and name the type of grading error illustrated.
- 3.4 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to describe and list the importance of standardized evaluation guidelines.
- 3.5 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to describe the purpose and importance of scenarios and role playing.
- 3.6 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list some of the do(s) and don'ts in scenario training.
- 3.7 **Learning Objectives:** The student could be asked to list the benefits and some of the steps in reality based training.
- 4.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to why documentation of training information is important. The student will demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of civil liability, validity of documentation, the remedial training process and release from the training program.
- 4.1 **Learning Objective:** Given the definition of any one of the seven affirmative links to liability, the student could be asked to name the affirmative link to civil liability in each case.
- 4.2 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to explain qualified immunity.
- 4.3 **Learning Objective:** List and describe the three types of evaluation reports and/or forms commonly used in documenting recruit training.
- 4.4 **Learning objective:** Given a statement relating to a recruit performance, the student could be asked to analyze a statement and label it as objective or subjective in each case.
- 4.5 **Learning objective:** After observing a training opportunity, the student could be asked to write objective documentation of the training opportunity using the six elements of documentation.

- 4.6 **Learning objective:** When handling documentation of recruits in the field training program, the student could be asked to interpret policy and instructions for confidentiality and disclose those documents accordingly.
- 4.7 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to describe the purpose and identify the steps in the remedial training process
- 4.8 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list the two methods a recruit may be released from the training program and categorize the reasons or circumstances for each.

Unit One
Training Methodology & Teaching Techniques

1.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to the different learning styles, theories of leadership, teaching techniques and the communication process. The student will demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of the different training methodologies.

1.1 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to define learner and classify characteristics of youth and adult learners.

A. Definition of Learner

1. Someone who increases skills, knowledge and sensitiveness.
2. This is brought about through:
 - a. purposeful education or training effort on the part of the learner,
 - b. purposeful educational effort on the part of the educator or trainer and,
 - c. a by-product of a random activity.
3. While learning a person is shaped and led by the instructor and the material (standards).
4. Learning is a process of discovery. All learners learn best when “learning by doing” and when instructors utilize interactive procedures.
5. Learning is most effective when organized around life problems, when the experience of the learner is taken into account and when the normal stages of human development are considered in the design of curriculum and implementation of instruction.
6. Every learner wants to be able to indicate his own readiness to learn to the instructor.

B. Adults as Learners

1. Part of being an effective instructor involves understanding how adults learn best.
2. Adults have special needs and requirements, compared to children and teens, as learners.
3. Adult learning is a relatively new area of study.
4. Malcolm Knowles pioneered the field of adult learning. He identified the following characteristics of adult learners:
 - a. Adults are autonomous and self-directed. They need to be free to direct themselves. Instructors must actively involve adults in the learning process and serve as facilitators for them.
 - b. Adults have accumulated a foundation of life experiences and knowledge that may include work-related activities, family responsibilities, and previous education.

- c. They need to connect learning to this knowledge/experience base. Instructors should draw out adults' experience and knowledge, relevant to the topic, to help them.
- d. Instructors must relate theories and concepts to adults and recognize the value of experience in learning.
- e. Adults are goal-oriented. Upon enrolling in a course, they usually know the goal they want to attain. Therefore, they appreciate an educational program that is organized and has clearly defined elements. Instructors must show adults how this class will help attain their goals. This classification of goals and course objectives must be done early in the course.
- f. Adults are relevancy-oriented. They must see a reason for learning something. Learning has to be applicable to their work, or other responsibilities, to be of value to them. Therefore, instructors must identify objectives for adults before the course begins. This means that theories and concepts must be related to a familiar setting. Letting adults choose projects that reflect their own interests can fulfill this need.
- g. Adults are practical. They focus on the aspects of a lesson most useful to them in their work. They may not be interested in knowledge for its own sake. Instructors must tell participants explicitly how the lesson will be useful to them on the job.
- h. As with all learners, adults need to be shown respect. Instructors must acknowledge the wealth of experiences that adult participants bring to the classroom. These adults should be treated as equals in experience and knowledge and allowed to voice their opinions freely in class.

C. Differences between Adult and Youth Learners

1. Youth Learners

- a. Youth learners are dependent on the structure of the teaching process and depend heavily upon the instructor or other authority figures.
- b. Youth learners are just beginning to develop a self-concept that defines them as individuals. Throughout adolescence they continue to define themselves in terms of external influences and are peer oriented.

2. Adult Learners

- a. Adult learners are more self-directed and need to be independent.
- b. Since adults define themselves more in terms of their life experiences than youths, they expect their experiences to be respected and considered by the instructor in the learning process.
- c. The adult's self concept has changed dramatically since adolescence so resistance and resentment may occur if an adult is not permitted to function as an adult during the learning process.

1.2 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list and explain the three learning styles.

A. Auditory (Hearing)

1. Auditory learners learn best by hearing the lesson or instruction.
2. Auditory learners interpret the message by listening to the tone of voice, pitch, speed and other nuances.
3. Auditory learners may read aloud and use a tape recorder.
4. Auditory learners may sit where they can hear but need not pay attention to what is happening in front of them.
5. Auditory learners may not coordinate colors or clothes but can explain why they are wearing what they are wearing. They may hum or talk to themselves or others when bored.

B. Visual (Seeing)

1. Visual learners need to see what is being taught and will usually sit in the front.
2. To fully understand the lesson, visual learners will also watch the body language and facial expression of the instructor.
3. As the instructor speaks visual learners may build pictures in their mind. They learn best from visual displays (diagrams, illustrated text books, overhead transparencies, videos, flipcharts and hand-outs).
4. Visual learners will take detailed notes from a lecture or discussion to absorb the information clearly.
5. They are attracted to written or spoken language rich in imagery and prefer stimuli to be isolated from auditory and kinesthetic distraction.

C. Kinesthetic (Doing)

1. Kinesthetic, or tactile, learners prefer a hands-on approach and will learn best by doing the activity or lesson.
2. Kinesthetic learners may find it hard to sit still for long periods and may become distracted by their need for activity and exploration.
3. Kinesthetic learners need to be active and take frequent breaks.
4. Kinesthetic learners speak with their hands and gestures and enjoy field trips or tasks that involve manipulating materials.

1.3 **Learning Objectives:** Given characteristics of a particular learner the student will in each case identify the learner developmental level and the appropriate leadership style according to the Situational Leadership Model.

A. The Situational Leadership Model Learner Development Levels

1. Low Competence/High Commitment, "The Enthusiastic Beginner"
 - a. Telling & Directing

- b. Decision are made by the leader and announced, so communication is largely one-way.
 - c. This learner is enthusiastic and excited about the job and new opportunity, but lacks the technical skill and experience to properly perform the tasks required.
 - 2. Some Competence/Low commitment, “The Disillusioned Learner”
 - a. Selling & Coaching
 - b. Decisions remain the leader’s prerogative, but communication is much much more two-way
 - c. This learner has gained some competence in the job, has developed rudimentary skills through training and has acquired some experience.
 - b. This learner also has gained a better understanding of the enormity of the tasks required and may at times feel overwhelmed and inadequate to the task.
 - 3. High Competence/Variable Commitment, “The Emerging Contributor”
 - a. Participating & Supporting
 - b. Leader facilitates and takes part in the decision, but control is with the follower.
 - c. This learner has gained a great deal of experience and technical skill, but may lack the confidence to perform all tasks required, all the time, all alone.
 - 4. High Competence/High Commitment, “The Peak Performer”
 - a. Delegating
 - b. Leader is still involved in decisions and problem-solving, but control is with the follower.
 - c. This learner has experience at the job and is comfortable with their own ability to do it well and may be more skilled than the leader
- B. Leadership Styles
 - 1. Directing Leader, “You’ll do it, I’ll Decide”
 - a. Directing Leaders define the roles and tasks of the learner and supervises them closely.
 - b. Decisions are made by the leader, so communication with the learner learner is largely one-way.
 - 2. Coaching Leader, “You’ll do it, We’ll discuss it, I’ll decide”
 - a. Coaching Leaders still define roles and tasks, but solicits ideas and ideas suggestions from the learner.
 - b. Decisions are still made by the leader, but communication is much more a two-way exchange with the learner to foster trust and build the learner’s confidence.

3. Supporting Leader, "You'll do it, We'll discuss it, You decide"
 - a. Supporting Leaders will delegate routine day-to-day decisions, such as task allocation and processes, to the learner.
 - b. The leader facilitates and takes part in decisions, but control and responsibility is given to the learner.
 4. Delegating Leader, "You'll do it, You Decide"
 - a. Delegating Leaders are still involved in decisions and problem-solving in the role of advisor.
 - b. Control of task allocation and processes has been delegated to the learner.
 - c. The learner, having reached a high level of competence and confidence, decides when and how the leader will be involved.
- C. Leadership/Learner Style Development Matching
1. Correspond leadership style to learner development
 - a. To get the most out of the learner at each development level and propel the learner forward to peak performance, the leader must match the correct leadership style with the learner's development level.
 - b. Failure to properly match leadership style with learner development may result is arrested development of the learner, wasted time, wasted money, and possibly the loss of a good employee.
 2. Leader must adapt to development level of learner
 - a. It is vitally important that the leader understands that it is he, not the learner that must adapt his style to the situation.
 - b. Because this is true and to get the most of situational leadership, a leader should be trained in how to operate effectively in various leadership styles.
 - c. In addition, the leader must be able to accurately determine the development level of the learner in order to successfully adapt his leadership style.
 - d. Situation will dictate adaptation
 - e. The leader must recognize that even a correct initial assessment of the learner's development level and thus the leadership style utilized, will not remain applicable as the situation changes.
 - f. As the learner progresses through each level of development the leader will adapt his style to the changing situation.

1.4 **Learning objective:** The student could be asked to list the five leadership styles of the Managerial Grid Leadership Model and classify the characteristics of each.

A. Managerial Grid Leadership Model

1. The Impoverished Style
 - a. Low concern for people
 - b. Low concern for organization
 - c. Both people and organizational needs are subordinated to his own need for self preservation
 - d. Manager avoids responsibility and works to preserve the status quo, particularly his own
2. The Country Club Style
 - a. High concern for people
 - b. Low concern for the organization
 - c. Has high hopes of increasing production through popularity
 - d. Managers focus on security and comfort of employees in order to increase production, resulting in a friendly, but not necessarily productive atmosphere
3. The Produce or Perish Style
 - a. Low concern for people
 - b. High concern for organization
 - c. This highly dictatorial leadership style is not uncommon during the management of a crisis, but has little or no value otherwise.
 - d. Real or perceived survival of the organization is paramount, while employee needs are unimportant or irrelevant
 - e. Managers dictate to employees who are placed under pressure from strict rules and threat of punishment to achieve goals.
4. The Middle of the Road Style
 - a. Leaders try to balance between concern for people and concern for the organization thereby striking a “happy medium,”
 - b. Managers hope to achieve acceptable, not exemplary performance from employees, likely resulting in acceptable, not outstanding production
 - c. Mediocrity and ambivalence are the rules, not the exception
5. The Team Style
 - a. High concern for people
 - b. High concern for organization
 - c. Leaders using this style encourage teamwork and foster commitment and loyalty to organization among people in order to improve employee morale and increase production

1.5 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to list and describe the four steps in the communication process

A. Sender

1. Communication starts with a sender.
2. The sender formulates ideas into a message intended to draw out response from the receiver.
3. In the “encoding” stage the sender puts the message into a format that the receiver can recognize and understand.
4. The sender encodes the message using language, words, pictures, actions, symbols and events that are meaningful to the receiver.
5. In interpersonal communication the message can take the form of written, verbal and nonverbal communication.
6. In marketing communication, the encoded message can take the form of brand messages, advertisements, press releases, signage and sales scripts.

B. Message

1. “It is not what you say, but how you say it.”
2. At this stage it is important to understand the degree to which nonverbal communication affects relationships.
3. In *Applying Psychology*, Andrew DuBrin defines nonverbal communication as “the transmission of messages through means other than words.” DuBrin describes nonverbal communication as a “silent message” that accompanies verbal messages but also stands alone. Nonverbal communication conveys the feeling behind a message and is typically seen in a person’s posture, facial expressions, appearance, vocal inflections, the interpersonal distance between the communicators and the environment. Cross-cultural differences can also affect nonverbal communication. Research consistently shows that at least half of all meaning is transmitted nonverbally. One classic study by Albert Merhabian and M. Weiner concludes that 93% of all communication is nonverbal. In their analysis, Merhabian and Weiner focus on only three elements of communication: words, voice tone, and facial expressions. However, their study helps to dramatize the importance of understanding the role of nonverbal communication in establishing effective relationships.

C. Receiver

1. In the “decoding” stage the receiver examines and puts the message into a format that the receiver can interpret in order to understand and assign some type of meaning to the message. Successful communication takes place when the receiver correctly interprets the sender's message.

2. The message is meant primarily for the receiver but is also for anyone who is exposed to a message. The extent to which this other person comprehends the message will depend on a number of factors:
 - a. how much the individual or individuals know about the topic,
 - b. their receptivity to the message and,
 - c. the relationship and trust that exists between sender and receiver.
3. All interpretation by the receiver is influenced by his experience, attitude, knowledge, skill, perception, and culture.

D. Feedback

1. Feedback is the manner and degree to which a receiver responds to the message.
2. Feedback is an essential step for transitioning from a one-way communication to a two-way approach that can strengthen the connection between sender and receiver.
3. By soliciting and properly decoding feedback, a sender can understand if and how the message was received and to what degree it was effective. This allows the sender an opportunity to adjust the message to better match the receiver's needs.
4. In a marketing communications environment, feedback also helps the sender determine if the message touched the intended targets. Soliciting and properly interpreting feedback are vital steps to measuring the effectiveness of marketing communications activities.

1.6 **Learning Objective**: The student could be asked to identify the barriers to communication

A. Barriers to successful communication

1. Information sent is not necessarily the information received.
2. All communication takes place in environments containing distractions that hinder successful communications. If not addressed and minimized, this "noise" can severely hinder successful communication.
3. In interpersonal communications, common sources of noise include: other conversations, ringing telephones, blasting boom boxes, traffic and crying children.
4. Nonverbal and environmental elements can also contribute to physical noise. For example, the layout of an office, flashing fluorescents lights, hand gestures and vocal intonations can add to or detract from successful interpersonal communication.
5. Psychological barriers also create noise that can hinder communication. Once a message passes physical barriers it must filter through the receiver's personal perceptions. The receiver will attempt to interpret the message in a manner that is consistent with his field of experience. A person's field of experience acts as a codebook by which he decodes the symbols that compose a message.

