

West Chester University

Digital Commons @ West Chester University

West Chester University Doctoral Projects

Masters Theses and Doctoral Projects

Fall 2021

Examining the Implementation Fidelity of a Police Field Training Officer Program: A Program Evaluation Perspective: A Mixed Methods Approach.

Yale Y. Margolis
ym900330@wcupa.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wcupa.edu/all_doctoral



Part of the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Margolis, Yale Y., "Examining the Implementation Fidelity of a Police Field Training Officer Program: A Program Evaluation Perspective: A Mixed Methods Approach." (2021). *West Chester University Doctoral Projects*. 112.

https://digitalcommons.wcupa.edu/all_doctoral/112

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Masters Theses and Doctoral Projects at Digital Commons @ West Chester University. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Chester University Doctoral Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ West Chester University. For more information, please contact wccressler@wcupa.edu.

Examining the Implementation Fidelity of a Police Field Training Officer Program:

A Program Evaluation Perspective: A Mixed Methods Approach.

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the

Department of Public Policy and Administration

West Chester University

West Chester, Pennsylvania

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctorate of Public Administration

By

Yale Y. Margolis

December 2021

© Copyright 2021 Yale Y. Margolis

Dedication

I must thank the *Ribbono Shel Olam* for all the goodness in my life and for granting me the will and stamina to complete this dissertation.

To my wife, Sara. You used to tell me every day that I am crazy for going back to school, and while that is true, you have always supported me without question. The gratitude, love, and devotion you have shown me since the day we met are unsurpassed. There is no way that I could have completed this journey without your love and support. You are the most amazing wife, mother, friend, and confidant I could ever have. Forever and always, my dear, *vivamus mea atque amemus*. I love you.

To my children, Ariella, Daniella, Gabriella, and James, you guys are the best thing I have ever done in my life. I love you all very much.

To my mom and dad. Thank you for instilling in me the desire to learn and strive for success.

To my siblings, Avigail, Rochel Leah, and Sara Rifkiah. I could not ask for better siblings.

To the NYPD. I had the honor of serving in the ranks as a police officer for 10 years at Police Service Area 2, and I miss it every day. I want to thank all the men and women of the NYPD for the tireless work they do on behalf of the public each and every day. *Fidelis Ad Mortem*.

To Lieutenant Michael Raimo. When I went back to school in 2010, as a joke, you started calling me professor. This is for you. RIP.

God Bless the United States of America.

Acknowledgments

I began this journey in September 2010 and, along the way, collected more diplomas than I knew what to do with. While the people who need to be thanked are too numerous to mention here, let me just say that the journey was long and the work arduous, but a heartfelt thank you to all those who have made it possible. The past 10 years have been full of change and surprise, and I look forward to the next chapter of my life.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Jeremy Phillips, for guiding me through this 18-month long dissertation with professionalism. Thank you.

Thank you to all the Professors at West Chester University who have taught me so much.

Abstract

Although researchers have studied policing in general, there has been a lack of studies focused on better understanding field training for officers. This study addressed the gap in knowledge regarding the dynamics of a specific Field Training Program (FTP) in a large metropolitan police department in the United States and whether the FTP was implemented with fidelity. A mixed methods research design was used whereby 49 FTOs participated in a survey, and eight of these officers participated in follow-up semistructured interviews. Survey data were treated as quantitative data and analyzed through logistical regressions. Interview data were treated as qualitative data, and themes were generated. Results showed that the FTP program was not implemented with fidelity. Quantitative results showed that gender, age of the FTO, and years serving were found all to be significant predictors for program infidelity. Qualitative data revealed that FTOs reported that the recommended proportion of one FTO to two rookies was not always followed during the training. Officers believed this proportion to be unsafe. Many of the officers were unaware of these incentives associated with their participation in the program; however, many of the officers interviewed reported that they would participate in the program again if given the opportunity. Recommendations for future practice include, but are not limited to, consulting with current FTOs when developing the program design and structure to identify best practices and include only those FTOs in the program who want to participate.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	x
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Problem Statement.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of the Study	4
Value of Topic to Public Administration.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Research Gap	7
Limitations of the Study	7
Definitions of Terms.....	7
Conclusion	8
Chapter Two: Literature Review	9
Demographics of the Department under Study.....	9
Police Academy Training	10
Origin of FTPs	11
FTP National Models: The San Jose Model and the Police Training Officer Model (Reno Model).....	12
Definition of an FTP	13
Development of FTPs	14
Implementation Issues with FTPs.....	16
Retention and Termination Issues.....	17
Ratings Given to Rookies from Their FTOs.....	18

Educational Requirements for Police Officers	19
Characteristics of an FTP	20
Selection of the FTO	21
Importance of Specific FTO Characteristics.....	22
Importance of Specific Rookie Characteristics.....	24
Age, Race, and Gender of FTOs	25
Chapter Summary	26
Chapter Three: Methodology	27
The Program	28
Data Collection	29
Survey Methodology.....	31
Interview Methodology.....	31
Research Questions.....	32
Hypotheses.....	33
Participant Sample	34
Analysis	35
Chapter Four: Results	37
Logistic Regression.....	41
Results for Question 23: Arrest Processing.....	42
Results for Question 37: One FTO with Two Rookies Responding to Jobs	43
Results for Question 38: FTO Feeling Safe Responding to Jobs with Two Rookies	45
Post Hoc Analysis: Mann–Whitney <i>U</i> Tests	47

Currently an FTO by Management Supporting FTP	47
Attend Training Before Becoming FTO by Perception of Management Supporting FTO	48
Attend Training Before Becoming FTO by Perception of Management Selecting Qualified Officers	49
Chapter Five: Interviews	51
Data Collection	51
Demographics of the Interviewees	51
Background Origins of the FTP	52
Interview Results	52
Theme 1: Safety	53
Theme 2: Reengagement.....	55
Theme 3: Program Fidelity	58
Theme 4: Program Outcomes	64
Summary of Interview Findings	68
Chapter Six: Discussion and Conclusion.....	69
Research Question 1 Findings	70
Finding 1	70
Finding 2	71
Finding 3	72
Research Question 2 Findings	73
Finding 1	73
Finding 2	74

Finding 3	74
Findings Relevant to This Study.....	75
Award Rate of Training, Transfers, and Promotional Incentives	75
Discussion.....	78
Recommendations.....	79
Recommendation 1	79
Recommendation 2	80
Recommendation 3	80
Recommendation 4	81
Recommendation 5	81
Recommendation 6	82
Recommendation 7	83
Recommendation 8	83
Recommendation 9	83
Limitations	84
Recommendations for Future Research.....	84
Future Research Recommendation 1	84
Future Research Recommendation 2	85
Future Research Recommendation 3	86
Conclusion	86
References.....	87
Appendix A: Chief of Department Memo	98
Appendix B: Operations Order 8	101

Appendix C: Survey Informed Consent and Survey Questions.....	106
C1: Informed Consent.....	106
C2: Survey Questions	109
Appendix D: Interview Informed Consent	122
Appendix E: Interview Questions.....	124
Appendix F: Operations Order 53.....	126
Appendix G: Finest Message No. 19237304	128
Appendix H: Operations Order 53	129
Appendix I: Finest Message No. 26049714.....	133
Appendix J: Finest Message No. 2605A528.....	134

List of Tables

1. Descriptive Stats for Key Categorical Variables	35
2. Descriptive Stats for Key Continuous Variables	35
3. Pearson r Correlations for Key Variables	41
4. Results from Logistical Regression: Q23, Arrest Processing	43
5. Results from Logistical Regression: Q37, Program was Followed Regarding One FTO and Two Rookies Responding to Jobs	45
6. Results from Logistical Regression: Q38, Responding to Jobs with Rookies as Safe	47
7. Descriptive: Are you currently FTO, 1 = Yes, 2 = No by Management Supporting FTO Program.....	48
8. Results for Mann–Whitney U	48
9. Descriptive: Did you attend FTO Training before you became an FTO? 0 = No/1 = Yes....	50
10. Results for Mann–Whitney U	50
11. Interviewee Demographics	52
12. Theme 2, Reengagement.....	55
13. Theme 3, Subtheme 1	61
14. Theme 3, Subtheme 2	62
15. Theme 3, Subtheme 3	63

Chapter One: Introduction

The primary concept behind a field training program (FTP) is real-world training. Police recruits have only an academic, sanitized understanding of policing after spending months in the police academy. The majority of the time, police are not fighting crime because much of the work is administrative (Goldstein, 1977). The academy is not the proper place to mesh the knowledge the recruits are taught with the decidedly unsterile environment of actual policing (Getty et al., 2016).

The importance of FTPs was magnified when the images and videos showing the death of George Floyd in Minneapolis jumped into the public consciousness on May 25, 2020. Floyd died due to police officer Derrick Chauvin's actions, a field training officer (FTO) for the Minneapolis Police Department. At the time of the incident, two of the other three officers on the scene, Officer Alexander Kueng, and Officer Thomas Lane, were on their third and fourth shifts, respectively, as police officers and were being trained by Officer Chauvin (Kaur & Chavez, 2020).

The death of Mr. Floyd or anyone at the hands of the police can alter the perception of police legitimacy, defined for this dissertation as "a sure pathway for police to elicit cooperation, obtain compliance and gain satisfaction from the public" (Mazerolle et al., 2013, p. 246). Gibbs (2016) studied how the public views and defines police legitimacy, and the highest response rate overall, 37.8%, defined police legitimacy as "integrity or morality" (p. 2). Interestingly, 41% of respondents who identified as non-White defined police legitimacy as integrity or morality at a higher rate, versus 37% among those who identified as White.

Why is integrity so vital to the policing mission? Police departments need to be considered legitimate by the communities they protect and serve in order to function. Officers

must have the highest integrity levels to have legitimacy. Officers are entrusted to pass on values to the next generation of police officers. FTOs must be the ideal role model to ensure that tragedies like George Floyd's death do not happen again.

Problem Statement

This study will address the gap in knowledge about the dynamics of a specific FTP in a large metropolitan police department in the United States, henceforth referred to as "the Department," by having FTOs fill out a survey about if the FTP was implemented with fidelity. Semistructured interviews were conducted after the survey data had been analyzed, focusing on how and why officers became FTOs.

Beaver (2006) stated that FTOs must be motivated, attend an FTO training course, and keep the FTP integrity levels high. An FTO must be held "accountable for what and how they teach" (Beaver, 2006, p. 14). The department studied in this dissertation may have forced its officers to accept the position as an FTO, known as "voluntold" in police lingo. However, much of the literature states that having an FTO who does not want the position is counterproductive (Eisenberg, 1981; Hartman, 1979).

On December 30, 2014, the Department announced FTP incentives for officers who joined and became FTOs to attract qualified police officers. The incentives were additional training, possible promotion, and transfers to the FTOs' choice unit. The awarding or lack thereof of incentives will be discussed tangentially. However, the focus of this dissertation will be whether or not the FTP was implemented faithfully according to the policy design. The question of incentives attracting qualified officers will be a recommendation for future research.

In January 2015, the Department announced that the FTP would be initiated immediately. The program was designed to assist probationary officers transitioning from the academy to the

field. The Department FTP is ripe for evaluation because the program has been operating for several years, and there has not been any published research or evaluations completed on the program.

The Department did not institute a field training sergeant until May 4, 2017, under Operation Order 23. The FTP was operating for over 2 years before this step was taken. Before the sergeant was instituted, no single supervisor had the authority or ability to provide incentives. The lack of direct supervision may have played a significant role in whether the incentives were awarded. This issue was examined through semistructured interviews.