Since field of experience is unique to each individual, psychological barriers cause frequent disconnects between a sender's intention and the receiver's comprehension. For successful communication, the sender and receiver need to share a common understanding of the symbols the receiver used to encode the message.

6. Communication is difficult because at each step in the process there is a potential for error. By the time a message gets from a sender to a receiver there are four basic places where transmission errors can take place. At each place there are a multitude of potential sources of error. Thus, it is no surprise that social psychologists estimate there is typically a 40-60% loss of meaning in the transmission of messages from sender to receiver.
7. Other common barriers to successful communication include: semantics, nonverbal communication, ambiguity and defensiveness.

Unit Two Counseling

2.0 **Functional Area:** The student will be able to describe and define the various aspects and techniques involved in being an effective counselor.

2.1 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to define counseling and identify the roles of an FTO as a counselor.

A. What is counseling?

1. Counseling can best be described as a face-to-face encounter between two people. It is during this encounter the counselor provides a learning situation in which the counselee is helped to:
 - a. acquire information,
 - b. understand his abilities, strengths, and weaknesses and
 - c. clarify options or alternatives that may help solve their problem.

B. Field Training Officer role as a counselor

1. In the role of a counselor the FTO must be able to combine teaching skills with leadership abilities.
2. Effective counseling offers each recruit an opportunity to grow.
3. Ineffective counseling is one of the biggest reasons for failure to retain quality employees.

C. Recognize the need for counseling

1. Not every recruit will ask for help. Therefore, the FTO must be able to recognize signs that indicate the recruit needs help with a problem.
2. Daily contact with the recruit puts the FTO in the position to detect danger signals.
3. Some indicators to look for are:
 - a. a good performer suddenly performs below par
 - b. a normally attentive recruit suddenly displays a lack of attentiveness or concentration,
 - c. a recruit performs deliberate acts of misconduct, refuses to follow instructions or orders,
 - d. a normally outgoing recruit becomes withdrawn and a loner and/or,
 - e. a recruit lingers after a meeting to talk.
4. Leaders who are unaware of such signals can delude themselves into thinking all is well when, in fact, the recruit is in need of help.

D. Types of counseling

1. Performance counseling can:
 - a. be used to assist in improving the job performance of the recruit,
 - b. be used to maintain a level of performance that already exists,
 - c. reinforce behavior that meets agency standards,
 - d. change behavior that is unacceptable,
 - e. provide the recruit with feedback regarding his performance and
 - f. utilize feedback to help correct a minor problem before it becomes a major one.
2. Aspects of personal counseling include:
 - a. used to help a recruit reach solutions to personal problems;
 - b. problems may involve:
 1. job assignment,
 2. financial problems and/or
 3. family problems;
 - c. can involve any problem involving the recruit's well-being;
 - d. the FTO must always be aware of his limitations;
 - e. the information or expertise required will be beyond what the FTO can handle;
 - f. the FTO must know who to recommend to the recruit that can solve the recruit's problem.

2.2 **Learning Objective**: Given the description of one of the three approaches to counseling, the student could be asked to identify the approach in each case.

A. Approaches to counseling:

- Successful counseling calls for the sensitive and flexible use of a variety of interview techniques.
- The FTO's objective is to influence the course of the interview so that the recruit is motivated to participate in a way most likely to bring about understanding by both parties.
- There will be times when the FTO will have to start with one approach and then move into the other.

B. Direct approach:

1. The FTO may give advice or make certain decisions for the recruit that is beyond the scope of knowledge or authority of the recruit.
2. The FTO's decision to use the direct approach is best made based on where the information necessary to solve the problem is located. If the information is found in policy, SOP's or other material the direct approach should be used. In using this method the FTO may have to point out where the information is, and how to find it, and then direct the recruit.

C. Non-direct approach:

1. This approach should be used if the problem is personal in nature. The FTO should help the recruit examine the problem logically so a feasible solution can be reached.
2. The non-direct counselor must be a GOOD LISTENER. The FTO must guide the recruit without making the decision for him.

D. Eclectic (combined) approach:

1. The eclectic approach is a combination of the direct and non direct approaches. The decision to use the eclectic approach is based on the recruit and the type of problem.

2.3 **Learning Objective**: The student could be asked to describe the counseling procedures.

A. Counseling procedures:

1. Preparation is the key to a successful counseling session.
2. The preparation of a formal counseling session entails five basic steps:
 - a. advanced notice,
 - b. selection of the site,
 - c. schedule of time,
 - d. general outline and
 - e. general atmosphere.
3. Formal counseling sessions are not always possible, so the FTO must provide on-the-spot correction, or give information, that will correct problem immediately.
4. This type of solution is usually short term and may require a follow-up session.

2.4 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to list the two factors that should be considered when conducting a counseling session.

A. Conducting a counseling session:

1. The FTO must establish rapport by:
 - a. attempting to relieve any tensions,
 - b. making sure the recruit feels at ease,
 - c. showing acceptance,
 - d. making sure the recruit feels that his views are important,
 - e. showing interest in what the recruit has to say,
 - f. explaining the purpose of the session,
 - g. encouraging questions and comments,
 - h. establishing facts, by guiding the interview in a tactful and inconspicuous manner, to determine what the recruit thinks his job is and,
 - i. listening and defining, determining and finding a solution.
2. The FTO must remember it is more useful to present solutions, and points for improvement, than to labor on deficiencies.

2.5 **Learning Objective:** Given a list of characteristics of a counselor, the student could be asked to identify at least three characteristics.

A. Characteristics of a counselor include:

1. being approachable,
2. being observant,
3. having the ability to communicate,
4. having flexible control and
5. having an awareness of limitations for improvement, than to labor on deficiencies.

2.6 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to list three or more of the 16 ways to improve your counseling.

A. Ways to improve counseling techniques include:

1. avoiding drawing conclusions from a statement made by the recruit,
2. trying to understand what the recruit is saying or feeling,
3. asking questions only when the information is needed,
4. keeping the conversation flowing by not interrupting,
5. not feeling you have to save the recruit from hurting,

6. refraining from being judgmental,
7. encouraging the recruit to take the initiative and say what they want to say,
8. refraining from interrogating the recruit,
9. keeping the FTO's personal experiences out of the conversation unless there is a belief it will help
10. remembering the recruit has the problem,
11. getting a commitment for another session, if necessary,
12. not taking sides,
13. keeping alert,
14. not confirming the recruit's prejudice,
15. helping the recruit help himself and
16. trying to find out what the recruit has done to resolve the problem, at the beginning of the counseling session, to gain knowledge of a possible starting point.

Unit Three
Evaluation Process

- 3.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to the evaluation process which includes grading errors, standardized evaluation guidelines and practical application communication skills. The student will be able to demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of the evaluation process.
- 3.1 **Learning Objective:** Describe the importance of a standardize evaluation process
- A. Importance of the evaluation process:
1. The frequency in which FTOs complete personnel evaluations on new employees depends on each agency's policy. Some agencies require daily evaluations to be completed on recruit throughout an FTO program.
 2. Evaluations help measure and track a new recruit's progress and they provide important documentation for litigation protection, remedial training design and for termination of probationary status.
 3. Daily evaluations ensure that an FTO continually gives feedback to a new employee, and providing it in written form helps lessen communication errors between the FTO and recruit.
 4. Although objectivity is sought, some subjectivity is inherent in most grading systems. Clearly defined evaluation guidelines must describe each rating category and provide examples of situations that most closely match the grade to be given.
 5. Training the FTO on each agency's evaluation system is paramount to making the grading and feedback system functional.
 6. FTO's and supervisors must recognize common grading errors because both the agency and the new employee will be shortchanged if grades do not accurately represent the employee's training progress. All criteria used to measure performance must be both "reliable" and "valid".
- 3.2 **Learning Objectives:** Given examples of reliability and validity as it relates to grading errors, the student could be asked to distinguish and explain which applies in each case
- A. Reliability:
1. Reliability means that the evaluation guidelines used to describe work behavior are accurately described so that an FTO can use them to consistently describe a recruit's behavior.
 2. An FTO grading a recruit who exhibits similar behavior will evaluate the recruit in a comparable, consistent manner.

3. Different FTOs must be able to apply the evaluation guidelines to an array of recruits and administer similar grades for similar performances.

B. Validity:

1. Validity means that the evaluation guidelines and evaluation documents measure what they are supposed to measure regarding an employee's work performance in a specific category.
2. Well-written guidelines will give specific descriptions of performances that are directly linked to the behavior being rated.

3.3 **Learning Objectives**: In a given situation, the student could be asked to evaluate the given information and name the type of rating error illustrated.

A. Most common rating errors:

1. Halo Effect:
 - a. The FTO gives the recruit scores on all dimensions based on behavior exhibited within a single dimension because he believes that this dimension is more important than all the others.
 - b. This error affects the other grades either positively or negatively and the evaluation guidelines are not properly followed.
2. "Recency" problem:
 - a. The FTO scores the recruit on a recent positive or negative event that overshadows all other events during the grading period.
3. Rater Bias:
 - a. Perhaps the most difficult error to overcome because it describes a personal bias an FTO may possess which affects how the recruit is graded.
 - b. Biases are not necessarily "evil" intentions such as racial prejudice or dislike for religious convictions. Biases that carry over to affecting the recruit's grades mean the evaluation guidelines are not followed and the recruit's progress is not being accurately reflected. A bias can also result in the recruit receiving grades that are higher than those deserved because the FTO has a positive bias for that person which is not related to job performance.
4. Constant Error Problem:
 - a. FTOs sometimes tend to give grades that are consistently harsher, more lenient or always "right down the middle" instead of applying the guidelines to specific behavior.
 - b. A recruit who is transferred from a lenient FTO to a harsh FTO will experience an unpleasant shock when receiving the harsh FTO's evaluation. This can be avoided by carefully following written guidelines that link specific behavior to specific grades.

5. Unclear Standards

- a. If written guidelines are not specific enough, or there are none, then the FTO will grade using his own personal standard.
- b. If guidelines do not provide a description of each grade category then the FTO is left to “read between the lines” and create personal categories.
- c. When an evaluation form consists of six grade choices for each dimension but the written guidelines only describes the lowest, middle and highest scores the ratings that fall in between are very subjective. The FTO’s individual interpretation has to fill in the gaps.

B. Training FTOs and supervisors to use evaluation guidelines:

1. A responsibility of the field training coordinator is making written evaluation guidelines available to FTOs and any supervisors who review them (print or electronic format).
2. A training session for both new FTOs and new field supervisors, at the beginning of a recruit’s field training, will assist in reducing subjective interpretations of the guidelines. The field training coordinator ensures that the guidelines are followed and that rating errors are recognized and corrected.

3.4 **Learning Objective**: The student could be asked to describe and list the importance of standardized evaluation guidelines.

A. Standardized Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs):

1. Training Evaluations:

- a. An evaluation is a systematic method of comparing observed performance to an established standard.
- b. During the field training process recruits must be guided, directed and made aware of their progress through written evaluations.
- c. Written evaluations can include Daily Observation Reports (DOR), Supplemental Daily Observation Reports (S/DOR), Weekly Coordinator Reports (WCR) and Phase Summary Reports (PSR).
- d. The DOR is the most crucial of the written evaluations.
- e. These evaluations must be consistent, objective and administered in a manner that promotes good performance and progress throughout the program.
- f. The learning goals and performance objectives in the field training manual, the judgment used by the probationary officer and the skills, knowledge, and competency demonstrated in performing the job-related duties of a patrol officer will serve as the basis for these evaluations.

2. The Evaluation Process

- a. Each recruit should be evaluated in a number of categories that, when taken together, reflect the totality of the job for which the recruit was hired).
 - b. When possible these categories should be rooted in a “job task analysis” that has been completed specifically for the agency. Job task analysis is the process of obtaining information about a job, and its requirements, in order to determine the knowledge, skills, and behaviors that are required for satisfactory performance of the job in question.
 - c. If the agency has not completed a job task analysis specific to that job, the agency should utilize the job task analysis information collected by the state or utilize categories developed by a similar type of agency.
 - d. Research by other agencies has indicated that the key job task elements for various law enforcement positions are similar or identical throughout the nation.
 - e. The evaluation procedure should be based on the behavioral anchor approach that uses “behavior anchored ratings”
3. Once the relevant job-related categories have been determined
- a. What is to be evaluated has been identified.
 - b. How to rate these categories now becomes the issue.
 - c. How is based upon the recruit’s performance as measured against SEGs.
4. The SEGs should be established to ensure each FTO’s rating of a recruit will be equal and standard throughout the program. They are designed to provide a definition, in behavioral terms, of various levels of performance.
5. The SEGs must be applied equally to all recruits, regardless of their experience, time in the program or other incidental factors.
6. SEGs should be provided for every category listed on the face sheet of the DOR.
7. Standardization
- a. Law enforcement has within it a wide variety of techniques and procedures mandating standardization of performance appraisals.
 - b. Reasons for using valid and reliable guidelines are to:
 1. ensure fair and consistent evaluation of the recruit,
 2. ensure the recruit is aware of expectations and
 3. assure credibility of the evaluation process
 - c. SEGs establish acceptable and unacceptable levels of performance according to agency requirements for each training category.

- d. Evaluation without standardization is not possible
- e. There is a need to articulate and document reference points in order to promote standardization of the evaluation process within each agency.
- f. Reference points need to be properly articulated to explain the rationale supporting a numerical score, such as "1" (unacceptable), "3" (acceptable), "5" (superior), "NO" (not observed) or "NRT (not responding to training).
- g. SEGs, and the explanations for unacceptable, acceptable and superior, reflect the operational standards for the agency.
- h. SEGs must be chosen to accurately reflect the levels of knowledge and skill in the agency.
- i. The categories listed on the DOR may also be modified to reflect the "job" (an agency requires that each officer be trained as an EMT should include that category). The categories selected for rating should:
 - a. cover the totality of what an employee is required to do and
 - b. be anchored in behaviorally descriptive terms
- j. The language in the SEGs cannot include everything that would represent the various levels of performance.
- k. The descriptors are designed to serve as examples to direct the FTO's thinking in a certain direction.
 - l. If every conceivable aspect of behavior in each category were included it would be unlikely that the FTO could become conversant with all the language due to the sheer volume of information.
- m. It is of paramount importance that each FTO uses a Standardized Evaluation Manual line in the evaluation process.

B. Rating Behavior/Performance

1. Each category listed on the DOR should be accompanied by a set of SEGs.
2. The "San Jose Model", adapted as the POST program in the majority of states, utilizes a 7- point rating scale. Other agencies use a variation on this scale, commonly either 3 or 5-point scale.
3. Recruits should be evaluated utilizing the solo patrol officer standard of unacceptable, acceptable or superior.
4. The FTO's role is to examine the recruit's performance and choose the appropriate description provided in the relevant SEGs.
5. The FTO selects the description that "fits" the behavior they are evaluating, (1, 3, 5, "NO" anchor, etc.).
6. The most difficult part of the evaluation process for an FTO is to surrender his own opinion of the recruit's performance.

7. FTOs must rate the recruit pursuant to the language in the manual if the recruit's performance is consistent with the language of that manual.
 - a. Unacceptable
 - 1- Unable to demonstrate capacity to perform in this category.
 - 2 - Demonstrates limited ability to perform in this category.
 - 3 - Demonstrates familiarity with category and acceptable performance on occasion.
 - b. Minimally Acceptable
 - 4 - Recruit functions at a minimally acceptable level. Performance can be improved (any rating less than a "4" means that improvement is needed. A "4" or above means that performance is acceptable. This is the minimal level of performance expected of all recruits at conclusion of Phase I and/or at the conclusion of their probationary period).
 - c. Acceptable
 - 5 - Performs at acceptable levels, but improvement is still possible and preferable.
 - 6 - Performs capably and confidently.
 - d. Superior
 - 7 - Performs confidently and professionally
8. FTOs should have no discretion in this matter. It is the only way that objective evaluations will be accomplished.

C. Evaluation Process

1. As a recruit progresses through the program his progress is recorded using written evaluations. The evaluation process is as important as the training process.
2. Evaluations are:
 - a. used to record and document a recruit's progress,
 - b. excellent tools for informing the recruit of his performance level at a particular point in time and are
 - c. excellent devices for identifying training needs and documenting training efforts by chronicling the skill and efforts of the FTO.
3. Evaluations tell a chronological story.
4. Evaluations tell of a recruit's successes and failures, improvements and digressions and the attempts to manage each of these occurrences.

5. Evaluations are critical in the career of each recruit and should be treated appropriately. Honest and objective evaluations of a recruit should be a prime consideration of all members of this program.
6. Each recruit should be evaluated in a number of categories. The categories should cover as much of each aspect of the police environment and responsibilities as practical.
7. SEGs should be established to ensure each FTO's rating of a recruit will be equal and standard throughout the program.
8. SEGs are behavioral task anchors. They provide a definition, in behavioral terms, of unacceptable, acceptable and superior levels of performance that must be applied to all recruits, regardless of their experience level, time in the program or other incidental factors.
9. SEGs for every category should be listed on the face of the DOR.
10. Evaluations represent feedback.
11. Effective feedback provides solutions, occurs frequently and is:
 - a. objective,
 - b. flexible,
 - c. acceptable,
 - d. comprehensive,
 - e. constructive,
 - f. organized and
 - g. specific.

D. Evaluation Frequency:

1. The responsibility for evaluating a recruit's performance lies in the FTO's DOR.
2. FTOs should complete a DOR on each recruit they evaluate.
3. The evaluation should be completed at the end of the shift/week and, except for extraordinary circumstances, not left to be done at a later time. Thus the recruit is provided the opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification not received earlier in the workday. This feedback serves to reinforce instructions, criticism and praise given during or after each earlier incident.
4. The Field Training Coordinators might also be responsible for completing a WCR for every recruit assigned to the program.
5. A WCR is useful not only to record a recruit's performance but also to serve as a check and balance of the FTO's evaluation of a recruit.

6. The WCR can provide a starting point for a Coordinator's meeting with the recruit along with the monthly FTO meeting. It should reflect the Coordinator's observations and review of DORs, other officers and supervisors remarks, written reports from the recruit, etc.
7. The WCR should reflect the recruit's performance over a period of time with the Coordinator providing another independent evaluation.
8. The Coordinator review will reinforce program guidelines and provide an evaluation of the FTO as an instructor.
9. At the end of each phase the Field Training Coordinator should complete a PSR for every recruit assigned to the program.
10. PSRs can be used to keep track of the overall performance of the recruit as well as serve as a record for his progress in the program.
11. An FTO working with a recruit during additional or remedial training should complete a DOR as well as the Additional Training Summary (ATS) at the end of the training.
12. The ATS can be used to record the training plans and progress of a recruit during additional training.

3.5 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to describe the importance of scenarios and/or role play in practical applications of communication skills.

A. The purposes of scenarios and/or role play are to:

1. provide the recruit with the opportunity to be exposed to situations he may not routinely encounter,
2. give the recruit the opportunity to perform tasks he is not familiar with or has had minimal exposure and
3. allow the recruit to practice difficult tasks.
 - Having role players follow a script is very important. If a role player strays away from the script it could change the outcome for the student, spelling defeat before the recruit even attempts to solve the problem .
 - Some instructors may find it easier to correct problems as they go. Other instructors may want the recruit to finish the problem, correct the recruit and then have the recruit work through the problem again doing it correctly.
 - Pre-approved scripts will make it easier for the instructor to follow also. This program should be monitored closely when in use.

3.6 **Learning Objectives:** The student could be asked to describe the do(s) and don'ts in scenario training.

A. "Do's to" scenario training:

1. A clear and concise scenario should be reduced to a written script.
2. There should be several stress-inducing scenarios. However, everyone reacts differently and may attempt to solve the problem in a different manner than the instructor. The recruit's way is not necessarily incorrect as long as the target goal is met. Having several different solutions to the same problem will strengthen the training.
3. Be a creative thinker so the recruit will be able to use what he knows, and then do what he has learned, to positively solve the problem.

B. "Don'ts to" scenario training:

1. Don't conduct training while on-duty out in the public or during down time.
2. Don't overwhelm the student with scenarios that he cannot win or do not involve his job classification.

3.7 **Learning Objectives:** The student could be asked to list the benefits and some of the steps in reality based training.

A. Benefits of reality based training:

1. The recruit can work through unexpected problems that may come up.
2. Problems that come up on a recurring basis will be worked out in a more efficient manner without showing negativity.
3. Problem-based learning will come into play.
4. Problem-based learning is based on the principal of knowing and doing which will enhance the recruit's critical thinking and problem solving skills.
5. It is easy to establish the rule of "safety first".

B. Setting up reality based training:

1. Ensure that the training environment is out of public view and a safe location.
2. Have realistic problems that are scripted and easy to follow. Be sure that the problems that are chosen apply to the recruits' job classification.
3. Have realistic solutions, with several different outcomes, to problems.
4. Have role players that will follow the script and not stray from it. The role players should not be from the group of recruits.
5. Have a dedicated FTO to follow the problem and progress of the recruit as he works through the problem.

6. Ensure that the FTO has a positive review and feedback session at the conclusion of each problem-solving session. Don't tell the recruit what he did wrong. Instead, ask the recruit how he thinks it went. Ask him what he could do to make it better or make a suggestion as to what the recruit may try to make it better. Have the recruit tell you what he did and what he saw.
7. It is important to have the recruit realize how the FTO/recruit relationship should work and that the relationship is not personal. At the conclusion of the training the recruit should be able to demonstrate what he has learned in a clear and concise manner.

Unit Four
Documentation

4.0 **Functional Area:** This section will introduce the student to why documentation of training information is important. The student will demonstrate, on a written examination, an understanding of civil liability, validity of documentation, the remedial training process and release from the training program.

4.1 **Learning Objective:** Given the definition of any one of the seven affirmative links to liability, the student could be asked to name the affirmative link to civil liability in each case.

A. Seven affirmative links to civil liability are:

1. “failure to train” – agencies have an obligation to provide valid, job-related training for their recruits;
2. “negligent hire” – when a person is hired without using proper screening techniques. This involves situations when an agency is aware of the shortcomings of their prospective applicant and hires that person anyway. This affirmative link is reached only when a reasonable person is able to determine that the lack of screening was plain and obvious;
3. “negligent retention” (failure to discipline) – after hire, the agency becomes aware, or should have become aware, of a problem behavior and does nothing to correct it;
4. “negligent entrustment” - entrusting a person into a position of responsibility who clearly should not have held such a position;
5. “negligent supervision” – FTOs must observe and correct behavior of recruits. Tolerating inappropriate behavior, such as violating or depriving people of their basic rights, make an FTO negligent in this area;
6. “negligent assignment” – when a recruit is not transferred or suspended to a non-sensitive assignment after numerous substantiated disciplinary reports are received. Also, this deals with persons being assigned to positions that they are not properly trained or qualified for, and;
7. “failure to direct” – failing to give a recruit directions for a task that they obviously do not understand how to complete.

4.2. **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to define qualified immunity.

A. Qualified immunity is:

1. a doctrine in United States law providing immunity from suit to government officials performing discretionary functions when their action did not violate clearly established law,
2. created by the U.S. Supreme Court, replacing frequently-required inquiries into subjective malice with a framework for objective inquiries into the legal reasonableness of the contested action and
3. is a potential [affirmative defense](#) to suits against government officials.

B. Relative case laws to the seven affirmative links to civil liability: **(Appendix I)**

1. Failure to train:
 - a. Canton v. Harris 109 S Ct. 1197-1989
 - b. Quezada v. County of Bernalillo 944 F2d 710 (CA 10th – 1991)
 - c. Manteyko v. Felix 924 F2d 824 (CA 9th – 1991)
2. Negligent hire:
 - a. Hild v. Bruner 496 F Supp 93 (DC NJ-1980)
 - b. Bryan County, Oklahoma v. Brown, 117 S.Ct 1382 (1997)
3. Negligent retention:
 - a. Brandon v. Holt 105 St Ct 873 1935
 - b. Bonsignore v. NYC 683 F2d 635 (2nd CA – 1982)
 - c. Tarver v. City of Edna, Slip Copy, 2006 WL 3053409 (S.D.Tex.)
4. Negligent entrustment:
 - a. Corridon v. City of Bayonne 324 A2d 42 (ND App-1974)
5. Negligent supervision:
 - a. Carter v. Carlson 447 F2d 358 (DC-CA 1971)
 - b. Shaw v. Stroud, 13 F.3d 791 (4th Cir. 1994)
 - c. Monell v. New York City Dep't of Soc. Servs., 98 S. Ct. 2018 (1978)
 - d. Thompkins v. Belt, 828 F.2d 298 (5th Cir. 1987)
6. Negligent assignment:
 - a. Davis v. City of North Richland Hills, 406 F.3d 375, 5th Circuit (2005)
7. Failure to direct:
 - a. Ford v. Breier 383 F. Supp 505 (DC-Wisc.-1974)
 - b. Bisbal-Ramos v. City of Mayaguez 467 F.3d 16, C.A.1.P.R., 2006

4.3 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to describe and list the three different types of reports and/or forms commonly used in documenting recruit training.

A. Training report forms should be easily distinguishable from evaluation report forms. It is recommended that each form have a different and individual color for each report. This method will reduce time needed for documentation, reduce confusion, reduce duplication of effort and assist in maintaining order of all documents. Additionally, agencies should consider the use of weekly critique forms to be completed by recruits (assessment of weekly training, end of program forms) and other forms, as needed, for proper documentation.

B. Training Reports

1. Daily reports are used to indicate whether training was provided or in which categories.
2. Weekly reports are used to indicate total weekly training opportunities.
3. End of phase reports are a comprehensive collection of all training provided during a particular training phase.

C. Evaluation Reports

1. Daily reports are used to indicate the actual grade (numerical, pass/fail, etc.) received in each evaluation category.
2. Weekly reports are used to indicate the total weekly evaluation of the recruit by the FTO.
3. End of Phase reports are a comprehensive collection of all data pertaining to the performance of a particular recruit.

D. Training Documentation

1. Training reports contain information that indicates if training was provided.
2. Training reports are most effective when they are one page, double-sided, and contain the categories on the front side and documentation on the back.

E. Training Opportunities

1. Any relative activity that the recruit comes in contact with during each training day.
2. Training opportunities will be listed chronologically on the back of the daily training report, give an account of all training opportunities which take place during the training day and contain the following information:
 - a. situation (real or scenario based),
 - b. actions of the recruit (hesitant, eager, competent) and a description of the training provided (none, some, extensive) and
 - c. details the need for any additional training.

4.4 **Learning Objective**: Given a statement relating to a recruit's performance, the student could be asked to analyze a statement and label it as objective or subjective in each case.

A. Subjective vs. objective documentation:

1. Subjectivity, in the form of opinionative or predictive statements, is not solicited for inclusion in documentation.
2. FTOs must avoid the use of subjective statements when documenting activity.
3. Subjectivity impacts the balance and validity of documentation.

4. Documentation should be objective in nature and reflect ONLY the facts.
5. Documentation must specifically identify only the tasks, actually performed by the recruit, that were observed by the FTO during that shift.
6. All performance must be documented, regardless of the assigned grade, and all grades given to the recruit on the front of the report will be supported by written documentation on the back of the report.

4.5 **Learning Objective**: After observing a training opportunity, the student could be asked to write objective documentation of the training using the six elements of documentation.

A. Six elements of documentation are:

1. the date and time of training,
2. the location of the training,
3. the offense, nature of incident, incident/citation numbers, list of all calls, arrests, and citizen contacts,
4. the description of the recruit's actions,
5. the training given by the FTO and
6. the recruit's response to training

B. Tool for writing objective documentation

1. Clear
2. Concise
3. Complete
4. Correct

4.6 **Learning Objective**: When handling documentation of recruits in the field training program, the student could be asked to interpret policy and instructions for confidentiality and disclose those documents accordingly.

A. Confidentiality of Documents

1. Files of individual recruits should be considered as personnel files and therefore confidential.
2. Files will not be:
 - a. provided to anyone other than persons authorized by the Field Training Coordinator,
 - b. reproduced by anyone unless authorized by the Field Training Coordinator,

- c. reviewed by anyone except those persons named within this section and/or persons authorized by the Field Training Coordinator (Chief of Police, Field Training Supervisors and staff members responsible for an individual recruit) or
 - d. discussed, or made public to anyone, without the permission of the Field Training Coordinator.
3. Unlawful disclosure of information contained in the files of recruits carries criminal penalties as defined in Title 110a, Article 6252-17a, Texas Open Records Act.

4.7 **Learning Objective**: The student could be asked to describe the purpose and identify the steps in the remedial training process

A. The purpose of remedial training is to:

- 1. correct any area in which the recruit shows a deficiency and
- 2. to retrain a recruit until he understands the specific task.

B. Steps in the remedial training process are:

- STEP 1 - problem area identified and documented,
- STEP 2 - recruit informed of the problem,
- STEP 3 - recruit assigned to remedial training,
- STEP 4 - recruit instructed on how to perform the task,
- STEP 5 - recruit shown how to perform task,
- STEP 6 - recruit demonstrates task by performing and
- STEP 7 - recruit is released from remedial training.