Purpose of the Study

I studied the literature gap on whether training and promotional incentives are awarded to determine if the FTP was implemented with fidelity to its design. A secondary objective was whether or not FTOs volunteered or were mandated to become FTOs; this objective is addressed qualitatively via the semistructured interviews in Chapter 5 (RQ2). Although researchers have studied policing as a whole, field training has not been studied. Chappell (2008) wrote, “there has been considerable research into the area of community policing, little of it focuses on training, especially field training” (p. 499).

An FTP may not change the nature of policing because policing is continuously shifting. An FTP established by a bureaucratic department will ultimately “reproduce the hierarchical, bureaucratic style” (Chappell, 2007, p. 502). How successful can such a program be if there is an emphasis on learning the job’s technical aspects and no time is allotted to develop independent thinking (Chappell, 2007)?

Across the literature, properly designed FTO programs all had one thing in common: the training needs to be realistic and prepare the officers for the actual job of policing. How is hands-

on training communicated to the rookie officer? The literature shows that a rookie will adapt the style of their FTO (Van Maanen, 1973). What is the mechanism that accounts for that transfer of knowledge and norms? Fagan and Ayers (1985) researched how the mentoring aspect of an FTP operates and how the FTOs deal with the rookies, positing that “although police cadets train extensively for their occupation, training is not complete until they work the streets under the guidance of a seasoned veteran” (p. 8).

Significance of the Study

An FTP is a process of transmitting an organization’s explicit and implicit values (Engelson, 1999). One of the main benefits of an FTO program is that field training is taught one-on-one, unlike the academy. The newly graduated recruit must incorporate learned behavior through repetition and consistency (Sun, 2003a).

Caro (2011) described FTOs as using their experience and knowledge from having done the job for the organization’s benefit. The added insight is that FTPs mainly exist to cover the void between academic learning and practical experience. The advantage of an FTP is that an individual with experience will transfer the organization’s values to the rookie rather than that burden falling on the organization or institution. Organizational leaders must select ideal FTOs to ensure that the correct values get transferred to the rookies.

When examining the incentive aspect of the FTP, the focus was on if the incentives were awarded at all, partially, or not at all. It would benefit the Department to attract the most qualified candidates to be the FTOs, as Balfour and Wechsler (1991) stated:

Higher levels of performance and productivity result when employees are committed to the organization, take pride in organizational membership and believe in its goals and values. Committed employees, it is argued, have a stronger sense of belonging to the

organization and a greater desire to remain organizational members; they are willing to make extra efforts for the organization; and, in most work situations, they put the organization's interests before their concern. (p. 355)

Field training must be delivered to allow the officer to engage in the dialectical method (Oliva & Compton, 2010). The general course format of police academies tends to be authoritative and dense on lectures and presentations. Students rarely discuss the concepts behind the material; instead, students focus on the policies and procedures that demand adherence without the necessary understanding (Birzer, 2003).

Value of Topic to Public Administration

Lyons (2010) discussed the political nature of policing and declared that “policing is inherently political because social control is a core and contested task of governance” (p. 36). Police officers have the authority to use force to maintain control. Officers take direction from their supervisor, who is either an elected official such as a sheriff, or a police commissioner or public safety director appointed by the mayor or county executive. Sometimes a combination of bureaucracy, structural issues, and civil service rules can defeat any elected official’s attempt to reform a police agency.

Kroll and Moynihan (2018) asserted that, in public administration, the value of studying governance is “that the structural conditions can be designed to improve governmental and therefore societal outcomes” (p. 183). What metric is being used to determine if the program is successful? Did the program accomplish the goal it set out to accomplish? Morehouse (1972) described program evaluation as “what works and what does not” (p. 869). Program evaluation also requires “methods that yield evidence that is objective, systematic and comprehensive” (Morehouse, 1972, p. 869).

The issues affecting the proper implementation of FTPs must be understood. Are there clearly defined criteria for who becomes an FTO? Are the incentives awarded, and if so, are they awarded correctly? Program evaluation of FTPs is complex because there is currently a dearth of research on the topic. The department under research has not had its FTP reviewed since it was established. Public administrators are suited to evaluate the FTP due to their focus on accountability and transparency (Dubnick, 2003; Douglas & Meijer, 2016; Piotrowski & Van Ryzin, 2007).

Research Questions

Research Question 1: Was the FTP implemented with fidelity according to the program design? If not, what variables were the best predictors of the programming aspect not being implemented correctly? Furthermore, are the various programmatic components that make up the FTP implemented with fidelity?

R1A: Were the arrest processing policies followed according to the program design? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1B: Were the policies followed concerning one FTO and two new officers assigned together responding to jobs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1C: Was the policy of one FTO and two rookies responding to jobs viewed as safe by the FTOs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

Research Question 2: What influenced how and why officers became FTOs?

Research Gap

Although there are data on policing in general and some research on FTOs, much of the prior research focuses on levels of complaints and use of force. There is a gap in the literature regarding how FTOs perceive their department-specific FTP and the incentive aspects, a crucial issue examined in this dissertation.

I conducted this study in a large urban police department using a snowball sampling strategy to recruit officers who currently or formerly served as FTOs in the FTP. An online survey was developed and administered using a nonrandom sample of police officers.

The FTO needs to be a positive role model to achieve success, which “rests on the appropriate behavioral and attitudinal examples set by FTOs during field training” (Sun, 2003a, p. 266). If the incentives are not awarded or are awarded sparingly or unfairly, it could prove difficult to recruit additional qualified officers or retain the current FTOs.

Limitations of the Study

The current study’s nonrandom sample was limited to one department in a large urban city. The study is specific to that department and may not be generalizable to other populations or settings. The study is further limited in assuming that all the participants who agreed to participate were FTOs. I also assumed the participants’ truthfulness in answering the survey and interview questions.

Definitions of Terms

For the sake of clarity, several terms used in this study need to be defined. Essential terms are described below:

Police academy: Police academies in the United States offer basic law enforcement training to individuals seeking to become law enforcement officers.

FTP: An FTP is a program designed to support probationary police officers' development as they transition from academic and tactical training to field assignments.

FTO: A FTO is an officer assigned to teach rookie officers who have just graduated from the police academy.

Probationary police officer: A probationary police officer is an officer who has been sworn in as a law enforcement officer who has not yet finished their probationary period. The department studied in this dissertation has a 2-year probationary period starting with the first day an individual attends the police academy.

Rookie: A rookie is a recruit in the police department. For this dissertation, a rookie shall refer to an officer who is in the FTP.

Conclusion

Chapter 1 included a description of the study, a problem statement, and a description of the significance of this study. I also listed the research questions, defined key terms, and outlined the study limitations. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature on topics such as police academy training. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology, including the population, sample, research procedures, research questions, and data-analysis procedures. Chapter 4 offers a quantitative analysis of the data for each research question. Chapter 5 offers a qualitative analysis of the semistructured interviews conducted with eight current and former FTOs. Chapter 6 summarizes the study and details my conclusions and recommendations for FTPs in police departments.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Research into the topic of FTPs from the perspectives of the FTO or examining incentive programs for FTOs is limited. Some tangential research (Doerner & Hunter, 2006) focused on allegations of misconduct on rookies after graduation or focused on complaints of FTOs and rookies (Getty et al., 2016).

Several researchers examined FTPs from the viewpoint of the rookie (Doerner et al., 1989). Some scholars used psychological tests to predict job performance in an FTO program (Wright et al., 1990) or how the rookies perceived their FTOs (Fagan, 1985). Only one study found examined if a monetary incentive helped the FTP focus on improving morale and commitment and “create an enthusiastic climate in which veteran officers would be encouraged to participate in the Field Training Process” (Johnson & Cheatwood, 1992, p. 35). Ultimately, the monetary incentive was found to be counterproductive and was discontinued.

Demographics of the Department under Study

The department under research has thousands of police officers. The exact number will not be disclosed due to the anonymous nature of this dissertation. The data is current as of 2020. White officers of all ranks comprise 46.9% of the department. White male police officers comprise 37.6% of the department, and White female officers comprise 5.7%. Black officers of all ranks total 15.2% of the department. Black male police officers comprise 10%, and Black female officers comprise 5.5%. Hispanic officers of all ranks total 29.1% of the department. Hispanic male police officers comprise 22.8% of the department, and Hispanic female officers comprise 8.4%. Asian officers of all ranks comprise 8.8% of the department. Asian male police officers comprise 9.1% of the department, and Asian female officers comprise .08%.

Police Academy Training

Police academies are highly bureaucratic and militaristic, but “recruits would learn that the formal vertical hierarchy was supplanted by an informal, more horizontal pattern of relationships where they could protect the group and themselves by checking one another” (Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2010, p. 197). The transmission of values begins in the academy and continues in the FTO program, making the academy lessons a reality (Conti & Nolan, 2005).

Bayley and Bittner (1984) understood policing as “more like a craft than a science, in that officers believe that they have important lessons to learn that are not reducible to principle and are not being taught through formal education” (p. 51). The art, not science concept furthers the notion that there needs to be a bridge between the academy and the real world of policing. Haarr (2005) studied police recruits who dropped out of the academy and found that over 88% “experienced a significant amount of stress and conflict when their beliefs and expectations about police work differed considerably from the actual practices and realities of police work” (p. 441).

What is the primary purpose of the academy? Is it to teach officers the primary skills needed to function as a police officer (craft), or is it meant as an academic exercise with supplementation after graduation with an FTP (White, 2008)? The underlying assumption is that selecting capable recruits who become competent cops can lead to valuable community interactions (Henson et al., 2010).

Oral communication skills, assertiveness, positive attitude, acceptance of criticism, self-initiative, and report writing, to name a few, are part of the skillset needed to be a competent police officer. Wood and Sereni-Massinger (2016) stated that the point of the police academy “currently focuses on rote memory and tactical skills” (p. 141). Can the police academy teach

someone these skills, or is the FTP supposed to mold the recruit into the officer the hierarchy wants? White (2008) discussed how police departments typically judge police officers on summons and arrest activities. However, that metric does not predict if any officer will be a good/qualified cop.

Origin of FTPs

Over time, policing has changed from a simple legalistic approach where officers simply responded to calls for service to a community policing era where the communities' problems are solved (Chappell, 2007; Kelling & Moore, 1989). The problem is that most traditional police training is narrowly pinpointed on crime reduction (King & Lab, 2000). There are times when the officer is allowed to use their discretion how they see fit, and other times where no discretion is used. An officer may be directed to issue summons to any blocked car on their post without any discretion, even cars of people attending church or the elderly.

Field training for police officers began in the 1970s as additional training meant to supplement the academy (Fagan & Ayers, 1985). Most of the training was left to "seasoned officers in the field," and there was no extensive hiring or training process (Chappell, 2007, p. 36). Before FTPs, recruits trained through a confusing process where supervisors had rookies ride along with senior officers. Sometimes the new officers would be assigned to a "passive officer" whose job it would be to keep the rookie "out of the way" (Chappell, 2007, p. 139).

In 1970, a San Jose police officer was involved in a car accident responding to a nonemergency job at a high rate of speed, and the passenger of the other vehicle was killed. Although this officer's prior evaluations stated that he was easygoing and pleasant to work with, "everyone who knew this officer knew him to be inadequate, especially in driving skills, but the official rating system used to evaluate his performance did not support this conclusion"

(Kaminsky, 2000, p. 14). At the time, the system rated this officer as needing improvement in several areas but not unsatisfactory. Kaminsky (2000) noted that this officer was rated above average in “appearance, cost consciousness, and work quantity” (p. 14). Once the above-average grades were combined with those that needed improvement, the grades balanced out, and the officer was not terminated.

Discretion is another term used a lot in policing, and officers have tremendous discretion in whether to make an arrest or issue a summons. The recruits need to be trained on how to exercise discretion properly. Policing organizations have many facets, and FTOs are best suited to transfers over the organization’s values, the chief among those values being discretion (Walker & Katz, 2013).

It is essential for the field of policing as a whole to ensure that the officers who are hired, trained, and sent out into the field are of the highest ethical and integral caliber. From the administrative standpoint, having high-caliber officers can reduce lawsuits and save the citizenry money, making it a winning proposition. McCampbell (1987) found that an FTO program can lower civil liability by reducing lawsuits and allowing police departments to integrate into the community.

FTPs National Models: The San Jose Model and the Police Training Officer Model (Reno Model)

The United States has approximately 18,000 law enforcement agencies spread between federal, state, county, and local agencies, representing roughly 800,000 law enforcement personnel (Banks et al., 2016). It is unimaginable to have all personnel agree on a national standard for their field training. State and local laws are vastly different, and the different cultures in each jurisdiction have a uniform training program. The main point of an FTP is the

transmission of values for the specific police department, and the research suggests that all the programs recognize that.

Police departments use two standardized models: (a) the San Jose model or (b) the PTO model, also known as the Reno model. The San Jose model is used by approximately 4,000 police agencies (Police Executive Research Forum, 2001). The San Jose model is very standardized in its approach to how the rookies are trained and evaluated. Each job is evaluated afterward, and the FTOs answer any questions. The PTO manual concluded that “traditional FTO programs exist largely to limit an agency’s liability due to poor training or lack of training” (Reno Police Department, 2004, p. 5). The PTO model is more focused on how the rookie learns, emphasizing community relations using problem-based learning.

Definition of an FTP

Lewis (2015) described an FTP as allowing officers’ experience and knowledge regarding responding to calls for service in the organization to benefit those who come later on. Caro (2011) defined FTPs similarly but with the added insight that the program mainly exists to cover the void between academic learning and practical experience. Much of the research on this matter focuses on (a) connecting education to a training program (Wood & Sereni-Massinger, 2016), (b) proactivity regarding traffic stops, or (c) if the FTO’s attitudes, negative or positive, rubbed off on the new officer (Sun, 2003a).

There is a myriad of ways that knowledge gets passed on in a policing organization. Glomseth et al. (2007) stated that these transfers take place in various forms, such as “between individuals, from individuals to explicit sources, from individuals to groups, between groups, across groups, and from the group to the organization” (p. 100). A practical, effective FTP with qualified officers can ensure that any knowledge transfer is correct.

Development of FTPs

FTP are an extension of the academy that takes place in the real world. FTPs are most effective directly after graduation, ensuring the recruits can meld the academy's academic training with real-world applicability (Chappell, 2007). For field training to work, police academy educators must transmit to the recruits that they are not just crime fighters but are also expected to become involved in various approaches to solving the community's problems.

Many police departments do not operate their academies for various reasons, such as expense, size, or human resources. Colleges and universities commonly operate police academies and certify police officers under the government's auspices (Berlin, 2013). A byproduct of this is the sterile academic nature of the training, not the realistic hands-on training needed for the real world. Chappell (2007) posited that recruits learn technical issues in the academy. The police agencies then want rookies to engage in the communities they patrol; thus, FTPs must "catch-up" recruits for the training they received in the academy to last for any significant period (Chappell, 2007, p. 500).

When implementing an FTP, a primary concern must be to ensure the academy's training will last. Mastrofski and Ritti (1996) clearly stated that the effects of academy training would start to fade, especially once rookies are exposed to the "powerful effects of everyday work, the organization, and the occupational culture of their more experienced colleagues" (p. 296).

Van Maanen (1973) researched how behavioral patterns develop among police officers, especially field training, and stated, "clearly, it is during the FTO phase of the recruit's career that he is most susceptible to attitude change" (p. 412). Van Maanen (1973) further evolved this idea by stating that, through the process of the recruits making mistakes and being corrected by their FTO, "the recruit begins to adopt the perspectives of his more experienced colleagues" (p.

413). Rookies who participate in field training directly after graduation can better retain knowledge and learn new skills. As time goes on, the horrors of the job will enter their psyche and allow the lessons to fade away (Van Maanen, 1973).

Haarr (2001) stated that field training takes place as soon as a recruit leaves the academy; therefore, field training is the best place “to expose the police recruits to community policing and problem-solving policing practices and strategies” (p. 429). A properly run FTP allows for the rookie to be vetted again by an experienced FTO and, if need be, allows for termination or retraining. It can only prove helpful to the department to have that second look at a now-rookie police officer after the academy as a legalistic matter.

Skolnick (1993) referred to the informal values and attitudes of police officers as “the working personality of police” (p. 49). Ford (2003) stated that, when referring to values and attitudes in policing, it is clear that the working personality is learned on the job. Ford also discussed field training and asserted that, during field training, “the adoption of a set of values and attitudes distinct from the value set that brought them to the profession is well underway” (p. 86).

Bennett (1984) researched the socialization of recruits (still in the academy) and probationary police officers (rookies). The author found that “there is support for the contention that recruits and probationary police officers are socialized into the occupation and that the process affects their cognitive orientations” (Bennett, 1984, p. 57). The key takeaway from this is that the FTOs will socialize the rookies, and it behooves the police departments to ensure their FTOs are of the highest caliber.

Implementation Issues with FTPs

Johnson and Cheatwood (1992) researched an FTP in the Anne Arundel County Police Department to see if a monetary incentive in an FTP would work. The authors conducted this study with the understanding that “the need to attract the most qualified FTO and the ability to keep him committed is key to the success of any field training program” (Johnson & Cheatwood, 1992, p. 35). When the program was assessed 1 year later, five significant shortcomings were discovered, resulting in a discontinued program. All of the problems were related to the poor implementation of the program.

Across the literature, there are many examples of how and why an FTP transfer transmits values to the recruits (Engelson, 1999; White, 2008). Walker and Katz (2002) further defined the transmission as socialization that occurs, akin to a rite of passage where the recruit is instilled with the values of their particular department, profession, and officers they work alongside. Once again, Walker and Katz’s definition cycles back to the idea of whether the FTO matters because they are the ones instilling the upper echelon’s values.

It should also be noted that the FTOs do not have an unlimited time frame with which to spend with the recruits. There is a short window to teach the officer's lessons to survive on the street and transmit the values of the specific department’s culture (Chappell, 2007). Additionally, officers have a list of skills that they must teach the recruits; however, some of what the top brass or political establishment may want is low on that list, especially if the terms of the FTP are not honored.

Eisenberg (1981) postulated that certain implementation problems are inherent in the FTP model, and adjustments should be made. Some of the problems mentioned were that the FTO program was either “too short or too demanding” and that FTOs have a tendency to do “more

evaluation than training” (p. 51). A critical point that Eisenberg discussed was the “too young and/or inexperienced FTOs” (p. 51), which I researched explicitly in this dissertation.

The department researched in this dissertation did not have guidelines for selecting who becomes an FTO. Operations Order 8 of 2015 used the term *qualified* when describing who the FTOs should be without any qualifiers. A memo issued by the Chief of Department in 2017, over 2 years after implementing the program, also used the phrase qualified without any qualifiers while the purpose of the memo was to “clarify the overall understanding of this program” (see Appendix A). The memo also detailed the alternate FTO if the primary is unavailable, stating, “same criteria used to select the FTO will be used to select the alternate”(COD memo, p. 1). At no point was there any definition or criteria of what precisely the term qualified was supposed to mean. As seen in the interviews, the FTOs themselves either did not know or thought the criteria to be an FTO was something that it was not.

Retention and Termination Issues

Retention of human resources, as well as the firing of an officer, is complex and costly. Scott (2010) surveyed 91 police agencies regarding their FTP and found that “73% of the responding agencies believed that an FTP utilized by an agency has a direct correlation to officer retention” (p. 66). Meehan (2001) argued that the selection and continuing evaluation of the FTOs could make or break an FTP because the FTOs are the “principal mechanism for the transmission of policing knowledge, skills, and attitudes, at least in the formative stages of the new officer’s career” (p. 26).

Firing an FTO, rookie, or any police officer is challenging; however, firing a rookie is not as tricky because they are still on probation, and their due process rights are more curtailed. As a way to properly document a rookie’s daily tour of duty, Oettmeier (1982) conducted a study in

the Houston Police Department on how the FTOs evaluate the rookies and found that, in order to fire a Rookie, “the decision to terminate an individual’s employment is predicated upon the data generated from the use of the daily FTO evaluation form” (p. 64). To ensure the rookies are appropriately evaluated, the FTOs need to be motivated to do the job properly and complete the paperwork correctly; otherwise, a rookie could slip through the cracks.

Ratings Given to Rookies from Their FTOs

Doerner et al. (1989) conducted a study to determine if race and gender via the ratee or rater affected rookies’ ratings in the FTP. In Phase 1 of the FTP, using the FTOs’ race and the rookies’ race and sex, some Black raters were found to be “more likely to score white male rookies higher than did white trainers” (Doerner et al., 1989, p. 107). Doerner et al. used 80 comparisons and only found a 15% statistical significance, representing a relatively low amount of influence. In Phase 2 of the FTP, using FTOs’ sex and rookies’ race and sex, only 12.5% out of 80 comparisons were found to be statistically significant. Doerner et al.’s study had two significant conclusions. First, “ratee sex and race achieved significance in earlier phases, their impact diminished towards the end of the program” (Doerner et al., 1989, p. 110). Second, although there was statistical significance in Phases 1 and 2 regarding race and gender in some of the ratings, “not a single rater characteristic surfaced as being statistically significant when determining whether probationary officers passed or failed” (Doerner et al., 1989, p. 110).

Another conclusion of the study was that, when it came to the race of the rookie, Black officers were significantly more likely to experience difficulty on virtually every knowledge component over the first three phases, and “black trainees were significantly more likely to fail every aspect of report writing and radio use in every phase” (Doerner et al., 1989, p. 111). Doerner et al. (1989) suggested that Black recruits’ difficulties may have occurred because the

Tallahassee Police Department was under a consent decree, which resulted in hiring quotas that led to unqualified people being hired. This topic is beyond this dissertation's scope, but it is worth mentioning as a topic for further research.

Educational Requirements for Police Officers

Mcelvain and Kposowa (2008) found that patrol officers, of which the FTO and rookie are part, have higher use of force rates when compared to other officers not assigned to patrol. This higher use of force is expected because these officers interact with the public at a higher rate; however, the higher educated (associate degree or higher) patrol officers were significantly less likely to use force. Even when those officers used force, it was less than officers with lower education levels. College education was associated with officers who were "30% less likely to shoot than those without a college education" (Mcelvain & Kposowa, 2008, p. 515).

Use of force levels have been shown to correlate with the officer's education level, with higher education levels leading to reductions in the use of force (Edwards, 2019). However, the relationship between the police officers and the citizenry is too complicated for analysis solely focused on numbers of arrests or complaints, especially when education levels that correspond to better problem-solving skills and critical thinking are not considered (Baro & Burlingame, 1999).

Similarly, Chapman (2012) found that "among patrol officers only, education predicted less frequent force and lower levels of use of force" (p. 421). Officers' experience level is another variable that is extremely important in the field of policing. Chapman reported that "more experienced patrol officers used higher levels of force, contrary to prediction, but received significantly fewer complaints" (p. 429). The use of force has a corrosive effect on the relationship between the public and the police. It can cause distrust and fear, reducing police legitimacy; the more the public trusts the police, the more the need for force is reduced (Fyfe,

1979; Smith, 2006). Education plays a role in reducing the use of force, which means that community relations can be improved by providing officers with more education.