C. Remedial training is not:

- 1. designed to terminate a recruit or
- 2. used for punishment.

D. Identifying and correcting the problem:

- 1. An important quality of a FTO is the ability to identify and correct areas of deficiency exhibited by a recruit.
- 2. In many cases correcting of the deficiency can, and should, be made on-the-spot and noted on the evaluation.
- 3. A FTO needs to recognize when a recruit possesses deficiencies that could be eliminated by receiving specialized, remedial training.
- 4. The training may include additional classroom instruction or additional field training.
- 5. The Field Training Coordinator should discuss what avenues are available for remedial training so that the FTO can make constructive suggestions a timely manner.

in

E. Remedial training:

1. Phase training stops when a recruit enters into remedial training.
2. During the remedial training process, documentation is very important.
3. If a recruit exhibits the same deficiency after the corrections have been made and continues to show a particular deficiency the recruit must be referred to remedial training.
4. The FTO must make the recommendation for remedial training.
5. The FTO's recommendations do not preclude the Field Training Coordinator from taking action based on his observations.
6. If a recruit cannot properly demonstrate the particular task for which he is in the remedial training he can be terminated from the training program.
7. Once the recruit has been shown how to perform the task he should be allowed several opportunities to demonstrate the ability to perform the task.
8. There should be no time limit to any portion of the remedial training.

F. Remedial training strategies:

1. During the course of the program it may become necessary for the FTO to utilize training tactics to enhance and improve the learning process. The following tactics can be used at anytime throughout the training. However, they are most effective when remedial training is necessary to improve the recruit's performance.
 - a. Flash cards - Have the recruit prepare flash cards to enhance the learning process. Preparing the cards will cause the recruit to utilize multi-sensory learning.
 - b. Commentary thinking - This is an excellent technique to aid a recruit who may know what to do but their thought patterns, once introduced to a stressful situation, become muddled or disjointed. It is simply thinking aloud. The recruit is required to talk out his thoughts in stressful situations. The benefit is that the recruit begins to organize his thoughts, slowing his thought processes and preventing overload.
 - c. Role playing - An excellent tool to teach interpersonal communication skills, field interviews and interrogations and safety. The FTO constructs a scenario and plays all the parts of the participants other than the recruit. This forces the recruit to interact with the FTO in a manner similar to real life but in a teaching environment.
 - d. Role reversals - This is similar to role playing except the recruit changes places with the FTO and observes how the FTO handles a particular situation. The FTO may even elect to perform the task in the same incorrect manner as the recruit did earlier so the recruit can see the mistakes. Have the recruit critique the actions when utilizing role reversal.

- e. Simulations - This is also similar to the role playing but typically involves task achievements such as handcuffing, vehicle positioning for car stops, loading/unloading weapons and/or handling radio traffic.
- f. Self evaluation - Another excellent technique that is especially valuable with a recruit who seems to have difficulty taking constructive criticism. The FTO can begin by providing the recruit with a DOR and advising the recruit that the recruit will complete the evaluation report on himself at the end of the training day. To aid the recruit the FTO should have him critique activity during the training day. This technique should be employed infrequently because it will lose its effect if used too often. the instructor should review the DOR with the recruit at the end of the training day.

4.8 **Learning Objective:** The student could be asked to list the two methods in which a recruit may be released from the field training program and categorize the reasons or circumstances for each.

A. Release from remedial training and/or from the program:

- 1. The FTO makes a decision to release the recruit back into their last phase of training or recommend termination.
- 2. If the recruit is released back into the phased training he is expected to successfully perform the task(s) in which he has received remedial training.

B. Recommendation for Termination

- 1. If the recruit demonstrates a trend of inability to perform tasks he will be recommended for termination.

C. Release from the program:

- 1. Each agency must have a written set of rules that describes how the recruit can successfully complete and graduate from the program.
- 2. These requirements vary between agencies and disciplines. However, the recruit needs to understand the process and what to expect.
- 3. When a recruit graduates, a probation period normally follows. It is beneficial for an agency to track a recruit's progress through the probationary period via well-written and well-documented evaluation forms.
- 4. Frequent evaluations of recruits by their supervisors will alleviate delinquent behavior of most employees during working and off-duty hours. If the recruit changes shifts often one supervisory employee should be designated to track his overall progress by reviewing all evaluations.

D. Types of releases:

- 1. Graduation:
 - a. The recruit must be able to identify the proper level of performance required to achieve a successful release.

- b. Educating FTOs on the agency's guidelines ensure that the process is objective and not based on inconstant or non-work related standards.
- c. Once the recruit is released supervisors should communicate to them how well they are performing by giving the recruits frequent feedback, especially in written form.

2. Termination

- a. The recruit is recommended for termination from the program when he cannot perform the required tasks in an acceptable manner and no reasonable amount of training will alter the outcome.
- b. Other reasons for termination may include: ethical lapses, poor judgment, lying to supervisors or internal affairs investigators, agency rule infractions and/or other serious agency violations.
- c. The FTO needs to communicate with the Field Training Coordinator so documentation can be reviewed and summarized, in written form, to support termination.
- d. Off-duty incidents involving poor judgment may result in termination even though the recruit has received good evaluations at work.
- e. Recruits sometimes perform well in low stress level environments but fall apart under stressful ones. Others may do well in most areas but perform below expectations in officer safety criteria.

APPENDIX I

(Synopsis of Case Laws)

Background of relative case laws to the seven affirmative links to civil liability (the specific case law must be consulted **in its entirety** for specific information regarding final appeals/decisions):

1. Failure to train:

a. Canton v. Harris 109 S Ct. 1197-1989

In April 1978, respondent Geraldine Harris was arrested by officers of the Canton Police Department. Mrs. Harris was brought to the police station in a patrol wagon. When she arrived at the station, Mrs. Harris was found sitting on the floor of the wagon. She was asked if she needed medical attention, and responded with an incoherent remark. After she was brought inside the station for processing, Mrs. Harris slumped to the floor on two occasions. Eventually, the police officers left Mrs. Harris lying on the floor to prevent her from falling again. No medical attention was ever summoned for Mrs. Harris. After about an hour, Mrs. Harris was released from custody, and taken by an ambulance (provided by her family) to a nearby hospital. There, Mrs. Harris was diagnosed as suffering from several emotional ailments; she was hospitalized for one week and received subsequent outpatient treatment for an additional year.

Some time later, Mrs. Harris commenced this action alleging many state-law and constitutional claims against the city of Canton and its officials. Among these claims was one seeking to hold the city liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for its violation of Mrs. Harris' right, under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, to receive necessary medical attention while in police custody.

A jury trial was held on Mrs. Harris' claims. Evidence was presented that indicated that, pursuant to a municipal regulation, shift commanders were authorized to determine, in their sole discretion, whether a detainee required medical care. In addition, testimony also suggested that Canton shift commanders were not provided with any special training (beyond first-aid training) to make a determination as to when to summon medical care for an injured detainee.

The city regulation in question provides that a police officer assigned to act as "jailer" at the city police station "shall, when a prisoner is found to be unconscious or semi-unconscious, or when he or she is unable to explain his or her condition, or who complains of being ill, have such person taken to a hospital for medical treatment, with permission of his supervisor before admitting the person to City Jail."

At the close of the evidence, the District Court submitted the case to the jury, which rejected all of Mrs. Harris' claims except one: her § 1983 claim against the city resulting from its failure to provide her with medical treatment while in custody. In rejecting the city's subsequent motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, the District Court explained the theory of liability as follows: "The evidence construed in a manner most favorable to Mrs. Harris could be found by a jury to demonstrate that the City of Canton had a custom or policy of vesting complete authority with the police supervisor of when medical treatment would be administered to prisoners. Further, the jury could find from the evidence that the vesting of such *carte blanche* authority with the police supervisor without adequate training to recognize when medical treatment is needed was grossly negligent or so reckless that future police misconduct was almost inevitable or substantially certain to result."

b. *Quezada v. County of Bernalillo* 944 F2d 710 (CA 10th – 1991)

In the early hours of December 20, 1986, Berlinda Griego was the sole occupant of a car parked in a parking lot behind a building in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Deputy Sheriff Ramona Martin noticed the car in the lot and investigated after radioing dispatch. Deputy Martin parked in front of the car and saw Ms. Griego put her head down on the steering wheel. When Ms. Griego did not respond to her waving spotlight, Deputy Martin stepped out of her vehicle and up to Griego's car window and rapped on it several times. Ms. Griego reluctantly rolled her window down just a few inches but refused Martin's request to produce her driver's license, telling Martin "I'm not doing anything."

Deputy Sauser heard Martin's radio transmission and was the second officer to arrive at the scene. He also parked in front of Griego's car. Sauser joined Martin and together they tried to convince Griego to roll her window down more and respond. Griego, however, was not cooperating. She tried to roll her window up but was stopped when Deputy Martin put her flashlight in the window frame. The flashlight prevented the window from completely closing. Both deputies then saw Griego pick up a pistol. Deputy Sauser saw Griego load the weapon with a magazine containing bullets. Just before Griego picked up the gun a third sheriff's deputy, Brian Murphy arrived. He also saw the gun and witnessed its loading.

In response to Griego's actions all three deputies drew their weapons. Deputies Martin and Murphy took cover. Deputy Sauser, on the other hand, moved only a few feet away from Griego's car. He stayed close and ordered Griego to put her gun down. Griego responded to Sauser's orders by saying, "Leave me alone, I want to kill myself." She placed the muzzle of the gun to her right temple. Then she started waving the weapon from the point of her right temple to her mouth. She also inserted the muzzle of the weapon inside her mouth.

Griego was still not cooperating when she put her car in gear and tried to slowly maneuver around the police cars and drive away. In response, Deputy Murphy moved his car, blocking the exit and trapping Griego in the parking lot. The deputies continued to tell Griego to drop the gun. Deputy Sauser testified Griego pointed her gun at him once before she tried to drive away. In response, he raised his weapon to a ready position and asked her to put the gun down. He described Griego's movements as "lackadaisical" and "aimless," and said she only pointed the gun in his "general direction."

Deputy Sauser positioned himself about five feet from Griego's car door after she stopped the car, picking a spot to stand where he thought Griego would not be able to see him. Various lights from the police vehicles were trained on Griego, in addition to the flashlight that was stuck in her window, and Deputy Sauser testified he thought it was difficult for Griego to see where he was standing. Griego's movements, according to Sauser, continued to be "aimless" until at one point she "turned abruptly, [and] aimed the weapon at me." Sauser said she "lowered her head and sighted," causing him to believe his life was in jeopardy. In response to this movement, Sauser fired three times. Two bullets struck Griego, mortally wounding her.

Both the other deputies observed the movement by Griego that prompted Deputy Sauser to shoot her. Deputy Murphy described it as a "movement toward Officer Sauser." Deputy Martin recalled that Griego "moved slightly forward in her seat, [and] turned her upper torso towards Officer Sauser's direction." Martin believed she yelled out a warning in response to Griego's actions.

After the shooting Griego was pulled from the car. Deputy Murphy remembered Griego saying "I can't believe you shot me." Deputy Martin likewise heard Griego speak and described her tone as one of "disbelief." Deputy Martin said Griego was struggling and trying to pull away when she was taken from the car, and Martin handcuffed her from the rear. Deputy Murphy also remembered Griego struggling, but noted she "wasn't very strong at that time." Only seven minutes elapsed from the time of Martin's first radio report until an ambulance was called after the shooting.

II. DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS

Plaintiff sued Bernalillo County, Sheriff Campbell, and Deputy Sheriff Sauser on behalf of her deceased daughter. Plaintiff claimed Sauser violated her daughter's Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights by using excessive force. She further claimed Sheriff Campbell failed to train his deputies and accused the County of tolerating excessive force by its deputies. She alleged Sheriff Campbell and the County also violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. Her state law claim, in essence, charged all the Defendants with wrongful death due to negligence and assault, battery and abuse of process.

Following a trial without a jury the district court entered judgment for Plaintiff on her federal civil rights claim against Deputy Sauser, and against Deputy Sauser, Sheriff Campbell and Bernalillo County on her state wrongful death claim. The court awarded \$1,243,876 in damages.

In its written fact findings, the district court said Deputy Sauser voluntarily and negligently placed himself in a position of peril where he had no choice other than to use deadly force. The court found Sauser's negligence was the proximate cause of Griego's death and found that, but for his negligence, deadly force would not have been required. Based on these findings the court concluded, as a matter of law, that Sauser violated Griego's Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. It also ruled against Sauser under the New Mexico Tort Claims Act.

The court then ruled against Sheriff Campbell and Bernalillo County on Plaintiff's New Mexico claims. The court found Sheriff Campbell negligently trained deputies. It further found the County negligent under New Mexico Law for failing to institute policies and procedures to deal with potential suicides. However, the court exonerated the County on Griego's federal claim, concluding the County was not deliberately indifferent in training employees. There was no mention in the court's conclusions of the federal claim against Sheriff Campbell.

c. Mateyko v. Felix 924 F2d 824 (CA 9th – 1991)

In Los Angeles on the afternoon of December 18, 1983, defendant officer Thomas Felix stopped Mateyko for crossing a street without stopping for a red traffic light in violation of California Vehicle Code § 21453(d). Mateyko resisted when Felix attempted to issue a citation, and Felix radioed for assistance. Defendant officer Michael Serafin responded to Felix's request for assistance and used a Tazer gun to subdue Mateyko. Mateyko was charged and ultimately convicted of willfully and unlawfully resisting, delaying and obstructing a police officer in the discharge of his duties in violation of California Penal Code § 148.

Mateyko brought this action against the City and officers Felix and Serafin pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging Felix and Serafin violated Mateyko's federally protected rights by using unnecessary force. Mateyko asserted pendent state law claims for assault, battery, negligence and emotional distress.

At the close of Mateyko's case in chief, the court granted the City's motion for a directed verdict on Mateyko's section 1983 claims. The remaining state law claims against the City and all Mateyko's claims against Felix and Serafin were submitted to the jury by special verdict. The jury found for defendants on all claims, except on Mateyko's claim against the City for negligent infliction of emotional distress. Mateyko's damages on this claim were found to be \$492,000. Mateyko was found to be 96% contributory negligent, and the court entered judgment for Mateyko for \$19,680.