The counterargument against educational degrees for officers is the “contention that experience is the greatest teacher for a police officer” (Paoline & Terrill, 2007, p. 179). Experience does play a role because different officers will teach different values based on their experiences. FTOs must be vetted thoroughly to ensure the transmission of the proper values to the recruit. More highly educated FTOs will reduce rookies’ use of force by successfully transmitting the organization’s values.

When reviewing an FTP in the Tallahassee Police Department, Doerner et al. (1989) discovered that the department required at least some college at the time of the study. In contrast, no college was required before the study, causing an imbalance. Senior officers who were FTOs had either no college or less college than the rookies they were training. Doerner et al. found that “training officers, particularly new FTOs, admit that they do feel awkward with this imbalance” (p. 113). While designing an FTP, it would be beneficial to avoid this imbalance by requiring FTOs to have a higher level of education than the minimum 60 college credits to be hired as a police officer.

Characteristics of an FTP

An interesting characteristic of FTPs across police agencies was the description of the relationship between the rookie and the FTO. Bergman (2017) conducted in-depth interviews with FTOs in Sweden and discovered that the FTO officers were assigned to mentor the newly hired police officers, not strictly as a teacher to provide information. Hartman (1979) used the word *camaraderie*, and other studies use the word *mentor* (Fagan, 1985). However, the

underlying theme requires the FTO to be an extraordinary officer who must volunteer to ensure the program's success.

Fagan (1985) studied FTPs in Fresno, California, and found that many FTOs viewed their rookies as friends. Out of 13 FTOs in the study, 11 referred to their rookies as "special," with only two FTOs indicating that "none were special" (Fagan, 1985, p. 141). Furthermore, Fagan discovered that "most (77 percent) FTOs believed there were some fellow FTOs who were not adequately prepared" (p. 142). Additionally, Fagan found that when the rookies were asked about their perceptions of the FTOs, eight out of 24 rookies stated there was "one FTO especially significant in their training" (p. 140). Further review of the data showed that, of those who mentioned their single most significant FTO, "two-thirds said the veteran was of the same sex and about half said the same race" (Fagan, 1985, p. 140).

Selection of the FTO

An article in the San Francisco Chronicle detailed problematic FTOs in the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD; Sward & Wallace, 1996). The article stated that in 1985, an investigation into the SFPD showed that about 40% of the lawsuits filed against the SFPD for battery were against FTOs. Sward and Wallace (1996) examined lawsuits from 1981 through 1996 and reviewed cases involving FTOs; in this investigation, the FTOs involved totaled 298 officers. Sixty-five FTOs were sued in lawsuits alleging assault and excessive force, and 102 FTOs were sued in a lawsuit alleging misconduct, totaling payouts amounting to about \$1.4 million. Twenty-one FTOs were charged internally, and some more than once. The punishments ranged from suspension for 20 days to 90 days with charges, including assault and battery. Eight of the FTOs were criminally charged with crimes ranging from assault, drinking while under the influence, burglary, and soliciting prostitution. Seven of the FTOs were convicted.

The expertise of FTOs is also an issue. Eisenberg (1981) identified that a significant issue is having an FTO who is “too young and/or inexperienced” (p. 51). Many factors comprise a proper police officer, especially an FTO, among them patience and maturity. The lack of those two qualities, among others, can lead to having “FTOs with a couple of years of field exposure are inappropriate and counterproductive” (p. 51). Hartman (1979) described the FTP as having “a trained FTO fill this void” (p. 23), referring to the police academy transition to the field and teaching field skills.

Importance of Specific FTO Characteristics

The literature suggests that whomever the FTO is, it does indeed matter. The U.S Department of Justice (2003) noted that the primary reason why FTOs are the single most crucial aspect of the FTP is that, for the rookie, FTOs are the “first person in authority who will orient a new officer to the job environment” (p. 24).

Sun (2003a) compared FTOs and non-FTOs and found that FTOs “were more proactive than non-FTOS in attempting to locate suspects and witnesses” (p. 265). Sun further stated that police departments need to select officers who are “competent craftsman as FTOs and provide them with appropriate training and recognition, then behavioral differences between FTOs and non-FTO would exist” (p. 266). To further transmit the department’s values, FTOs are expected to behave differently from the other officers. FTOs can be an indicator of the FTP’s success.

Experience is a crucial indicator of what will happen in any police-involved scenario. Smith and Aamodt (1997) used several variables to determine the relationship between education and overall police performance. Some of the variables examined were “communication skills, public relations skills, report writing skills, response to new training, decision-making ability, and commitment to the police department” (Smith & Aamodt, 1997, p. 7). Smith and Aamodt

found many correlations with police officers' level of performance and levels of education, and the most interesting finding was that "the benefits of a college education do not become apparent until police officers gain experience" (p. 7). Another intuitive finding from Smith and Aamodt's study was those police officers with only a high school diploma had an overall reduction in their performance after 5 years of experience. Thus, FTPs would benefit from having educated and experienced officers because there seems to be a correlation between those variables.

Although education level has not been found to affect officers' level of arrests or searches, officers who have a college education "significantly reduce the likelihood of force occurring" (Rydberg & Terrill, 2010, p. 92). Rydberg and Terrill (2010) cautioned that more research is needed to determine how education affects police officers. Further research should focus on grade-point average when a degree was received, the nature of the degree, and other variables that can determine exactly how and by which mechanism the use of force drops when combined with education and experience.

Getty et al. (2016) examined if it mattered whom the specific FTO has had any effect on the number of complaints issued against his Rookies, and Getty et al. found that "FTOs seem to have a statistically significant effect on their trainee's allegations of misconduct" (p. 834). Therefore, it is appropriate to assess the FTP from the perspective of FTOs. Their perspectives could shed light on refining or creating a better FTP and seeing if the program has accomplished its goals.

Sun (2002b) surveyed FTOs on their perspectives on the management of their respective departments, and the data showed "less than 40% of FTOs gave positive evaluations of management recognition of good performance, while more than half of non-FTOS showed positive evaluations" (p. 113). Sun (2003b) also researched police officers' and FTOs' behavior

toward the public, peers, and supervisors compared to non-FTOs. Sun's (2003b) study results indicated that FTOs were more disparaging of their supervisors when compared to non-FTOs. One of the possible reasons for this is that the FTO "quickly realizes that they are more knowledgeable and have a keener grasp of things than their sergeants" (Sun, 2003b, p. 79). Naturally, insubordination is not something a police department can allow, which is further evidence that the FTO matters greatly.

Importance of Specific Rookie Characteristics

Detrick and Chibnall (2006) conducted a study using the NEO Personality Inventory test, which measures five aspects of personality. The five aspects are neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Detrick and Chibnall asked 100 FTOs to "describe a very good entry-level police officers, specifically, the best entry-level police officers they had supervised during field training at any time in the past" (p. 276). The authors reported that FTOs overwhelmingly stated terms such as "easygoing and slow to anger, steady under stress, predisposed away from the depressive effect, goal-setters with high aspirations" (Detrick & Chibnall, 2006, p. 278).

The literature is mixed on psychological tests that can weed out someone before becoming a police officer. Bartol (1991) discussed the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, a standard test used during the prescreening hiring process for becoming a police officer. Bartol posited that there is no set criterion for success in determining if these tests are valid predictors or people who will be problem officers. Bartol followed 600 police officers for 13 years and realized that over 60% of the officers were fired or forced to resign in the first year, over 84% in the second year, and over 90% in the third year, a clear indication that problems seemed to occur early in a police officer's career. Bartol concluded that, although not all

problematic recruits would be screened out, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory had some validity in predicting who would be an issue as an officer.

Age, Race, and Gender of FTOs

Doerner and Patterson (1992) used race and gender from the rookie's perspective to evaluate the FTOs and encountered interesting differences. When it came to race, Doerner and Patterson found that White rookies rated FTOs significantly higher on one of the eight criteria: the FTO's level of interest in their training. White rookies rated FTO's at the rate of 4.5, whereas "non-white rookies, on average, saw their FTOs as significantly less interested in their training" (Doerner & Patterson, 1992, p. 28). Although significant, the rate difference between White and non-White rookies was only .3 (4.5 versus 4.2), and the other seven items had no significant difference. The authors ultimately concluded that "Rookie race had no systematic impact on FTO evaluations" (Doerner & Patterson, 1992, p. 27). When Doerner and Patterson examined gender, the results were flipped. The study results showed that "female rookies are far more critical of their FTOs, regardless of FTO gender," and female rookies "issued much lower scores to male FTOs on seven of the eight dimensions" (Doerner & Patterson, 1992, p. 28). Interestingly, the female rookies graded female FTOs more severely than male FTOs. Thus, the gender of the rookies was the most significant variable.

Doerner and Hunter (2006) evaluated the rookie twice: during post-Academy monthly evaluations and before the rookie's probation with the Tallahassee Police Department ended. The probationary period was 12 months, including the 6 months of the academy. The authors discovered that the gender and race of the sergeant conducting the evaluation were significant. Officers were evaluated on 18 different characteristics, ranging from communication skills to report-taking. Black sergeants were found to grade officers significantly lower on five criteria

while giving out higher marks on geography. When accounting for gender, the study showed that female sergeants rated officers higher on criminal investigations but rated officers lower on the use of force. Doerner and Hunter also found that, when accounting for officers' gender and race, White officers were graded significantly higher on 14 out of the 18 issues, and female officers were graded higher on three of the 18 criteria. The authors also discovered that veteran sergeants gave higher grades on some items, and the newly promoted sergeants graded more strictly. Doerner and Hunter also changed the variables and coefficients, which changed some of the findings out of the 18 characteristics; however, the overall differences stayed the same.

Some think that selecting police officers is simple; however, this is far from the truth. Wright et al. (1990) investigated whether using the standard psychological tests administered to potential police recruits—the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the California Personality Inventory—could predict how a rookie would perform during their FTP. The authors found that “one cannot use psychological test scores to make informed judgments about how well Rookies will perform during their initial training period” (Wright et al., 1990, p. 74).

Chapter Summary

Through this dissertation, I aimed to ascertain the perspectives of the FTOs and if the FTOs' recommendations are followed, and if the incentives offered by the Department are awarded. I also investigated if the Department fostered such an atmosphere allowing the ideal candidates to be selected as FTOs. The ultimate recommendation an FTO can put forward for a recruit is termination. One level below that is extended probation to allow that officer time to improve. If the FTO officers are submitting their recommendations and the recommendations are not followed, it can reflect the lack of caring from the upper-level management. In this study, I explore possible explanations as to why the FTO officers hold particular perspectives.

Chapter Three: Methodology

I used my professional experience as a police officer and FTO in the department under research to form the survey questions and research questions. The purpose of this study was to explore the FTOs' perspectives of the FTP and whether the incentives offered were awarded. Additionally, I examined whether the implications of recruiting qualified officers if the incentives are not awarded.

This dissertation focused on the perspectives of the FTOs, who are the street-level bureaucrats dealing with the citizenry on a day-to-day basis (Lipsky, 1980). FTOs are responsible for training the new generation of police officers. I chose to study the FTP and FTOs for two reasons. First, the FTP was introduced into the Department in 2015, and the program has not yet been evaluated. The second reason is that the Department is one of the largest in the United States and is an excellent data source.

Using my personal perspective as a former FTO in the Department, I designed a 39-question survey to gather data from other FTOs. The survey was designed to examine whether or not the program was implemented with fidelity according to its design. The various programmatic components were broken down separately to see which components, if any, were implemented correctly. The survey questioned current and former FTOs regarding their perspectives of the FTP through the lens of (a) if the FTP was implemented with fidelity as designed, (b) if the incentives aspect of the FTP were appropriately awarded, and (c) using the interviews to springboard into other topics that may arise and to clarify the quantitative responses.

The Program

The Department started an FTP to provide “guidance, instruction, and mentorship” to rookies, defined as “inexperienced police officers” (Ivkovic, 2003, p. 606). In addition, the Department offers an incentive program to get qualified police officers to train the rookies. These training officers are called FTOs. Department leaders want these FTOs to pass along the Department’s values, culture, and behaviors to the rookies. The literature supports the idea that the FTOs can best offer this type of training (Connor, 2000; Sun, 2002b). However, there is limited research to support the idea that FTP incentives are effective. For example, Johnson (1992) found that using a monetary incentive in an FTP backfired. The monetary incentive ultimately proved counterproductive for several reasons analogous to the FTP under study in this dissertation.

The fundamental idea behind an FTP is transmitting a police department’s ideals and values to the new generation of police officers. The Department acknowledged this concept in the memo sent out when the program was established. The memo stated that the FTP was designed to assist the rookies “from their academic and tactical training to their field assignments” (see Appendix B) because rookies do not participate in hands-on learning or learn how to internalize their training at the police academy. The academy is where recruits learn procedures and how to take reports but do not learn problem-solving or creative thinking, which is needed on the streets (Brand & Peak, 1995; Germann, 1969; Marion, 1988). In an analysis of multiple police departments, Bradford and Pynes (1999) found that only about 3% of what a recruit does in the academy uses decision-making skills, and the rest of their time is spent learning how to take reports or “task-oriented activities” (p. 288).

FTPs bridge the gap and supplement the lack of experience a rookie receives in the academy by having qualified officers serve as FTOs and train the rookies per the police department's guidelines. Previous research suggests that police departments have been using field training as the place where rookies internalize their police academy lessons for decades (Conti & Nolan, 2005; Haarr, 2005).

The Department offered incentives to officers to join the FTP and serve as an FTO. The incentives ranged from promotions, transfers, and training that they would receive automatically after joining as an FTO. There are two primary reasons why the awarding of these incentives is crucial to the success of the FTP. First, if the incentives are not appropriately awarded, it has a chilling effect on recruiting further officers to join the FTP. Second, not awarding incentives shows that the FTP is not implemented with fidelity as designed.

As discussed further in Chapter 6, if the program is not implemented according to its design, there will be significant issues in recruitment and retention for the FTP. I am focused on examining how the FTP itself stated it should be implemented rather than how the FTOs may want the FTP to be implemented.

Data Collection

I employed a mixed-methods research approach for this study, which allowed me to gather both quantitative and qualitative data to explore and confirm all research questions and hypotheses (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In order to gather quantitative data, a 39-question survey using Qualtrics was employed. Quantitative data gathered via the survey allowed me to determine which variables were the best predictors for various outcomes investigated by this study.

The quantitative data were used to answer the dichotomous research questions. For example, were the incentives awarded with fidelity? However, the quantitative data cannot explain why or why not something was or was not done, only if it was or was not. As I report further in the paper, officers had particular perspectives for different reasons elucidated in the qualitative interviews.

Qualitative data were gathered through eight semistructured follow-up interviews with FTOs. The qualitative data provided in-depth information that went beyond the statistical analyses provided by the quantitative data and allowed me to confirm quantitative findings and extend those findings with more detail (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Another example of how the qualitative data enriched the study was in determining why some officers became FTOs. For example, some of the FTOs wrongly assumed that specific incentive (i.e., an extra week of vacation) were offered; however, an extra week of vacation was not, in fact, a department-sanctioned incentive. An FTO I interviewed stated that he assumed he would be drafted into the program, so he attempted to cut a deal with his immediate supervisor to obtain an extra benefit for volunteering. These types of nuances would be lost if I solely used quantitative data.

The survey was designed to be completely anonymous in order to maintain confidentiality. A total of 51 completed responses were recorded. One response was not fully answered and was deleted, and another response was not reliably filled out, leaving 49 responses for analysis. The computer I.P. addresses were not recorded. It was assumed that all participants responded honestly without fear of repercussion and that only current or former FTOs participated in the survey. The survey was sent out to multiple groups through text messages and WhatsApp groups, and the link was posted on Facebook. I did not offer a monetary incentive for

participants. Instructions in the survey indicated that the expected completion time was approximately 5 minutes. The criteria for the participants were as follows:

- employed as a police officer in the Department; and
- a current or former FTO in the Department.

Survey Methodology

The quantitative results of the survey were used to answer RQ1 and the RQ1 subquestions. The online survey was designed using Qualtrics software (see Appendix C for complete survey questions with response options). Respondents were required to read and agree to the informed consent before being allowed to take the survey (see Appendix C). If participants did not agree to the informed consent, they were taken to a page thanking them for their time and ending their survey. The survey was designed to be taken only once.

A variety of categorical and interval measurement scales were used. The first three questions were descriptive and were related to participants' age, gender, and ethnicity. The following seven questions were related to participants' status as an FTO, such as length of time as an FTO and if the participant volunteered for being an FTO, among others. The following 10 questions concerned the incentives aspect of the FTP. The questions ranged from inquiring if the participant had received any incentives and even knew about the incentives. The following five questions asked questions concerning the participants' evaluation to determine if their recommendations about rookies were being followed. The remaining questions inquired about several aspects of the FTP requirements to determine if these requirements were followed.

Interview Methodology

Eight current or former FTOs were contacted to participate in semistructured follow-up interviews, discussed in Chapter 5. The semistructured interviews allowed me to understand how

and why people became FTOs and how the incentives, whether the incentives were being awarded or not, or became diluted and had other nondepartment-sanctioned incentives granted in lieu of the authorized incentives. All participants completed an informed consent form before participating in the interviews (see Appendix D). The questions from the survey were expanded to allow for more nuanced answers and explanations to some of the survey questions (see Appendix E). The interviews were recorded with the participant's permission and transcribed to study the responses further. At the onset of the interview, the participants were told that the interview was completely voluntary and that they could terminate the interview at any time and that the recording would be erased. The identities of the interviewees were guaranteed to remain anonymous. Participants are referred to as Respondent 1, Respondent 2, and so on, with no identifying characteristics mentioned.

Research Questions

For this study, one overarching research question and two main research questions with corresponding subquestions were examined. Research Question 1 and its subquestions were answered quantitatively through the use of correlations and logistic regressions. Research Question 2 was primarily answered qualitatively. The study's Research Question 1, the corresponding sub questions, Research Question 2, and the hypotheses are presented below.

Research Question 1: Was the FTP implemented with fidelity according to the program design? If not, what variables were the best predictors of the programming aspect not being implemented correctly? Furthermore, are the various programmatic components that make up the FTP implemented with fidelity?

R1A: Were the arrest processing policies followed according to the program design? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1B: Were the policies followed concerning one FTO and two new officers assigned together responding to jobs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1C: Was the policy of one FTO and two rookies responding to jobs viewed as safe by the FTOs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

Research Question 2: What influenced how and why officers became FTOs?

Hypotheses

$H_0: \beta_1 = \emptyset$

H_0 = Therefore, it was hypothesized that demographics are not significant predictors for officers being told by a supervisor that an officer or different FTO could take over an arrest processing due to overtime.

$H_0: \beta_1 \neq \emptyset$

H_1 = Therefore, it is hypothesized that demographics are significant predictors for officers being told by a supervisor that an officer or different FTO could take over an arrest processing due to overtime.

$H_0: \beta_1 = \emptyset$

H_0 = Therefore, it is hypothesized that demographics are not significant predictors for officers believing that the program was followed when it came to one field FTO and two new officers in the radio motor patrol (RMP) car responding to jobs.

$$H_0: \beta_1 \neq \emptyset$$

H_1 = Therefore, it is hypothesized that demographics were significant predictors for officers believing that the program was followed when it came to one field FTO and two new officers in the RMP responding to jobs.

$$H_0: \beta_1 = \emptyset$$

H_0 = Therefore, it is hypothesized that demographics are not significant predictors as to whether the officers agreed that the FTO responding to jobs with two new officers was a safe practice.

$$H_0: \beta_1 \neq \emptyset$$

H_1 = Therefore, it is hypothesized that demographics were significant predictors as to whether the officers agreed that the FTO responding to jobs with two new officers was a safe practice.

Participant Sample

I used the snowball sampling method to increase the sample size of the nonrandom sample. The sample population was supplemented with additional individuals from my contacts. I also asked the participants to forward the survey link to any current or former FTOs.

The sample size was 49 participants. Fifty percent (25) of the participants were White, 8% (4) were Black, 12% (6) were Asian, 2% (1) were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 24% (12) were Hispanic, and 4% (2) identified as other. Eighty-two percent (41) of respondents were male, and 18% (9) were female. Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of the respondents by gender, race, and educational level.

Table 1*Descriptive Stats for Key Categorical Variables*

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	40	81.6
Female	9	18.4
Race		
White	24	49
Not White	25	51
Education level		
Associates/60 credits	11	22.4
61 Credits/less than B.A.	12	24.5
Bachelor's degree	23	46.9
Master's degree	3	6.1
Doctorate/PhD/JD	0	0

Table 2*Descriptive Stats for Key Continuous Variables*

	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Age	49	23	58	35.86	7.564
Years in the department	49	1.0	22.0	9.102	4.9117
FTO, how many months?	48	3	120	25.65	22.170

Analysis

I employed a Pearson *r* correlation to examine the direction and degree of the relationships between variables (Field, 2009). This bivariate correlation was conducted based on the data gathered from the 39-question survey. Initially, 19 variables (i.e., demographic variables and survey items) were inputted into the Pearson *r* correlation. Demographic variables that were statistically significant ($p < .05$) were retained and used as predictor variables for the purposes of

running logistic regression against those survey items that were also found to be significant (Field, 2009). A regression analysis was warranted to determine if these significant relationships were also predictive based on the number of these variables that were significantly correlated. Logistic regression was employed since the scale for several survey items was dichotomous in nature. A multiple regression, more commonly used, requires a dependent variable that is continuous, and therefore a binary logistic regression was warranted (Field, 2009).

In addition to the above logistic regression, a series of Mann–Whitney *U* Tests were performed (Field, 2009). The Mann–Whitney *U* Tests were employed for survey items that used a Likert-type scale. The data were treated as continuous and demographic items were treated as grouping variables. I performed these Mann–Whitney *U* Tests to examine between-group differences for Q24 (does the department management support the FTP) and Q25 (does the department select qualified officers to be FTOs) between former and current FTOs.

Chapter Four: Results

As stated in the previous chapter, I employed a Pearson *r* Correlation to isolate which demographic variables and which survey items were statistically significant and then used those items moving forward to run binary logistical regressions. Initially, 19 variables were inputted into the Pearson *r* Correlation. Ten items were retained from this initial bivariate. Seven of those items were demographic items: age, gender, race, months as an FTO, years in the department, if the participant attended FTO training before working as an FTO, and education. It was anticipated that these items would be used as predictor variables to directly answer the study's main research questions. The significant predictor variables were age, gender, race, years in the department, months as an FTO if the participant attended FTO training before working as an FTO, and education ($p < .05$ or $p < .01$). Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (1 FTO-2 Rookies), and Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe) were retained due to the fact that they would be used as the outcome variable and again would answer this study's Research Question 1. Next, I performed a second Pearson *r* Correlation with the 10 retained variables (see Table 3).