2. Negligent hire:

a. Hild v. Bruner 496 F Supp 93 (DC NJ-1980)

Civil rights action was brought against town and township and town and township police officers. A pendent state claim for false arrest was also asserted. After a jury returned verdicts in favor of plaintiffs and against all defendants for compensatory and punitive damages, defendants moved for judgment notwithstanding the verdicts or, alternatively, for a new trial. Plaintiffs moved for attorney fees, costs and prejudgment interest, and the District Court, Whipple, Senior District Judge, held that:

(1) the jury could reasonably have found that town police officers falsely arrested plaintiffs; (2) testimony of plaintiffs' experts could be used against all defendants; (3) the verdict finding the town police officers liable for assault and battery was not contrary to the weight of the evidence; (4) the jury was not subjected to prejudicial influences; (5) objections to special interrogatories were waived; (6) the jury could reasonably have inferred that the town and township were grossly negligent in failing to conduct psychological testing of police officers; (7) all objections to the jury charge were waived; (8) the jury could reasonably have inferred that the town officer committed assault and battery, false arrest and invasion of privacy; (9) the awards of compensatory damages were not excessive; (10) the awards of punitive damages against the town and township could not stand; (11) plaintiffs were not entitled to prejudgment interest; and (12) plaintiffs were entitled to attorney fees.

b. Bryan County, Oklahoma v. Brown, 117 S.Ct 1382 (1997)

In the early morning hours of May 12, 1991, Jill Brown (hereinafter respondent) and her husband were driving from Grayson County, Texas, to their home in Bryan County, Oklahoma. After crossing into Oklahoma, they approached a police checkpoint. Mr. Brown, who was driving, decided to avoid the checkpoint and return to Texas. After seeing the Browns' truck turn away from the checkpoint, Bryan County Deputy Sheriff Robert Morrison and Reserve Deputy Stacy Burns pursued the vehicle. Although the parties' versions of events differ, at trial both deputies claimed that their patrol car reached speeds in excess of 100 miles per hour. Mr. Brown testified that he was unaware of the deputies' attempts to overtake him. The chase finally ended four miles south of the police checkpoint.

After he got out of the squad car, Deputy Sheriff Morrison pointed his gun toward the Browns' vehicle and ordered the Browns to raise their hands. Reserve Deputy Burns, who was unarmed, rounded the corner of the vehicle on the passenger's side. Burns twice ordered respondent from the vehicle.

When she did not exit, he used an "arm bar" technique, grabbing respondent's arm at the wrist and elbow, pulling her from the vehicle, and spinning her to the ground. Respondent's knees were severely injured, and she later underwent corrective surgery. Ultimately, she may need knee replacements.

Respondent sought compensation for her injuries under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law from Burns, Bryan County Sheriff B.J. Moore, and the county itself. Respondent claimed, among other things, that Bryan County was liable for Burns' alleged use of excessive force based on Sheriff Moore's decision to hire Burns, the son of his nephew. Specifically, respondent claimed that Sheriff Moore had failed to adequately review Burns' background. Burns had a record of driving infractions and had pleaded guilty to various driving-related and other misdemeanors, including assault and battery, resisting arrest, and public drunkenness. Oklahoma law does not preclude the hiring of an individual who has committed a misdemeanor to serve as a peace officer.

See Okla. Stat., Tit. 70, § 3311(D) (2) (a) (1991) (requiring that the hiring agency certify that the prospective officer's records do not reflect a felony conviction). At trial, Sheriff Moore testified that he had obtained Burns' driving record and a report on Burns from the National Crime Information Center, but had not closely reviewed either. Sheriff Moore authorized Burns to make arrests, but not to carry a weapon or to operate a patrol car.

In a ruling not at issue here, the District Court dismissed respondent's § 1983 claim against Sheriff Moore prior to trial. Counsel for Bryan County stipulated that Sheriff Moore "was the policy maker for Bryan County regarding the Sheriff's Department." At the close of respondent's case and again at the close of all of the evidence, Bryan County moved for judgment as a matter of law. As to respondent's claim that Sheriff Moore's decision to hire Burns triggered municipal liability, the county argued that a single hiring decision by a municipal policymaker could not give rise to municipal liability under § 1983. The District Court denied the county's motions. The court also overruled the county's objections to jury instructions on the § 1983 claim against the county.

To resolve respondent's claims, the jury was asked to answer several interrogatories. The jury concluded that Stacy Burns had arrested respondent without probable cause and had used excessive force, and therefore found him liable for respondent's injuries. It also found that the "hiring policy" and the "training policy" of Bryan County "in the case of Stacy Burns as instituted by its policymaker, B.J. Moore," were each "so inadequate as to amount to deliberate indifference to the constitutional needs of the Plaintiff." The District Court entered judgment for respondent on the issue of Bryan County's § 1983 liability. The county appealed on several grounds, and the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed. The court held, among other things, that Bryan County was properly found liable under § 1983 based on Sheriff Moore's decision to hire Burns.

The court addressed only those points that it thought merited review; it did not address the jury's determination of county liability based on inadequate training of Burns, nor do we. We granted certiorari, 517 U.S. 1154, 116 S.Ct. 1540, 134 L.Ed.2d 645 (1996), to decide whether the county was properly held liable for respondent's injuries based on Sheriff Moore's single decision to hire Burns. We now reverse.

3. Negligent retention:

a. Brandon v. Holt 105 St Ct 873 1935

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, 516 F.Supp. 1355, entered a damages judgment against director of city's police department in his official capacity under Civil Rights Act. The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, 719 F.2d 151, reversed, holding that he was protected by qualified immunity, and plaintiffs petitioned for writ of certiorari. The Supreme Court, Justice Stevens, held that: (1) where, although section 1983 suit did not name the city as a defendant because it was decided before *Monell*, record plainly identified petitioners' claim for damages as one that was asserted against the office of city's director of police department rather than against the particular individual who occupied that office when the claim arose, petitioners would be permitted to amend their pleadings to conform to the proof and to district court's findings of fact, and

(2) Court of Appeals erred in failing to distinguish between suits against government officials “in their individual capacities” and those in which only the liability of the municipality itself was at issue, so that liability would be imposed on the municipality. Reversed and remanded.

b. Bonsignore v. NYC 683 F2d 635 (2nd CA – 1982)

An off-duty officer shot his wife and then killed himself. Applying New York law, the court found liability. It reasoned: “The City could reasonably have anticipated that its negligence in failing to identify officers who were unfit to carry guns would result in an unfit officer injuring someone using the gun he was required to carry. Furthermore, it was reasonably foreseeable that such an officer would injure a member of his own family. . . . Since the City was negligent precisely because of the risk posed to other policemen and members of the public by requiring all officers, without adequate screening, to be armed at all times, the District Court did not err in denying the City’s motion for judgment n.o.v. or a new trial.” The officer inflicted the injury with his service revolver, which he was required to carry at all times. In addition, the officer had displayed many signs of mental or emotional problems, such as excessive sick leave and incomplete performance reports.

4. Negligent entrustment:

a. Corridon v. City of Bayoone 324 A2d 42 (ND App-1974)

Administratrix brought action against municipality and police officer, founded upon fatal shooting of decedent by officer at a time when he was not on duty. The Superior Court, Law Division, entered judgment adverse to defendants, and they appealed. The Superior Court, Appellate Division, held that evidence was for jury on issue whether city, which according to credible evidence knew or might reasonably have known of officer's intoxication in public places on a number of prior occasions, was guilty of negligence in its apparent neglect of its duty to abate risk, that jury should not have been permitted to consider theory of respondeat superior in its deliberations with respect to municipality's negligence, and that in light of fact that jury returned a general verdict finding that both defendants were guilty of negligence, the court was unable to determine, without speculation, whether liability was predicated on respondeat superior theory or on primary liability evidence, thus requiring a reversal and new trial.

5. Negligent supervision:

a. Carter v. Carlson 447 F2d 358 (DC-CA 1971)

Plaintiff brought action wherein he sought to hold police officer liable for assault and battery or for negligence in making arrest, to hold precinct captain and police chief liable for negligence in failing to give arresting officer adequate training and supervision, and to hold District of Columbia liable either for its own negligence in failing to train and supervise arresting officer, or for torts of supervisory officers on theory of respondeat superior. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Matthew F. McGuire, j., dismissed complaint, and plaintiff appealed.

The Court of Appeals, Bazelon, Chief Judge, held that officer's act of making arrest of plaintiff was 'ministerial' rather than 'discretionary', and thus the District did not have sovereign immunity from suit based on theory that the District had vicarious liability at common law for arresting officer's conduct. The court further held that suit could be maintained against the District for deprivation of civil rights on theories that District was vicariously liable for arresting officer's conduct and for supervisory officers' conduct with respect to supervision of arresting officer and was directly liable for failure to supervise, train and control arresting officer.

b. **Shaw v. Stroud, 13 F.3d 791 (4th Cir. 1994)**

On February 27, 1990, Officer Alfred Morris (Morris), a seven-year veteran of the North Carolina Highway Patrol, stopped Sidney Bowen (Bowen), a 42-year-old black man, as he pulled into his driveway, on suspicion of driving while impaired. At Morris' request, Bowen displayed his driver's license and seated himself in the patrol car. When Morris reached for his ticket book, Bowen ran from the car. Morris, flashlight in hand, pursued him.

Meanwhile, Nancy, Bowen's wife, was in her bedroom, and Kimberly, their fifteen-year-old daughter, was in the bathroom. At some point during the chase, both Kimberly and Nancy heard Bowen say, "Okay, Okay, I'll go anywhere you want me to go." Morris claims that, when Bowen fell to the ground, Morris caught up with him and took control of him with either an arm-bar technique or by holding him around his collar. Both Kimberly and Nancy heard Bowen yell, "Nancy, I'm going to jail." Kimberly and Nancy then ran to the front porch where they saw Bowen and Morris near the patrol car. Bowen was standing with his hands behind his back and Morris was standing behind him. Bowen called to Kimberly, "Kimberly, Kimberly, go get help, tell them the law is trying to kill me in my own front yard." Kimberly ran through the house and out the back door to a nearby uncle's house.

Nancy witnessed from the porch the following entire violent encounter. Morris called the Elizabethtown Office of the Highway Patrol and asked for backup at 9:41:46 p.m. Just as he dropped the microphone, Nancy saw Bowen jerk his hand away from Morris. At this point, Morris became the aggressor and began to hit Bowen with the flashlight about the head and shoulders until he fell to the ground. Nancy claims that Bowen got up and struggled with Morris for control of the flashlight. At that point, she asserts, Morris let go of the flashlight, pulled out his pistol, and fired at Bowen. She stated that Morris was either crouched down or kneeling as he shot Bowen. He fired at least twice; then, Bowen swung at Morris with either his fist or the flashlight. Morris stood up and began backing away from the rear of his car toward the highway as Bowen continued to swing at him. Morris then resumed firing his pistol until Bowen fell to the ground. Morris had fired six bullets, five of which struck Bowen. The injuries were fatal. Morris called for assistance at 9:43:19 p.m.-93 seconds following his initial call prior to the physical confrontation.

Morris presents a different view of the events. Morris claims that he pushed Bowen's chest up against the right rear passenger door of the patrol car to search him. Bowen allegedly told Morris that he was going to have to call for some help because he (Bowen) would not go along willingly.

Deciding to radio for assistance, Morris reached in through the open front passenger door with his right hand (his left hand was holding Bowen) to grab the radio. At 9:41:46 p.m., he called the Elizabethtown Highway Patrol Office and asked for backup. Morris claims that Bowen then swung at Morris with his left hand. A struggle ensued during which Bowen was knocked to the ground. When Morris reached through the passenger door of the car to retrieve his handcuffs, Bowen took the flashlight from his right hand. When Morris looked up, he says that Bowen had the flashlight poised to hit him.

The blow struck the back of Morris' head. Next, Morris claims that he staggered behind his car, stumbled, and fell to his knees at the edge of the roadway. Bowen allegedly then pounced on him and struck him again with the flashlight. Morris reached for his revolver with his right hand, stuck his middle finger in the trigger guard, flipped off the safety, and then saw Bowen perched to strike him again. He stood, moved away from Bowen, and fired his pistol simultaneously, firing six bullets, five of which struck Bowen.

Although Morris sustained a two-centimeter laceration on the lower left back of his head, his medical records indicate that he never lost consciousness. The autopsy of Bowen revealed that he had sustained many blunt force injuries to the head and neck. He had extensive bruising on his neck, indicating that pressure had been applied to the front of his neck by some object. He had a blood alcohol content of .11. Sergeant C.I. Stroud (Stroud) was Morris' supervisor from the time Morris joined the patrol in 1983 until late November 1988. Stroud was transferred fifteen months before the Bowen shooting. Nevertheless, during his tenure as Morris' supervisor, Stroud received reports about Morris' use of excessive force.

One year after Bowen's fatal shooting, the administrator of Bowen's estate, together with his widow and minor children, filed this § 1983 action against Morris, alleging (1) that he was liable to Bowen's estate for violating Bowen's Fourth Amendment rights by using excessive force to arrest him and (2) that he was liable to Bowen's wife and children for violating their substantive due process "right" to enjoy the "life, love, comfort, and support of their husband and father" without undue state interference. Plaintiffs also asserted § 1983 claims against a number of Morris' supervisors, based on allegations that they had "caused" the constitutional violations alleged by failing to properly train, supervise, and discipline Morris. Only two of the original supervisory defendants are involved in this appeal: Stroud and Smith. Finally, plaintiffs asserted several pendent state-law claims: a wrongful death claim brought against all defendants by Bowen's estate, and claims for negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress brought against all defendants by Bowen's widow and minor children.

As to Morris, the district court granted summary judgment on the Fourteenth Amendment due process claim, the negligent infliction of emotional distress claim, and the intentional infliction of emotional distress claim only as it pertained to Lee Bowen, the minor son of Bowen; however, the district court denied summary judgment on the other claims.

As to Stroud, the district court denied Stroud's motion for summary judgment on the § 1983 supervisory liability claim alleging that he caused the violation of Bowen's Fourth Amendment rights at the hands of Morris.

The district court reasoned that Stroud exhibited deliberate indifference because he ignored the complaints of at least three witnesses who alleged that Morris had beaten them during an arrest. Rejecting Stroud's qualified immunity defense, the district court found "no reasonable officer could have believed that Stroud's conduct in tacitly approving Morris' allegedly unlawful conduct was lawful under clearly established law." Holding that a reasonable jury could find the requisite bad faith to support a wrongful death claim against a public officer, the district court also withheld summary judgment on this claim.

However, summary judgment was granted on the state law claims of intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress. The district court also granted summary judgment to Stroud on the claim based on Morris' violation of Bowen's Fourteenth Amendment substantive due process rights.

Consequently, the district court left the following claims remaining for trial: (1) the Fourth Amendment claim against Morris, (2) the wrongful death claim against Morris,

(3) the intentional infliction of emotional distress claim against Morris, (4) the § 1983 claim against Stroud alleging that he caused the violation of Bowen's Fourth Amendment rights through failure to supervise Morris, and (5) the wrongful death claim against Stroud.