Many of the variables used in this chapter were selected based on a review of the literature and the survey data. For example, I selected education—which did not reach significance in this study—as a variable, along with age, experience, and years in the department, all of which had a correlation and predictive significance. Although months as an FTO was a significant predictor, there was not a large body of literature to pull from, and this variable is study-specific. The age of an officer usually equaled experience, as many officers enter policing when they are young (Mcelvain & Kposowa, 2008). Older and more experienced officers are associated with reduced incidents of utilizing force (Aamodt, 2004; Paoline & Terrill, 2007).

In this study, age was treated as a continuous variable and was significantly correlated with years in the department, months serving as an FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, and Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) and Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe). Age was not significantly correlated with gender, race, education, or Q23 (Arrest Processing Overtime). Doerner et al. (1989) found that there was significance by race in how raters scored rookies as well as significance by gender. Doerner and Hunter (2006) found that there was significance by gender and race in how sergeants rated the rookies. Gender was a significant predictor for the arrest processing question. As discussed further in Chapter 6, policing tends to be a male-dominated profession, and there are questions as to how women are capable in physical terms (Prenzler & Sinclair, 2013) or how when duties are assigned to officers, there can be a breakdown by gender (Garcia, 2003).

Gender was treated as a binary or dichotomous variable. Gender was found to not be significantly correlated with race, years in department, months as an FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, education, or Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (1 FTO-2 Rookies), or Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

Race was treated as a binary or dichotomous variable (White/not White). Race was not significantly correlated with any of the other variables: age, gender, years in the department, months serving as an FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, education, or Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (one FTO to two rookies), and Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

Years in the department were treated as a continuous variable. Years in the department were significantly correlated with age and months as an FTO. Years in the department were not significantly correlated with gender, race, training before, education, or Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (one FTO to two rookies), or Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

Months serving as an FTO were treated as a continuous or interval variable. Months serving as an FTO was significantly correlated with age, years in the department, and training before serving as an FTO was not significantly correlated with gender, race, education, or Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (one FTO to two rookies), or Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

Attending training before beginning to work as an FTO was treated as a binary or dichotomous variable. Attending training was significantly correlated with age, months serving as an FTO and Q38. Attending training was not significantly correlated to gender, race, years in the department, education, Q23 (arrest processing), or Q37 (one FTO to two rookies).

Education was treated as a continuous variable. Education was not significantly correlated with any of the following variables: gender, race, years in the department, months serving as FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, education, or Q23 (arrest processing), Q37 (one FTO to two rookies), or Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

For this study, Q23 (arrest processing) was examined in order to determine (a) if the program was implemented with fidelity surrounding this component and (b), if so, what were the variables that were the best predictor of this outcome. Q23 (arrest processing) measured whether a supervisor told officers about overtime and the arresting process and whether officers were told to leave due to overtime constraints against policy. This question was treated as a binary or dichotomous variable (“yes, told” or “no, not told”). Q23 (arrest processing) was not significantly correlated with any of the other items: gender, race, years in the department, months serving as FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, education, or Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) or Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe).

For this study, Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) was examined in order to determine (a) if the program was implemented with fidelity surrounding this component, and (b) if so, were their demographic variables that were the best predictor of this outcome. Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) measured whether the procedure was followed regarding one FTO and two new officers in the RMP responding to jobs. This question was treated as binary or dichotomous (“yes” or “no”). Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) was significantly correlated with age and Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe). This question was not significantly correlated with gender, race, years in the department, months as an FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, education, or Q23 (arrest processing).

For this study, Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe) was examined to determine if the program was implemented with fidelity surrounding this component and, if so, were there demographic variables that best predicted this outcome. Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe) measured whether officers believe that responding to jobs with two new officers was a safe practice. The variable was treated as binary or dichotomous (“yes” or “no”). Q38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe) was significantly correlated with age, attending training, and Q37 (one FTO to two rookies). It was not significantly correlated with gender, race, years in the department, months as an FTO, education, or Q23 (arrest processing; see Table 3).

Table 3*Pearson r Correlations for Key Variables*

	Age	Gender 1 = m 2 = f	Race 0 = not White 1 = White	Year in the dept.	Months as FTO	Training 1 = yes 2 = no	Edu	#23	#37	#38
Gender	-.005	1	-.043	-.118	-.021	.161	-.085	-.258	.067	.014
Race: 0 = not White 1 = White	-.074	-.043	1	.013	.251	-.142	.180	.050	-.009	-.144
Years in the dept.	.803**	-.118	.013	1	.428**	-.255	-.102	-.027	-.275	-.240
Months as FTO	.553**	-.021	.251	.428*	1	-.500**	-.105	-.079	-.005	-.131
Training: 0 = no 1 = yes	3.51*	.161	-.142	-2.55	.500**	1	-.043	.034	.102	.388**
Edu	-.156	-.095	.180	-.102	-.105	-.043	1	-.185	.181	.083
#23	.016	-.258	.050	-.027	-.079	.034	-.185	1	-.180	-.175
#37	-.370**	.067	-.009	-.275	-.005	.102	.181	-.180	1	.490**
#38	-.346*	.014	-.144	-.240	-.131	.388**	.083	-.175	.490**	1

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

The 10 variables presented in Table 3 were retained and used to conduct a series of binary logistic regressions. These regressions directly answered the study's main research questions. The seven demographic items served as predictor variables, and the three survey items (Q23, arrest processing; Q37, one FTO to two rookies; Q38, responding to jobs with rookies as safe) served as the outcome variables. Based on the analysis in Table 3, a regression analysis was warranted to determine if these significant relationships were also predictive based on the number of these variables that were significantly correlated.

Logistic Regression

After reviewing the Pearson r correlation table, three logistical regression analyses were employed based on data from the survey. Q23 regarding arrest overtime ("yes" or "no"), Q37

regarding whether one FTO responded to jobs with two rookies (“yes” or “no”), and Q38 as a follow up to Question 37: if the FTO thought it was safe to respond to jobs with two rookies (“yes” or “no”).

Results for Question 23: Arrest Processing

One program component that examined program fidelity was whether officers were told by their supervisory to allow any officer or a different FTO to take over the arrest processing due to overtime against the program design. If officers were not told, then the program was being implemented according to design. I performed a binary logistic regression to examine the impact of seven predictor variables and the probability of these variables predicting the outcome variable. Predictor variables were age, gender, race, years in the department, months as FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, and education. Age, years in the department, education, and months as FTO were all treated as continuous variables. Gender, race, and attending FTO training before becoming an FTO were all treated as dichotomous variables. The outcome variable was, “Were you ever told by a supervisor to allow any officer or a different FTO to take over the arrest processing due to overtime?” The outcome variable was 0 = no, the officers were not told, or 1 = yes, the officers were told. Overall, an examination of the Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test revealed that the model was appropriate for the data: $\chi^2(7)$, $= 9.786$, $p = .201$. In addition, the model was also able to discriminate between officers who said “yes” (their supervisor told them) or “no” (their supervisor told them that another officer or FTO could take over an arrest due to overtime). Overall, this model explained 18.4% and 32.7% of the variance in answering “no” to the statement and correctly classified 87.5% of the cases. Based on this, further examination of the coefficients was warranted.

Gender was the only significant predictor ($p = .023$). Examination of the odds ratio for gender revealed that being female increased the probability that officers would answer “yes,” a supervisor did tell them that any officer or different FTO could take over an arrest processing due to overtime by 16.87 times (see Table 4).

Table 4

Results from Logistical Regression: Q23, Arrest Processing

		<i>B</i>	S.E.	Wald	<i>df</i>	Sig.	Odds ratio
Step 1 ^a	Age	-.162	.153	1.118	1	.290	.851
	Gender: 1 = male 2, = female	2.826	1.243	5.165	1	.023*	16.87
	Race binary: 1 = White, 0 = not White	-.887	1.026	.747	1	.387	.412
	Years in the dept.	--.169	.191	.783	1	.376	1.184
	FTO how many months?	--.046	.034	1.891	1	.169	1.047
	Attend FTO training before beginning to work as FTO: 1= yes, 2 = no	.107	1.324	.007	1	.935	1.113
	Education	1.138	.813	1.958	1	.162	3.121
	Constant	-6.175	6.498	.903	1	.342	480.41

Note. * $p \leq .05$. Dependent Variable #23. 0 = no, I was not told by a supervisor to allow another FTO or officer to take over during the arresting process due to overtime; 1 = yes, I was told by the supervisor.

Results for Question 37: One FTO with Two Rookies Responding to Jobs

Another program component that was examined in relation to program fidelity was whether the original ratio of one FTO responding to a job with two rookies was followed in the program. If one FTO and two rookies responded to jobs, the program was being implemented as originally planned. I performed a binary logistic regression to examine the impact of seven predictor variables and the probability of these variables predicting the outcome variable. Predictor variables were age, gender, race, years in the department, months as FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, and education. Age, years in the department, education, and

months as FTO were all treated as continuous variables. Gender, race, and attending training before becoming an FTO were all treated as dichotomous variables. The outcome variable was whether the officers agreed that the FTP was followed when it came to one field FTO and two new officers in the RMP responding to jobs. The outcome variable was 1 = yes, the program was followed, or 0 = no, the program was not followed. Overall, an examination of the Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test revealed that the model was appropriate for the data: $\chi^2(7)$, $=12.48$, $p = .078$. In addition, the model was also able to discriminate between officers who agreed (“yes”) or disagreed (“no”) that the program was followed accordingly. Overall, this model explained between 23.3% and 39.3% of the variance in answering “no” to the statement and correctly classified 91.7% of the cases. Based on this, further examination of the coefficients was warranted.

Age and months as an FTO were the only two significant predictors ($p < .05$). More specifically, age ($p = .025$) and months serving as an FTO ($p = .044$) were significant. The strongest predictor was months serving as an FTO. Examination of the odds ratio for months revealed that each month an officer served as FTO increased the probability of the officer responding “yes” to Q37 (one FTO to two rookies, the program was followed) increased by .933 times. The other variable that was predictive was age. Age was positively correlated with the “yes” response. Examination of the odds ratio for age revealed that the older per year that an officer was, the probability that the officer would respond with “yes” to Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) increased by 1.385 times (see Table 5).

Table 5

Results from Logistical Regression: Q37, Program was Followed Regarding One FTO and Two Rookies Responding to Jobs

		<i>B</i>	S.E.	Wald	<i>df</i>	Sig.	Odds ratio
Step 1 ^a	Age	.326	.145	5.049	1	.025*	1.385
	Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female	-1.700	1.854	.840	1	.359	.183
	Race binary: 1 = White, 0 = not White	1.921	1.287	2.230	1	.135	6.828
	Years in dept.	-.096	.130	.536	1	.464	.909
	FTO how many months?	-.069	.034	4.039	1	.044*	.933
	Did you attend FTO before beginning to work as an FTO: 0= no 1=yes	-.413	1.117	.137	1	.712	.662
	Education	-.485	.366	1.751	1	.186	.616
	Constant	-8.222	4.379	3.525	1	.060	.000

Note. * $p \leq .05$. Dependent Variable #37. 0 = no, the program was not followed. 1 = yes, the program was followed.