Stroud filed an interlocutory appeal from the district court's denial of his motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity on the § 1983 claim against him, as he was entitled to do under *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 105 S.Ct. 2806, 86 L.Ed.2d 411 (1985). At Stroud's request, we agreed to hear two other issues as part of the same interlocutory appeal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b): (1) whether the district court erred in denying his motion for summary judgment based on the *merits* of the § 1983 claim against him and (2) whether the district court erred in denying his motion to strike the deposition testimony of Jessie James.

Plaintiffs sought leave to cross-appeal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), on three additional issues: (1) whether the district court erred in granting Sergeant Smith's motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity with respect to the § 1983 failure-to-supervise claim against him; (2) whether the district court erred in entering summary judgment against plaintiffs on their state-law claims for negligent infliction of emotional distress; and (3) whether the district court erred in entering summary judgment against plaintiffs on their § 1983 claims for violation of their substantive due process rights. We agreed to hear these issues as well. Morris appeals nothing. Neither side appeals the decisions on the intentional infliction on emotional distress claim. We consolidated the appeals and cross-appeals of Stroud and the plaintiffs for briefing and argument.

c. *Monell v. New York City Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 98 S. Ct. 2018 (1978)

Petitioners, female employees of the Department of Social Services and the Board of Education of the City of New York, brought this class action against the Department and its Commissioner, the Board and its Chancellor, and the city of New York and its Mayor under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which provides that every "person" who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State subjects, or "causes to

be subjected,” any person to the deprivation of any federally protected rights, privileges, or immunities shall be civilly liable to the injured party. In each case, the individual defendants were sued solely in their official capacities. The gravamen of the complaint was that the Board and the Department had as a matter of official policy compelled pregnant employees to take unpaid leaves of absence before such leaves were required for medical reasons.

The District Court found that petitioners' constitutional rights had been violated, but held that petitioners' claims for injunctive relief were mooted by a supervening change in the official maternity leave policy. That court further held that Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167, 81 S.Ct. 473, 5 L.Ed.2d 492, barred recovery of back pay from the Department, the Board, and the city. In addition, to avoid circumvention of the immunity conferred by *Monroe*, the District Court held that natural persons sued in their official capacities as officers of a local government also enjoy the immunity conferred on local governments by that decision.

The Court of Appeals affirmed on a similar theory.

Held: 1. In *Monroe v. Pape, supra*, after examining the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, now codified as 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and particularly the rejection of the so-called Sherman amendment, the Court held that Congress in 1871 doubted its constitutional authority to impose civil liability on municipalities and therefore could not have intended to include municipal bodies within the class of “persons” subject to the Act. Re-examination of this legislative history compels the conclusion that Congress in 1871 would *not* have thought § 1983 constitutionally infirm if it applied to local governments. In addition, that history confirms that local governments were intended to be included among the “persons” to which § 1983 applies.

Accordingly, *Monroe v. Pape* is overruled insofar as it holds that local governments are wholly immune from suit under § 1983.

2. Local governing bodies (and local officials sued in their official capacities) can, therefore, be sued directly under § 1983 for monetary, declaratory, and injunctive relief in those situations where, as here, the action that is alleged to be unconstitutional implements or executes a policy statement, ordinance, regulation, or decision officially adopted or promulgated by those whose edicts or acts may fairly be said to represent official policy. In addition, local governments, like every other § 1983 “person,” may be sued for constitutional deprivations visited pursuant to governmental “custom” even though such custom has not received formal approval through the government's official decision-making channels.

3. On the other hand, the language and legislative history of § 1983 compel the conclusion that Congress did not intend a local government to be held liable solely because it employs a tort-feasor—in other words, a local government cannot be held liable under § 1983 on a *respondeat superior* theory. Pp. 2036-2038.

4. Considerations of *stare decisis* do not counsel against overruling *Monroe v. Pape* insofar as it is inconsistent with this opinion.

a) *Monroe v. Pape* departed from prior practice insofar as it completely immunized municipalities from suit under § 1983. Moreover, since the reasoning of *Monroe* does not allow a distinction to be drawn between municipalities and school boards, this Court's many cases holding school boards liable in § 1983 actions are inconsistent with *Monroe*, especially as the principle of that case was extended to suits for injunctive relief in *City of Kenosha v. Bruno*, 412 U.S. 507, 93 S.Ct. 2222, 37 L.Ed.2d 109.

(b) Similarly, extending absolute immunity to school boards would be inconsistent with several instances in which Congress has refused to immunize school boards from federal jurisdiction under § 1983.

(c) In addition, municipalities cannot have arranged their affairs on an assumption that they can violate constitutional rights for an indefinite period; accordingly, municipalities have no reliance interest that would support an absolute immunity.

(d) Finally, it appears beyond doubt from the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 that *Monroe* misapprehended the meaning of the Act. Were § 1983 unconstitutional as to local governments, it would have been equally unconstitutional as to state or local officers, yet the 1871 Congress clearly intended § 1983 to apply to such officers and all agreed that such officers could constitutionally be subjected to liability under § 1983. The Act also unquestionably was intended to provide a remedy, to be broadly construed, against all forms of official violation of federally protected rights. Therefore, without a clear statement in the legislative history, which is not present, there is no justification for excluding municipalities from the "persons" covered by § 1983.

5. Local governments sued under § 1983 cannot be entitled to an absolute immunity, lest today's decision "be drained of meaning," *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 248, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 1692, 40 L.Ed.2d 90.

d. **Thompkins v. Belt, 828 F.2d 298 (5th Cir. 1987)**

Supervisory liability exists if supervisory officials implement a policy so deficient that the policy itself is a repudiation of constitutional rights or is a proximate cause of the constitutional violation.

6. **Negligent assignment:**

a. *Davis v. City of North Richland Hills*, 406 F.3d 375, 5th Circuit (2005)

Police Officer Allen L. Hill, a member of the North Richland Hills Police Department ("NRHPD") SWAT team, shot and killed Troy James Davis during the execution of a no-knock search and arrest warrant at the residence of Troy James Davis and Barbara Jean Davis. The circumstances of the raid are sharply contested. Asserting claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law, Davis's estate and Davis's mother, Barbara Jean Davis sued Chief of Police Tom Shockley, Police Officer J.A. Wallace, and

Police Officer Allen Hill. Plaintiffs asserted that while executing the search and arrest warrant, Officer Hill used excessive force against Davis, shooting and killing him. Hill was the first SWAT team member to enter the home and he shot Davis within the initial two seconds.

At the time, according to Plaintiffs, Davis was in his living room, unarmed, arms outstretched and repeating “don't hurt us.” According to the police officers, upon entering the home, Hill was immediately confronted by an armed Davis standing at the end of the hallway, pointing a gun at Hill.

Plaintiffs further contended that Officer Wallace and Chief Shockley, two of Hill's supervisors, should be held liable under section 1983 for their inadequate supervision and training of Hill, resulting in Hill's use of excessive force during the raid. According to Plaintiffs, Wallace and Shockley knew prior to the shooting that Hill was “prone to use excessive and/or deadly force without cause,” that Hill had “a reputation for displaying lewd and criminal behavior while on and off-duty,” and that Hill's “employment history branded and identified him as dysfunctional and unfit for police work.”

Neither Wallace nor Shockley actually participated in the raid. Officer Wallace, the SWAT Team commander, was present outside Davis's house at the time. Chief Shockley was not present at the house. Shockley and Wallace, along with the other defendants, moved for summary judgment based on qualified immunity. The district court determined that Plaintiffs produced evidence demonstrating a genuine issue of material fact whether Shockley and Wallace were deliberately indifferent to Hill's propensity to use excessive force, whether their conduct was objectively unreasonable in light of clearly established constitutional law.

The district court noted that the following evidence supported supervisory liability: testimony from Ann Shelton, a former member of the NRHPD SWAT team, indicating that Hill fired his weapon on three occasions during training exercises when the scenarios did not call for the firing of a weapon; a background investigation report indicating that Hill had a tendency to act too aggressively; and testimony of Randy Cole, a citizen who was pulled over by Hill for a traffic violation, indicating that Hill behaved “like a psycho” and was “going to kill somebody.” The district court found that the seriousness of the SWAT team training incidents was magnified when laid against Cole's allegations. Further, the district court found evidence that Hill had a reputation for exposing himself, including during a team photograph at SWAT team training—a reputation that earned him the nickname “Penie.”

The district court concluded that Shockley and Wallace were not as a matter of law entitled to qualified immunity on the supervisory liability claims and also denied summary judgment to Hill on the excessive force claim. Shockley and Wallace (“Appellants”) filed this appeal.

The district court granted summary judgment to Shockley, Wallace, Hill, and the other police officers named as defendants as to all of Plaintiffs' remaining claims.

7. **Failure to direct:**

a. **Ford v. Breier 383 F. Supp 505 (DC-Wisc.-1974)**

Mother of deceased who was shot by one of two police officers who converged on plaintiff's house where it was thought a fugitive was hiding brought civil rights action for monetary damages against officers and police chief. On police chief's motion to dismiss, the District Court, Reynolds, Chief Judge, held that complaint alleging that police chief had failed to establish a requirement that police officers procure search and arrest warrants before entering domiciles stated cause of action.

b. **Bisbal-Ramos v. City of Mayaguez 467 F.3d 16, C.A.1.P.R., 2006**

City employee brought action against city and the president of the city assembly, alleging political harassment and termination of employment in violation of the First Amendment. The United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, Juan M. Pérez-Giménez, J., entered judgment, upon jury verdict, in favor of employee, but reduced the damages awarded by the jury. Employee and defendants appealed. The Court of Appeals, [John R. Gibson](#), Circuit Judge, sitting by designation, held that:

(1) evidence was sufficient to support determination that employee was deprived of his work duties in retaliation for his political affiliation;

(2) evidence was sufficient to support determination of municipal liability;

(3) president of city assembly was liable for punitive damages as supervisor under § 1983;

(4) president was not entitled to qualified immunity; and

(5) reduction of jury's compensatory damages award from \$250,000 to \$50,000 violated city employee's Seventh Amendment rights.

Intentionally left Blank

Intentionally left Blank

APPENDIX II

(Copy of Sample Evaluation Reports)

BEXAR COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
OBSERVATION REPORT



WEEK _____
PHASE _____

Probationary Deputy: _____ DATE OR WORK WEEK _____

FTO _____ DIVISION/SHIFT _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS: Rate observed behavior on the scale below using the numerical value definitions contained in the standardized evaluation guidelines. You must comment on the most and least acceptable performance of the day or week. Although specific comments are required for all ratings of "1" or "6" and above, and "NRT", you are encouraged to comment on any behavior you wish. Use category numbers to reference your narrative comments. Check the "NO" box if a category is not observed. Check the "NRT" box if the recruit fails to respond to training.



PERFORMANCE TASKS

			NO	NRT
1.	Driving skills: Normal Conditions	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Driving Skills: Stress Conditions	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Orientation/Response To calls	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	Field Performance: Stress Conditions	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	Self-initiated Field Activity	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	Officer Safety	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	Control of Conflict: Verbal Skills	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Control of Conflict: Physical Skills	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	Radio: Comprehension/Usage	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Routine Forms: Accuracy/Completeness	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Report Writing: Organization and Detail	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	Report Writing: Appropriate Time Used	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Field Performance: Non-Stress	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	Investigation Skills	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	Interview/interrogation Skills	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Problems Solving/Decision Making	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

KNOWLEDGE

17.	Agency Policies/Procedures	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18.	Penal Code, CCP	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	Vehicle Code	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ATTITUDE

20.	Acceptance of Feedback	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	Attitude toward Law Enforcement Work	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	Relationship with Public in General	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	Relationship with Ethnic Groups	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	Relationship with Other Officers and Supervisors	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPEARANCE

25.	General Appearance	1234567	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	--------------------------

NARRATIVE COMMENTS

Most Acceptable Performance: _____

Improvements Needed _____

Additional Comments _____

I CERTIFY that this report is an accurate reflection of the recruit's training during the period.

FTO Signature and Badge number

Training Deputy's Signature and Badge number

Supervisor's Signature



**CORPUS CHRISTI POLICE DEPARTMENT
RECRUIT EVALUATION FORM #2**

RECRUIT _____ EMP# _____ DATE _____ CALL# _____

FTO: _____ EMP# _____ SPRV. _____

NSI=Needs Significant Improvement M=Marginal A= Acceptable S=Superior

NO=Not Observed NRT=Not Responding to Training: Grade recruit based on his/her display of the following traits.