Results for Question 38: FTO Feeling Safe Responding to Jobs with Two Rookies

The next program component that was examined in relation to program fidelity was whether officers believed it was actually a safe practice for one FTO and two rookies to show up to a job. One FTO and two rookies working together was the original idea behind the program's design. I performed a binary logistic regression to examine the impact of seven predictor variables and the probability of these variables predicting the outcome variable. Predictor variables were age, gender, race, years in the department, months as FTO, attending training before becoming an FTO, and education. Age, years in the department, education, and months as FTO were all treated as continuous variables. Gender, race, and attending training before becoming an FTO were all treated as dichotomous variables. The outcome variable was whether the officers agreed that the FTO responding to jobs with two rookies was a safe practice. The outcome variable was 1 = yes, it was a safe practice, or 0 = no, it was not a safe practice. Overall,

an examination of the Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test revealed that the model was somewhat appropriate for the data: $X^2(7) = 15.296, p = .032$. In addition, the model was lower than the previous analysis in being able to discriminate between officers who agreed (“yes”) or disagreed (“no”) the practice was safe. Overall, this model explained between 27.3% and 33.5% of the variance in answering “no” to the statement and correctly classified only 75% of the cases. Based on this, further examination of the coefficients was warranted.

Whether the officer attended training before they became an FTO was the only significant predictor ($p < .05$). More specifically, this variable was significant at ($p = .017$). Examination of the odds ratio revealed that if officers said “yes” they did attend training before they became an FTO, the likelihood of responding to “yes” to Question 38 (responding to jobs with rookies as safe) increased by 7.535 times (see Table 6).

Table 6

Results from Logistical Regression: Q38, Responding to Jobs with Rookies as Safe

		<i>B</i>	S.E.	Wald	<i>df</i>	Sig.	Odds ratio
Step 1 ^a	Age	.198	.105	3.579	1	.059	1.219
	Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female	.088	1.047	.007	1	.933	1.092
	Race binary 0 = not white 1 = white	1.406	.844	2.774	1	.096	4.079
	Years in the dept.	-.072	.120	.362	1	.548	.930
	FTO, how many months?	-.047	.026	3.448	1	.063	.954
	Did you attend FTP before beginning to work as FTO: 0 = no, 1 = yes	-2.020	.848	5.676	1	.017*	7.535
	Education	-.238	.305	.611	1	.434	.788
	Constant	-6.900	3.204	4.638	1	.031	.001

Note. * $p < .05$. Dependent Variable #3. 0 = no, the practice was not safe. 1 = yes, the practice was safe.

Post Hoc Analysis: Mann–Whitney *U* Tests

In addition to the above logistic regression, I also performed a series of nonparametric Mann–Whitney *U* Tests. These Mann–Whitney *U* Tests aimed to examine between-group differences for Q24 (does the department management support the FTP) and Q25 (does the department select qualified officers to be FTOs).

Currently an FTO by Management Supporting FTP

I performed a Mann–Whitney *U* Test to examine if significant differences existed between those officers who were currently FTOs and those who were no longer FTOs and whether they believed department management supported the FTO program overall (see Table

7). Perception of management support was gathered via a 4-point agreement scale whereby 1 = *strongly agree*, and 4 = *strongly disagree*.

Those who were working as FTO's at the time of the study had a higher level of disagreement regarding being supported by management ($Md = 29.12$) compared to those officers who were not working as an FTO at the time of the study ($Md = 19.02$). Examination of the Mann–Whitney U Test revealed that this difference in mean ranks was statistically significant: $U = 170.50$, $z = -2.648$, $p = .008$ (see Table 8). Q25 (does the department select qualified officers to be FTOs) by current and past FTO's was not significant ($p > .05$).

Table 7

Descriptive: Are you currently FTO, 1 = Yes, 2 = No by Management Supporting FTO Program

#24. Dept. management support FTO	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Yes	29	29.12	844.50
No	20	19.02	380.50
Total	49		

Note. 1 = *Strongly Agree*, 2 = *Agree*, 3 = *Disagree*, and 4 = *Strongly Disagree*.

Table 8

Results for Mann–Whitney U

Statistical test	Results
Mann–Whitney U	170.500
Z	-2.648
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.008*

Note. * $p < .05$.

Attend Training Before Becoming FTO by Perception of Management Supporting FTO

I performed a Mann–Whitney U Test to examine if there were significant differences between those officers who attended training before becoming an FTO and those who attended

training after becoming an FTO and whether they believed the Department management supported the FTO program overall (see Table 9). Those who did not attend FTO training before becoming an FTO had more disagreement that the department does not support the FTO program ($Md = 29.65$) than those who attended training before becoming an FTO ($Md = 17.66$).

Examination of the Mann–Whitney U Test revealed that this difference was statistically significant ($U = 145.500$, $z = -3.118$, $p = .002$; see Table 10).

Attend Training Before Becoming FTO by Perception of Management Selecting Qualified Officers

Next, I performed another Mann–Whitney U Test to determine if there were significant differences between those officers who attended training before becoming an FTO and those who attended training after becoming an FTO and whether they believed the department selected qualified officers to serve as FTOs. Those who did not attend FTO training before becoming an FTO had more disagreement that the department did not select qualified officers to become FTOs ($Md = 28.25$) than those who attended training before becoming an FTO ($Md = 19.87$; see Table 9). Examination of the Mann–Whitney U Test revealed that this difference was statistically significant ($U = 187.50$, $z = -2.125$, $p = .034$; see Table 10).

Table 9

Descriptive: Did you attend FTO Training before you became an FTO? 0 = No/1 = Yes

Dependent variable	Training	<i>N</i>	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
24. Dept. management supports the FTO?	Yes	19	17.66	335.50
	No	30	29.65	889.50
	Total	49		
25. Dept select qualified officers to serve as FTO?	Yes	19	19.87	377.50
	No	30	28.25	847.50
	Total	49		

Note. 1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, and 4 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 10

Results for Mann–Whitney U

Statistical test	Results
#24 Mann–Whitney U	145.500
<i>Z</i>	-3.118
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.002*
#25 Mann–Whitney U	187.500
<i>Z</i>	-2.125
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.034*

*Note. * $p < .05$.*

Chapter Five: Interviews

I conducted eight semistructured interviews ($n = 8$) with current and former FTOs in the Department. The interviews took place from January 1, 2021, to April 7, 2021. I conducted the interviews on the phone, and interviews ranged in duration from 15 to 45 minutes, with the average interview lasting approximately 20 to 30 minutes. All interviewees were informed that the interview could be terminated at any point and the recording would be erased, and their interview would not be used. In addition, interviewees were informed that their exact words or quotes during the interview may not be used but aggregated into the data and summarized. All the interviewees were guaranteed anonymity with their identities known only to me.

Data Collection

The initial interview protocol included the original 39 questions from the survey reviewed in the previous chapters. I then asked follow-up questions to elucidate more in-depth information on a particular point or contextualize the response correctly. The interviews were then transcribed verbatim using an outside transcription service.

Demographics of the Interviewees

The respondents were all male. Seven out of eight respondents were White, and one was Hispanic. The average time on the job was 8.87 years, with 16 years being the most and 6 years being the least. The average time as an FTO was 3 years, with 4 years as the most time as an FTO and 1 year as the shortest time as an FTO. Five of the eight officers did attend the FTO training before working as an FTO, and three did not. On average, those three officers spent 16 months as an FTO before attending the training, with one FTO spending 24 months as an FTO before training and one FTO spending 6 months as an FTO before training. Of the eight respondents, four are current FTOs, and four are no longer FTOs. Their levels of education were

as follows: R1 has a bachelor's degree, R2 has a bachelor's degree, R3 has between 60 college credits and a bachelor's degree, R4 has an associate's degree, R5 has an associate's degree and reported he is seven credits away from his bachelor's degree, R6 has an associate's degree, R7 has a bachelor's degree, and R8 has between 60 college credits and a bachelor's degree. A complete overview of demographics for the interviewees can be found in Table 11.

Table 11

Interviewee Demographics

Gender	Male: 8; female: 0
Race	White: 7; non-White: 1
Average time as a police officer	8.875 years; High of 16 years vs. low of 6 years
Average time as an FTO	Three years; high of 4 years v. low of 1 year
Attend FTO training first	Yes: 5 officers; no: three officers
Average time as FTO before attending training from the three officers who were FTO before attending the training	16 months; high of 24 months vs. low of 6 months
Highest level of completed education	Three bachelor's degrees; and three associate's degrees. Two respondents have between an associate and bachelor's degree

Background Origins of the FTP

This section will address how and why officers became FTOs. In December of 2014, the Department established an FTO incentives program that offered FTOs a chance at receiving benefits for becoming an FTO. The Department established the FTP on January 28, 2015. However, the reality of what occurred was not how the program was initially designed or envisioned.

Interview Results

From eight interviews, four officers volunteered, but the process was more nuanced than a simple volunteer or not volunteered. Two officers volunteered on their own because they either

believed in the mission of public safety or wanted to help other officers. The other two officers volunteered either because they were asked to do so by supervisors or because they assumed they would be mandated to join the program; thus, these officers joined the program and tried to obtain a small benefit for themselves in the process. For this paper, those two respondents are considered volunteers even though they reported that they did not have a choice and were essentially forced into serving as an FTO; therefore, this qualitative analysis will be using a total of four respondents who volunteered and four who did not.

Theme 1: Safety

During the interviews, the issue of safety was mentioned specifically regarding the FTP policy of having one FTO and two rookies answer jobs. According to the Chief of Departments Memo OCD#1-0375-17, the FTP was designed to have one FTO and two rookies assigned together on patrol. Interviewees noted that this procedure was the first thing that was ignored. All eight respondents said that the policy of one FTO to two rookies was not followed and perceived that many of the officers thought it was unsafe to follow this ratio of FTO to rookie.

Respondent 6 stated that he did volunteer because he felt that he would be able to “leverage volunteering that position into a favorable quality of life in other areas by doing the FTP.” He also stated that he and his partner assumed that they would be drafted into the FTO program, so they decided to intercept and work out a deal with their lieutenant. The deal was in direct opposition to the FTP guidelines, Department Memo OCD#1-0375-17; R6 and his partner would stay together, and a rookie would be in the car with them, rather than having one FTO with two new rookies out on patrol. Nowhere in the paperwork establishing the program was a lieutenant given the authority to revise the program and make such deals.

R5 also said that the policy was not followed; however, he said that even when he specifically asked his immediate supervisors, “Hey, do you mind putting me with my partner maybe one- or two-days week,” his supervisors would ignore his request. R5 relayed a specific incident where he and his partner asked a supervisor if they could continue their partnership and have the rookies work with them as a two FTO to one or two Rookies ratio for safety reasons. Their request was denied, so R5 ended up working only with rookies and was left embittered about the FTP.

R1 said the policy was not followed and that “if that was followed, I think that would be terribly unsafe.” When asked if the policy was followed, a fascinating response came from R4, who said that the policy was being followed when he started in the FTO program. He further stated that the Department’s Neighborhood Coordination Officers (NCO) program conflicted with the FTO program. In his exact words, “NCO was a lot about the demise of the FTP.” This issue is beyond the scope of this dissertation but will be included as a recommendation in Chapter 6 for further research. R4 continued regarding the safety issues, saying, “I tried not to think about it.” When asked if the policy was followed, R2 stated “for half a second;” thus, R2 agreed that the policy was not followed. However, when asked about the safety aspect, R2 was the only respondent who thought it was safe to respond with two rookies in the car and himself. He thought that “as long as the FTO, him or herself, is capable of handling themselves professionally, I think it’s fine.” This officer was assigned to the transit bureau. In contrast, all the other officers were assigned elsewhere, so it is possible that an officer’s specific assignment affected their perspective of the program and its policies.