PERFORMANCE TASKS

						NO	NRT
01 Non-stress Performance	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02 Stress Performance.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03 Officer Safety.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04 Self-Initiated Activity	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05 Observation Skill	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06 Situation Control: Verbal Skill	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07 Situation Control: Physical Skill.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08 Problem Solving/Decision Making.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09a Driving Skill (normal).....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09b Driving Skill (stress/emergency).....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Investigative Skill	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 Interview/Interrogation Skill.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 Radio: Comprehension/Transmission.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 MDC Skill.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14 Report Writing: Accuracy/Completeness	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 Report Writing: Grammar/Spelling/Neatness.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16 Report Writing: Appropriate Time Used	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ATTITUDE

17 Accepts Feedback	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 Follows Instructions.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19 Relationship with Public in General	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 Relationship with Ethnic Groups	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

KNOWLEDGE

21 Departmental Policies/Procedures	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22 Penal Code	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23 Code of Criminal Procedures.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24 Family Code.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25 Health & Safety Code.. ..	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26 Transportation Code.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27 City Ordinances	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28 Geographic Comprehension.....	NSI	M	A	S		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NARRATIVE COMMENTS

Least Acceptable Performance _____

Most Acceptable Performance _____

Additional Comments _____

Recruit's Comments:

Recruit's Signature *Date* _____
FTO's Signature *Date*

Lieutenant's Signature *Date* _____
Captain's Signature *Date*

FTO Coordinator's Signature *Date*

**Hays County Sheriff's Office
End of Phase Report**

IDS _____

Phase _____

FTO _____

Date _____

- 1) **General Appearance & Attitude**

- 2) **Knowledge of Department Policies & Law**

- 3) **Driving, Use of Maps and Response Time to Calls**

- 4) **Report Writing (Organization, Details, Grammar, Spelling, Neatness, Appropriate Time Used)**

- 5) **Field Performance, Control of Conflict, Common Sense, Judgment etc.**

- 6) **Relationships (citizens, minorities, other officers, supervisors).**

- 7) **List any areas or categories that were not evaluated or covered by instruction in the last phase that should be noted for the next FTO to address.**

- 8) **Any other comments or recommendations**

Signature of FTO

Signature of IDS

Signature of FTO Supervisor

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
DAILY OBSERVATION REPORT SUMMARY

Officer in Training: _____

Phase: _____

Dates: _____

DAILY OBSERVATION REPORT – NUMBER OF DAY IN PHASE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
1. General Appearance																					
2. Acceptance of Feedback																					
3. Attitude Toward Police Work																					
4. Knowledge of Policy and Procedure																					
Verbal/Written Testing																					
Field Performance																					
5. Knowledge of Criminal Statutes																					
Verbal/Written Testing																					
Field Performance																					
6. Knowledge of TAMU Regulations																					
Verbal/Written Testing																					
Field Performance																					
7. Knowledge of Texas Traffic Codes																					
Verbal/Written Testing																					
Field Performance																					
8. Texas Code of Criminal Procedures																					
Verbal/Written Testing																					
Field Performance																					
9. Driving Skill (Normal Conditions)																					
10. Driving Skill (Moderate Stress)																					
11. Response Time to Calls																					
12. Routine Forms (Accuracy/Completeness)																					
13. Report Writing (Organization/Details)																					
14. Field Writing (Grammar/Speech)																					
15. Report Writing (Use of Time)																					
16. Field Performance (Non-stress)																					
17. Field Performance (Stress)																					

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
CONTINUATION OF DAILY OBSERVATION REPORT SUMMARY

Officer in Training: _____

Phase: _____

Dates: _____

DAILY OBSERVATION REPORT – NUMBER OF DAY IN PHASE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
18. Investigative Skills																				
19. Interviewing/Interrogation																				
20. Self Initiated Field Activity																				
21. Officer Safety (General)																				
22. Officer Safety (Suspect/Prisoner)																				
23. Control of Conflict (Voice Command)																				
24. Control of Conflict (Physical)																				
25. Use of Common Sense/Judgment																				
26. Radio (Use of Codes/Procedure)																				
27. Radio (Listens and Comprehends)																				
28. Radio (Articulation of Transmission)																				
Relationship With:																				
29. Citizens in General																				
30. Ethnic Groups (Other Than Own)																				
31. Field Training Specialist																				
32. Other Officers																				
33. Supervisors and Command Officers																				

**TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD TRAINING OFFICER PROGRAM**

REQUEST FOR INTENSIVE REMEDIAL TRAINING OF OFFICER

OFFICER IN TRAINING: _____ **DATE:** _____

FIELD TRAINING OFFICER: _____ **PHASE:** _____

DESCRIBE THE WEAKNESS OR DEFICIENCY:

DESCRIBE THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN DURING THIS PHASE AND THE RESULTS:

FIELD TRAINING SPECIALIST

DATE

FIELD TRAINING COORDINATOR

DATE



DAILY TRAINING REPORT

PHASE 1 2 3 4 6 WEEK 1 2 3 4 DAY 1 2 3 4 5 6 DATE _____

PDS _____

EMP. # _____

FTO _____

EMP. # _____

The line checked across from the categories indicates training opportunities experienced by the PDS during this day. Documentation detailing the training provided is listed on the following pages. **Phase 6:** Circle the number of the FORMAL category(s) and document only the training provided in that category.

TRAINING CATEGORIES

TRAINING PROVIDED

No. of hours with FTO today _____ (Min. of 7.5 to constitute valid training day) **YES/NO**

- 1. Computer Operation ___ ___
- 2. Control of Persons/Prisoners/Mentally Ill ___ ___
- 3. Departmental Policies and Procedures ___ ___
- 4. Form Proficiency ___ ___
- 5. Investigations / Evidentiary Process ___ ___
- 6. Map Book / District Awareness ___ ___
- 7. State Statutes ___ ___
- 8. Traffic Laws / Local Ordinances. ___ ___
- 9. Professional Demeanor ___ ___
- 10. Radio Communication ___ ___
- 11. Report Writing ___ ___
- 12. Safety Awareness ___ ___
- 13. Scene Management and Resolution ___ ___
- 14. Search and/or Seizures ___ ___
- 15. Self-Initiated Field Activities ___ ___
- 16. Vehicle Operation ___ ___



FTS _____



DAILY EVALUATION REPORT

PHASE 5 7 WEEK 1 2 3 4 DAY 1 2 3 4 5 6 DATE _____

PDS _____
FTO _____

EMP. # _____
EMP. # _____

Through cumulative grading, the appropriate Performance Level Designator (PLD) which most reflects the PDS's daily performance in each of the evaluation categories will be circled. **Phase VII:** Circle the number of the Formal category(s) being evaluated. Put an asterisk next to any category number that indicates documentation was needed in a Non-formal category.

EVALUATION CATEGORIES

PERFORMANCE LEVEL DESIGNATORS

1. Computer Operation.	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
2. Control of Persons/Prisoners/Mentally Ill	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
3. Departmental Policies and Procedures	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
4. Form Proficiency	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
5. Investigations / Evidentiary Process	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
6. Map Book / District Awareness	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
7. State Statutes	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
8. Traffic Laws / Local Ordinances	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
9. Professional Demeanor	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
10. Radio Communication	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
11. Report Writing	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
12. Safety Awareness	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
13. Scene Management and Resolution	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
14. Search and/or Seizures	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
15. Self-Initiated Field Activities	PASS	FAIL	N.O.
16. Vehicle Operation	PASS	FAIL	N.O.

ROUTING: Dailies to FTS daily. FTS sends to FTC at end of week with weekly.

Documentation must specifically identify only the tasks actually performed by the PDS and observed by the FTO. The documentation will include a description of the actions of the PDS during the shift. The details of the documentation will contain the following information when applicable: **TIME, LOCATION, NATURE OF THE INCIDENT, CASE/TICKET NUMBER, and CLEARANCE CODE.** In Phase VII: Only formal categories must be documented on a daily basis.

Houston Police Department FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM



WEEKLY EVALUATION REPORT

PHASE 4 6 WEEK 1 2 3 DIVISION _____ DATE _____
 PROBATIONARY OFFICER _____ EMP. NO. _____ CLASS NO. _____
 FIELD PERFORMANCE EVALUATOR _____ EMP. NO. _____ SHIFT: 1 2 3

Through cumulative grading from the five previous Daily Evaluation Reports, circle the appropriate Performance Level Designator (PLD) which most reflects the PPO's weekly performance in each of the evaluation categories. Furnish the required documentation on the back of this report.

EVALUATION CATEGORIES

PERFORMANCE LEVEL
DESIGNATORS

Computer Operation	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Control of Persons / Prisoners / Mentally ILL	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Departmental Policies and Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Form Proficiency	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Investigations / Evidentiary Process	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Key Map / District Awareness	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Texas Statutes	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Traffic Laws and City Ordinances	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Professional Demeanor	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Radio Communication	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Report Writing.....	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Safety Awareness	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Scene Management and Resolution	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Search and/or Seizures	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Self-Initiated Field Activities	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.
Vehicle Operation	1	2	3	4	5	N.O.

RECEIVED _____ CHECKED _____ MONITOR _____
 RETURNED _____ RECEIVED _____ CHECKED _____

List any CONSISTENT strengths displayed by the probationary police officer (PPO) over the past five evaluation days:

List by category and explain those CONSISTENT weaknesses displayed by the PPO over the previous five evaluation days:

(should more space be required, use a supplemental form)

PHASE VI ONLY: List by category all weaknesses "NOT" being formally evaluated which you identified during the past five evaluation days:

Cat. No.(s) _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____ , _____

I CERTIFY that this report is an accurate reflection of this _____
PPO's performance during the previous five days of evaluation. *Signature – Field Performance Evaluator*

WEEKLY EVALUATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Date _____

Who was present at this conference? _____

Were the performance levels on the front of this report discussed with the PPO? Yes No
(If NO, explain)

Were the significant strengths listed above discussed with the PPO? Yes No
(If NO, explain)

Were the significant weaknesses being formally evaluated discussed with the PPO? Yes No
(If NO, explain)

Were the previous five daily evaluation reports discussed with the PPO? Yes No
(If NO, explain)

PHASE VI ONLY: Were any weaknesses identified in categories "NOT" being formally Yes No
(If YES, explain)
evaluated during the past five evaluation days:

Were the above weaknesses being discussed with the PPO? Yes No
(If NO, explain)

GENERAL COMMENTS

I CERTIFY that this report is an accurate reflection of the _____
Weekly conference conducted by me. *Signature – Field Training Supervisor*

I CERTIFY that I have been shown this report and that I am _____
aware of its contents. *Signature – Probationary Police Officer*

I CERTIFY that I have reviewed this report and found that I am _____
aware of the PPO's status in the program. *Signature – Division Training Coordinator*

**SAN ANGELO POLICE DEPARTMENT
STANDARDIZED EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

DAILY	
END OF PHASE	

	PHASE
	WEEK

RECRUIT _____ FTO _____ SHIFT _____ DATE _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS: Rate observed behavior on the scale below using the numerical value definitions contained in the standardized evaluation guidelines. You must comment on the most and least acceptable performance of the day. Although specific comments are required for all ratings of “2” and below, “4” and above, and “NRT”, you are encouraged to comment on any behavior you wish. Use category numbers to reference your narrative comments. Check the “NO” box if a category is not observed. Check the “NRT” box if the recruit fails to respond to training.

Assignment of Reason for No Evaluation: _____ TAPE #: _____

PERFORMANCE TASKS

	1	2	3	4	5	NO	NRT
1. Driving skills: Normal conditions							
2. Driving skills: Stress conditions							
3. Orientation/Response time to calls							
4. Self-initiated field activity/Observation skills							
5. Field Performance: Non-stress conditions							
6. Field Performance: Stress conditions							
7. Control of conflict: Verbal skills							
8. Control of conflict: Physical skills							
9. Officer Safety							
10. Routine forms: Accuracy and completeness							
11. Report writing: Organization and detail							
12. Report writing: Appropriate time used							
13. Radio/MDC/Video: Comprehension/usage							
14. Investigative skills							
15. Interview/interrogation skills							
16. Problem solving/Decision making							
17. Multi-tasking							

KNOWLEDGE

18. Departmental police/procedures	1	2	3	4	5		
19. Penal Code, Code of Criminal Procedures, City Ordinance	1	2	3	4	5		
20. Vehicle Code	1	2	3	4	5		

ATTITUDE

21. Acceptance of feedback/following instructions	1	2	3	4	5		
22. Attitude toward police work	1	2	3	4	5		
23. Relationship with Public in general	1	2	3	4	5		
24. Relationship with ethnic groups	1	2	3	4	5		
25. Relationship with other Officers and Supervisors	1	2	3	4	5		

APPEARANCE

26. General appearance	1	2	3	4	5		
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

REMEDIAL TRAINING TIME USED _____ (Explain under additional comments)

FTO CRITIQUE FORM

In an effort to ensure that the Field Training Officer maintains a high level of skill, performance and interest, this critique form is presented to the Recruit Officer for completion. It is to the FTO's benefit that they know the impression the FTO is making on the new officer. It is the belief of this department that an FTO who is truly interested in doing their best would welcome this type of objective feedback. With this in mind, the Probationary Police Officer (PPO) is requested to honestly appraise and evaluate the FTO in the areas listed below. FTO's WILL NOT receive these critique forms until the completion of the fourteen week program. You are asked to sign your name, but signatures will be deleted from any copies presented to the FTO.

PART I INSTRUCTIONS: Place your FTO's name in the blank space below. If you had more than one FTO during the period being rated, place the name of the FTO you spent MOST of your time with. This does not include the one week assignment to the Traffic Section. Complete a separate critique form for your Traffic FTO. Second, select the time period for which the evaluation takes place.

YOUR FIELD TRAINING OFFICER

Limbo _____ Weeks 1-4 _____ Weeks 5-7 _____ Traffic _____ Weeks 8-10 _____ Weeks 11-12 _____

PART II INSTRUCTIONS: Circle one of the responses which are beneath each of the eight statements below. A circling of "Poor" or "Fair" must be explained on the line following the statement. "Average", "Good" or "Excellent" do not require explanation. Please give honest ratings in each statement. Do not give one of the latter ratings to avoid writing an explanation.

1. The FTO's ability as a Police Officer:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

2. The example your FTO sets for YOU:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

3. The FTO's interest in imparting training material and information to you:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

4. The FTO's knowledge of the training material covered:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

5. The FTO's skill as an instructor/teacher/trainer:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

6. The FTO's ability to communicate with you:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

7. The FTO's application of honesty, fairness and objectivity in rating you:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

8. The FTO's overall attitude for the work he is doing:

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

Explanation: _____

List the area(s) in which you think your FTO puts forth the BEST effort.

List the area(s) in which you think your FTO puts forth the WORST effort.

Printed Name & PIN _____ SIGNATURE _____

Performance Tasks

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 11. Driving skills: normal conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Driving skills: stress conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Orientation/Response time to calls | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. Radio: comprehension/usage | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. Routine forms: accuracy/completeness | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Report writing: organization/detail/spelling | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Report writing: appropriate time used | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Investigative skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Interview/Interrogation skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Field performance: non-stress conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. Field performance: stress conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. Self-initiated field activity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Control of conflict: verbal skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Control of conflict: physical skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Officer safety | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Problem solving/decision making | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Patrolling techniques | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Most Acceptable Performance:

Least Acceptable Performance:

Recruit Officer's Comments:

Activity/Comments:

Service number

Nature of call

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

Please read carefully before signing!



Recruit Officer's signature/Date



I read this performance evaluation, understand it, and received a copy of it. Furthermore, the Training Instructor has reviewed this evaluation with me, and explained (to my satisfaction) both my strengths and weaknesses noted. I also understand that this evaluation is instrumental in determining my future employment with the Killeen Police Department, while assigned to the Field Training Program. Click the box below to signify your signature then in the first form field type your name along with the date in the last form field.

Training Instructor's signature/Date

Jail Training Program

Remedial Training Assignment Worksheet

Date: _____ Phase: _____ Week: _____

Trainee: _____ JTO: _____

Your JTO has identified the following area(s) of deficient performance in need of immediate attention. You are assigned to _____ for your remedial training, which should be completed by _____?
(JTO)
(Date)

Performance Deficiencies:

(Specifically define the problem area. Give examples.)

Training Assignment:

(Describe the specific assignments given to the Trainee to correct the above problem area(s).)

Trainee: _____ JTO: _____
(Signature, Date) (Signature/Date)

Assignment Completion:

1. Has the trainee satisfactorily completed the above training plan?
Yes[] No[]
2. Is the trainee now performing at a competent level?
Yes[] No[]
3. Has an additional assignment been given?
Yes[] No[]

Comments:

JTO: _____ Program Coordinator: _____
(Originating Phase JTO Signature/Date) (Signature/Date)

Jail Training Program

Weekly Training Report

Trainee Name	JTO Name	Date/Week
--------------	----------	-----------

NOT ACCEPTABLE BY **→** **ACCEPTABLE** **←** **SUPERIOR BY**

APPEARANCE

1. General	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	----

ATTITUDE

2. Acceptance of Feedback: JTO/JTO Program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
3. JFT Program Standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT

RATING INSTRUCTIONS: Rate observations/performance using the scale below. Comment on the most satisfactory performance and the least satisfactory performance of the week. Comment on any behavior noted; however, a specific comment is required for scores of "1" and "7." Circle "N/O" response for behavior not observed and "NRT" for not responding to training. Enter the number of remedial training hours after the initials "RT."

KNOWLEDGE

4. Department Polices and Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
5. Statutes of Jail Standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
6. Use of Force in Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
7. Code of Criminal Procedure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT

PERFORMANCE

8. Officer Safety: General/Observation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
9. Officer Safety: With Inmate/Detainees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
10. Control of Conflict: Voice Commands	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
11. Control of Conflict: Physical Skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
12. Inmate/Cell Searches	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
13. Self-Initiated Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
14. Field Performance: Normal Conditions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
15. Field Performance: Stress Conditions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
16. Problem Solving/Decision Making	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
17. Listens and Comprehends Verbal Instructions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
18. Comprehends Written Instructions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
19. Communication Skills: Verbal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
20. Communication Skills: Non-verbal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
21. Computer Operations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
22. Use of Radio: Listens and Comprehends Transmissions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
23. Use of Radio: Articulation of Transmission	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
24. Proper Use and Operation of Equipment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
25. Routine Forms: Accurate/Complete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
26. Report Writing: Organization and Detail	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT

RELATIONSHIPS

27. With Public in General	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
28. With Ethnic/Cultural/Social/Gender Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
29. With Departmental Personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT
30. With Supervisors and Command Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N/O	NRT	RT

Jail Training Program

End Of Phase Report

Trainee

JTO

Date Written

Phase: _____ **Date Phase Began:** _____ **Date Phase Ended:** _____

Significant Strengths:

1. _____

2. _____

This trainee is in the ____ week of training. Per above and previous evaluations, this JTO appraises this trainee as rated in the ____ week of training in terms of performance.

3. _____

Significant Weaknesses:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Additional Training to Include Remedial:

Optional Comments:

This trainee *is* / *is not* performing at a solo officer level per phase tasks.

Trainee Signature

JTO Signature

Program Coordinator Signature

Date

Jail Training Program

Jail Training Officer Critique Form

This critique form is to be completed by the trainee.

In an effort to enhance the level of skill, knowledge and performance of our Jail Training Officers (JTOs), we are requesting all trainees complete the following critique. It is very important that this feedback is given honestly, so that the JTO may benefit from your impressions of the quality of training.

This critique is confidential and will be reviewed only by the field training program staff. Your answers (but not your identity) will be shared with the JTO to assist in improving training methods. Please substantiate answers with narrative examples.

JTO: _____ Date: _____ Phase: _____

1. The Jail Training Program emphasis focuses on both on training and evaluation. Please note the percentages (equaling 100%) of the amount of emphasis you felt the JTO put forth on each area. Training _____ Evaluation _____
2. Again using percentages, note overall how you felt your JTO's emphasis related to you. One of many trainees _____ or as an individual _____
3. How would you rate your JTO as a positive role model?
Poor Fair Average Good Excellent
4. Was this JTO responsive to your needs, problems and concerns as a trainee?
Never Seldom Occasionally Usually Always
5. Rate this JTO's knowledge base concerning the presented topics/tasks.
Poor Fair Average Good Excellent
6. How would you rate this JTO's skill as a trainer/evaluator and the methods (s)he used in these categories?
Poor Fair Average Good Excellent
7. Rate this JTO's communication skills.
Poor Fair Average Good Excellent

8. Rate this JTO's honesty, integrity, and objectivity when evaluating you as a trainee.

Too Negative Too Critical Unfair Good Very Positive

9. Did this JTO work with you on areas of deficiency or where additional practice/guidance time was needed?

Never Seldom Occasionally Usually Always

10. List JTO strengths (training skills, policies and procedures, report writing, etc.)

11. List areas that you feel are in need of improvement.

12. Did you note any discrepancies in policy/procedure or task completion among JTOs?
Please cite examples.

Additional Comments:

Trainee Signature

Date

Jail Training Program

Field Training Program Critique Form

1. Did your JTO sufficiently explain program process and expectations to you prior to beginning training/evaluation process?

2. Was length of program adequate?

Trainee: Please complete the following form, providing feedback on your impressions of the current Jail Training Program. Please read questions carefully and answer honestly and in a specific manner. This will enable our department to utilize your comments for future program improvement.

3. Do you feel the training directly applied to the job you will be doing on a daily basis?

4. Were there any topics/tasks you felt needed inclusion or areas needing additional time allotted? If so, which areas?

5. Were the Jail Training Officers consistent with each other on training/evaluation procedures, processes and information given?

6. Did you find the inclusion of evaluations helpful in the training process (DOR's, Weekly, etc.)?

7. Did you feel Jail Training staff was fair and objective when rating evaluations, and in making judgments and recommendations concerning your progress?

8. Are there any changes you would like to suggest to improve the current program?

9. Upon completion of this Jail Training Program, do you feel you are “solo” ready in each of the following areas?

A. Security	YES	NO
B. Inmate Supervision	YES	NO
C. Policy and Procedure	YES	NO
Documentation and Report Writing	YES	NO
D. Door Operations	YES	NO
E. Count	YES	NO
F. Feeding, Showers, Phone	YES	NO
G. Movement	YES	NO
H. Inmate Supplies	YES	NO
I. Housekeeping/Sanitation	YES	NO
J. Inmate Requests	YES	NO
K. Grievance Process	YES	NO
L. Disciplinary/Control of Inmate Behavior	YES	NO
M. Visitation	YES	NO
N. Commissary/Recreation	YES	NO
O. Mail Policy and Procedure	YES	NO
P. Maintenance	YES	NO
Q. Keys	YES	NO
R. Medical/Blood Born Pathogens	YES	NO
S. Use of Force/Defensive Tactics	YES	NO
T. Fire Training	YES	NO
U. Hostage/Escape Attempts	YES	NO
V. Suicide	YES	NO
W. Cell Searches	YES	NO

10. Additional Comments?

**Jail Training Program
Completion/Competency Confirmation Form**

Trainee Name Date

Name of Jail Training Officer(s):	Training Dates (To/From):
_____ Phase I	_____
_____ Phase II	_____
_____ Phase III	_____
_____ Phase IV (if applicable)	_____
_____ Remediation (if applicable)	_____

I have been instructed in all information/tasks recorded in the Jail Training Program Lesson Plan:

Signature of Trainee Date

I certify that Officer _____ has received the instruction outlined in the Jail Training Program Lesson Plan and that Officer _____ has performed successfully in all structured information/task areas. I also certify that all tests have been completed in a satisfactory manner and that he/she is now prepared to work in a solo capacity.

Evaluating Jail Training Officer Signature Date

Jail Training Officer Program Coordinator Date

I attest that the above named trainee has successfully completed the required Jail Training Program and is competent to perform in a solo capacity.

Departmental Head Date

Daily Evaluation Report

Operator _____ **Date** _____

Trainer _____

MOST satisfactory area of performance:

LEAST satisfactory area of performance:

Goals for improvement:

Operator Trainee's Comments:

Operator Trainee _____ **Date** _____

Training Operator _____ **Date** _____

Supervisor _____ **Date** _____

Daily Performance Report

Operator Trainee _____ Date _____

Training Operator _____ Time _____ am _____ am
Observed _____ pm _____ pm

Activity Observed _____ Total Hours _____

Rating Scale: 1 = Unacceptable 4 = Minimum Acceptable 7 = Superior
N/O = Not Observed

GENERAL TASKS

General Appearance (Beginning of Shift)	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Attendance	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Phone Skills Normal	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Phone Skills Stressful	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Organizational Skills	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Information - Normal	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Call Information - Stressful	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Problem Solving	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Decision Making	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Comprehension/Listening Skills	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relationship with Public	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relationship with Co-Workers	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relationship with Other Agencies	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relationship with Officers	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Complies with Direction/Instruction	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Accepts Correction/Feedback	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Utilizes/Refers to Training Materials	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Care of Equipment	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Utilizes Resources/Equip Effectively	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Accepts Responsibility	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Department Policies & Procedures	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

CRITICAL PERFORMANCE TASKS

Officer/Public Safety	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Radio Comprehension/Listen	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Voice Tone Quality over Radio	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Prompt in Giving Out Calls	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ability to Prioritize Calls	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Use of Ten Codes	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Send Correct Officers to Calls	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Prompt in Acknowledging Officers	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ability to Keep Up with Officers	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Radio Operating Procedures	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Performance Under Stress	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Takes Control of Situations	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Geography	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Radio Skills Normal	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Radio Skills Stressful	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ability to Multi-Task	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

CAD/TCIC/NCIC FORMATS

Information Entries	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Understands DL Returns	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Understands Vehicle Returns	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Wanted/Stolen Conformations	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TCIC/NCIC Formats	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
CAD Formats & Functions	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
FCC Regulations	N/O	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Training Operator's Remarks

Operator Trainee's Response

Follow-Up Action

Training Operator _____ **Operator Trainee** _____

Supervisor _____ **Date** _____

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF - CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY

FTO Module Performance Checklist

Chapter: _____

Trainee _____

Module Title: _____

FTO: _____

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: After explanation, demonstration, and practice, the trainee will

STEPS:

Trainee Reads/Reviews Task Documents	FTO Explains & Demonstrates	Trainee Explains as FTO Demonstrates	Trainee Explains & Demonstrates	Trainee Practices	Trainee Performs Successfully (Proficiency Test Completed)

I certify that proficiency was demonstrated by the above trainee concerning this task on,

_____ (date)

X _____ FTO

X _____ Trainee

Training Hours Credit

OLMSTED COUNTY ADULT DETENTION CENTER FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM

Module Title:

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE:

After explanation, demonstration, and practice, trainee will

1. Trainee reads/reviews task document
2. FTO explains and demonstrates
3. Trainee explains as FTO performs
4. Trainee explains and demonstrates
5. Trainee practices
6. Trainee performs task unassisted

Task Steps	1	2	3	4	5	6

I certify that the trainee demonstrated proficiency concerning this task.

DATE:

TRAINEE:

FTO:

Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility

FTO Module Performance Checklist

Chapter: _____

Trainee: _____

Module Title: _____

FTO: _____

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: After explanation, demonstration, and practice, the trainee will:

STEPS:

Trainee Reads/Reviews Task Document	FTO Explains and Demonstrates	Trainee Explains as FTO Demonstrates	Trainee Explains and Demonstrates	Trainee Practices	Trainee Performs Successfully (Proficiency Test Completed)

I certify that proficiency was demonstrated by the above trainee concerning this task on _____ (date)
 X _____ *FTO*
 X _____ *Trainee*

Boulder County Sheriff's Office
FTO MODULE PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

CHAPTER:

Trainee _____

Module Title:

FTO: _____

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: After explanation, demonstration, and practice, the trainee will be able to

STEPS:

- 1.

Trainee Reads/Reviews Task	FTO Explains & Demonstrate	Trainee Explains as FTO	Trainee Explains & Demonstrate	Trainee Practices (Note Training)	Trainee Performs (Proficiency Test)
<p><i>I certify that proficiency was demonstrated by the above trainee concerning this task on _____(date)</i></p> <p>_____ (FTO)</p> <p>_____ (Trainee)</p>					

MECOSTA COUNTY, MI FTO MODULE PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

CHAPTER:

Trainee: _____

Module Title:

FTO: _____

Training Time:

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: After explanation, demonstration, and practice, the trainee will be able to

STEPS:

1.

Trainee Reads/Reviews Task Document	FTO Explains & Demonstrates	Trainee Explains as FTO Demonstrates	Trainee Explains & Demonstrates	Trainee Practices (Note Training Times on Form)	Trainee Performs (Proficiency Test Completed)
T I M E				LOG	

I certify that proficiency was demonstrated by the above trainee concerning this task on _____(date)

_____(F
TO)

_____(Trai
nee)

RESOURCES

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
Officer Standards and Education
Attn: Education and Training Programs Division
6330 U.S. Hwy 290 East, Ste. 200
Austin, Texas 78723
(512) 936-7700
www.tcleose.state.tx.us

Texas Associations of Counties
1210 San Antonio
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 478-8753
www.county.org

National Association of Field Training Officer
P.O. Box 3236
Evansville, IN 47731
(812) 436-7951
www.nafto.org

National Institute of Corrections Academy Division
320 First Street NW
Washington, DC 20534
(800) 995-6423
www.icic.org

Professional Pride Training Co. (Dispatch Training)
1812 Pease Avenue
Sumner, WA 98390
(800) 830-8228
www.911trainer.com

State of California – Department of Justice
Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
1601 Alhambra Blvd
Sacramento, California 95816-7083
(916) 227-3909
www.post.ca.gov

REFERENCE MATERIAL

- Blake, R & Mouton, J. (1964). The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blanchard, K. & Hersey, P. (2000). Leadership and the One Minute Manager. New Ed: Harper Collins Business.
- Bloomington Police Department. (2001). Bloomington Police Dept: Field Training Guide. Bloomington, IN: Bloomington Police Dept.
- Daft, L. & Lengel, R. H. (1996). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness, and Structural Design. Managerial Science. pp. 554-72
- DuBrin, A. (2000). Applying Psychology: Individual and Organizational Effectiveness. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., p 294.
- Duncan, B. (2005). Communicating for Greater Personal and Professional Effectiveness. Workshop conducted for University of Phoenix Undergraduate School of Management.
- Kaminsky, G. (2002). The Field Training Concept in Criminal Justice Agencies. Saddle River, New Jersey. Prentice –Hall, Inc.
- Katz, D. & R. L. Kahn (1966). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., pp. 223-24.
- Lieb, S. (1991). Principles of Adult Learning. Senior Technical Writer and Planner, Arizona Agency of Health Services and part-time Instructor, South Mountain Community College from VISION.
- Mehrabian, A. & Weiner M. (1967). Decoding of Inconsistent Communications. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 1967, pp. 109-114.
- Murray, K. (2004). Training at the Speed of Life. Vol. 1. Gotha, FL: Armiger Publications Co.
- Peak, Gaines, & Glensor. (2004). Police Supervision and Management: In an Era of Community Policing. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.