As seen from R5 and R6, the policy was not followed, and it seemed that different precincts implemented different policies depending on the individual supervisor or command-

level preferences. Of the 49 survey respondents, only seven (14.2%) said the program design of one FTO and two rookies were followed, and 42 (85.7%) said it was not followed. Furthermore, of the 49 survey respondents, 15 (30.6%) said the policy was safe as designed, and 34 (69.3%) said it was unsafe.

Theme 2: Reengagement

When the respondents were asked if they would be FTOs again, the answers yielded some interesting responses. Many of the FTOs, especially those who did not volunteer, reported that they would be an FTO again. The primary reason for wanting to be an FTO again was that it was the right thing to do. As a comparison to the quantitative data, 13 out of 49 respondents (26.5%) said they would be an FTO again, 26 (53%) respondents said they would not be an FTO again, and 10 (20.4%) did not know if they would be an FTO again or not. Although only 13 (26.5%) total respondents would be an FTO again, perhaps counterintuitively, all four (100%) of the interviewees who did not volunteer for the program said they would do so again. Table 12 displays some of the interview responses.

Table 12

Theme 2, Reengagement

FTO volunteers	R1, 3, 5 and 6	Would you do so again? R1 and R6 would, R3 and R5 would not. 50% return rate
FTO non-volunteers	R2, 4, 7, and 8	Would you do so again? R2, 4, 7, and 8 would. 100% return rate

R1, who volunteered to be an FTO, would be an FTO again even after not receiving any of the incentives as part of the program. Regarding his reason for being willing to be an FTO again, R1 stated:

Yeah, I would because I think I've helped enough of the rookies get a better understanding of stuff and the paperwork and whatnot, so I definitely would do it again even though there is, none of the stuff promised has come through.

R2, who did not volunteer, stated he would be an FTO again "even with a really poor framework, I think it is the right thing to do."

R3 reported that he would not do the program again if given the opportunity. His response is noteworthy because, out of all the interviewees, R3 had the most experience as an FTO. In addition, R3 discussed the safety concerns mentioned earlier in this dissertation:

Honestly, it's one of those things where it's like I've done it for a while. And I don't mind doing it. I like helping other cops, but sometimes you're in situations where it's a brand-new police officer and me. And it's almost like you're alone on the job with them. And it's nail-biting. I've been in situations where thank God; it worked out in the end; everything was good, but you don't know who you are with at that point. You're with a brand-new cop. He's a cop, but you're teaching him field training. You're at the job, and anything can happen. You don't know how he's going to react. The situation could go either way, and in the end, it's a little scary.

I then reiterated what R2 said and asked him if safety was his primary concern. R2 responded:

Yeah. I know like some guys would do, the better way we've done it. And they had done it a little bit better like this, where you have you and your partner, and then the kid rides in the back. That's a better situation, I feel.

R5 had similar ideas to R3. I asked R5 if he would be an FTO again, and he said he would not. I asked why not, and his reason was as follows:

Just because being in the program and then seeing how they [Department] ran it, I don't agree with it. Then the fact that these guys [FTOs] that you [Department] supposedly put in this position because you [Department] like the way they [FTOs] do the job, but when they [FTOs] say, "hey, do you [Supervisor] mind putting me with my partner maybe one or two days a week." They [Department] kind of turn the shoulder on you [FTOs], you know what I mean.

I also asked R5 if the Department memo regarding one police officer and two rookies was followed, and he said he thought it was supposed to be him and his partner and the two rookies. However, once I explained how the policy was supposed to be implemented, he said the policy was not followed. R5 added, "that's not safe for anybody." I then asked him if he thought the FTO program would have been served better by keeping partners together, and his response is worth recording in full:

Yeah, because more so than learning the job, they can see a partnership dynamic and see how two people would handle a job instead of just one person with two new people, you know what I mean. Because I heard plenty of stories from other FTOs where the kids, the guys, they get into stressful situations, and then certain people jam up, you know what I mean. They lock up; they don't know what to do. Where, if I had my partner, I feel like I would be more confrontable heading to these jobs. Then these guys would be able to pick up the job a little bit quicker because they would see "all right, he benefits from picking a good partner, somebody he can trust." That's one of the biggest things with the job is you want to pick a partner with somebody you can trust.

The Department did not consult with the officers regarding this particular FTP policy, which seemed to have had a deleterious effect on the officers to either volunteer or remain or recommit to the program. I will discuss this in my recommendations for further research in Chapter 6, along with the 100% retention rate among non volunteers. The interview responses indicated that the Department has people who believe in the mission of FTPs; however, the program implantation was horrific. With tweaking, the Department has the personnel to support the program.

Theme 3: Program Fidelity

The third theme to emerge was program fidelity. This theme had the following four subthemes:

- awareness of the incentives: training, transfers, and promotions;
- attend training before working as an FTO;
- department support; and
- arrest processing: supervisors disregarding the program design.

Subtheme 1: Awareness of the Incentives: Training, Transfers, and Promotions. The Department established the FTP incentives via Operations Order 53 on December 30, 2014 (see Appendix F). There were eight modules of training in all, and the wording in the document stated that the FTOs who are not already qualified “will receive training related to patrol functions” (see Appendix F). The memo also listed the training elements, making clear that all FTOs who were not already qualified would receive training as a matter of course. A separate Chief of Department Memo with Auto Crimes Training for FTOs was issued on November 3, 2015 (Serial Number #19237304; see Appendix G), which stated that there were to be eight openings per month set aside for the FTOs expressly. The only restriction was that the FTO had to have

already completed the FTO training before participating in the Auto Crime Training.

Unfortunately, as will be discussed later on, some FTOs did not participate in FTO training until after they had been acting as an FTO for 2 years. FTO training is often not available to FTOs through no fault of their own. The incentive program also offers transfers, interviews with specialized units such as Harbor and Counterterrorism, and promotion to detective specialists listed as incentives available to the FTOs.

Training. Five out of 49 survey respondents (10.2%) requested a transfer, and only two out of five received it. However, out of the 49 respondents, 26 respondents (53%) were not aware that transfers were an incentive available to them. Some of the respondents specifically asked for training and promotions and received neither. For example, R1, who volunteered to be an FTO, requested two of the training incentives and received neither. Furthermore, at the time of the interview, R1 said it had been 1 year since he requested the training and still had not received any.

Four officers who volunteered were all aware of the incentive aspect of the FTO program. There were nine modules of training available per officer for a total of 36 pieces of training; thus, the officers received a combined total of three pieces of training for a 1.08% award rate. Of the four officers who did not volunteer to be an FTO, two officers were aware of some aspect of the incentive program. Therefore, because there were nine modules of training available per officer for a total of 36 pieces of training, the officers received a combined total of three pieces of training for a 1.08% award rate.

The data indicated that most of the respondents had fragmented knowledge of the incentives, and some thought there were other incentives that did not exist. For example, such an extra weeks' vacation was a common refrain, but that was not an incentive offered by the

Department. It may have only been offered at the command level, which begs the question of how individual precincts are reworking a department-wide program on their own?

Interviews and Promotions. None of the respondents had requested the interview incentive at the time of this study. However, several respondents posited that this incentive might be something they would be interested in later on. Of the 49 respondents, only five (10.2%) requested an interview, and three out of the five had completed said interview at the time of this study. No interviewee was promoted to a detective or knew anyone who was promoted to detective due to the FTP. Of the 49 respondents, only two (4.08%) stated they were promoted from the FTO program to detective.

R1 said he was the most skilled regarding productivity and instruction of the rookies of all the FTOs in his precinct, and he had asked the field training sergeant if the sergeant would submit R1 for a detective shield. When he asked his sergeant about the detective shield, “the sergeant kind of gave me one of those half giggles, like yeah, I do not know how much that is possible.” R3 participated in a 1-day, department-wide refresher for the FTOs. While at the refresher with about 300 FTOs in the room, the instructor asked the FTOs who had gotten their detective shield. R3 said maybe two people raised their hands. Table 13 displays the data regarding this FTO incentive.

Table 13*Theme 3, Subtheme 1*

	Awareness of incentives	Requested training	Received training	Transfers, interviews, promotions
FTO volunteers	All the FTO who volunteered were aware of incentives	R1 asked for one training and one other incentive, a Detective Shield	I did not receive either	No transfers, interviews, or promotions
FTO nonvolunteers	Half were aware, and half were not	R8 asked for one training	Did not receive	No transfers, interviews, or promotions

Subtheme 2: Attend Training Before Working as an FTO. The Department released an Operations Order 23 on May 4, 2017, titled “Field Training Sergeant” (see Appendix H). The order stated that “all Field Training Officers must complete a two-day course of instruction” (see Appendix H). Although the order did not explicitly state that FTO training must occur before an officer begins to work as an FTO, it would be odd to have untrained officers be in charge of other untrained officers.

Respondents’ average time as an FTO was 3 years, with 4 years as the most time as an FTO and 1 year as the shortest time as an FTO. Five of the eight officers did attend the FTO training before working as an FTO, and three did not. The time those three officers spent as FTOs before attending the training was 16 months on average, the high being 24 months and the low being 6 months, with a 62.5% rate of officers trained first and a 37.5% rate of officers being trained after. Recall that those three officers were not eligible for the Auto Crime Training until completing the FTO training.

R1 was not trained before working as an FTO. He was working as an FTO for 6 months before he was sent to the training. R1 said that the training “was not available at that point,” so he just started doing it at the request of his sergeant. R2 was not trained before working as an

FTO. He worked as an FTO for 2 years before being sent to the training. After 2 years, R2's supervisors said to him, "all right, let's just formalize this. Let's send you to the training so now we can formally call you an FTO." Lastly, R6 was not trained before working as an FTO. He was acting as an FTO for 18 months before being sent to the training. Table 14 displays the data regarding this FTO training.

Table 14

Theme 3, Subtheme 2

Respondents	Training before	Training after	Time before training
R1	No	Yes	6 months
R2	No	Yes	24 months
R3	Yes	NA	NA
R4	Yes	NA	NA
R5	Yes	NA	NA
R6	No	Yes	18 months
R7	Yes	NA	NA
R8	Yes	NA	NA

Subtheme 3: Department Support. Five of the eight respondents did not think that the Department management supports the program. However, three respondents, R5, R7, and R8, had interesting viewpoints and explained why they think the support is nonexistent or stopped.

R5 felt that since the NCO program started, the FTP was "pushed on the back burner." R7 said that for police officers who work in a busy precinct like where he works, the FTP is supported because supervisors do not want to be bothered by rookies. R8 stated that the FTP was supported when the program first started. However, since becoming a supervisor a couple of years ago, R8 shared that department support for the FTO program has gone "all out the window, they do not care about that anymore." Table 15 displays the data regarding support for the FTP.

Table 15*Theme 3, Subtheme 3*

Respondents	Program is supported	The program is not supported
R1	NA	No
R2	NA	No
R3	Yes	NA
R4	NA	No
R5	NA	No
R6	Yes	NA
R7	Yes	NA
R8	NA	No

Subtheme 4: Arrest Processing: Supervisors Disregarding the Program Design. The fourth subtheme for Theme 3 was arrest processing. According to the Department's Finest Message sent on May 8, 2017, from the Chief of Patrol, Serial #26050528 of 2017, FTOs were allowed overtime to help the rookie process arrests. This message stated that no cap was placed on the amount of overtime an FTO could earn. In the Department, overtime is classified generally as overtime or operational; both have their own rules and regulations. The message also stated that the arrest processing of FTOs with the rookies was to be classified as arrest overtime, presumably not to take away funds from command operations.

An interesting point to note is that two messages from the Chief of Patrol were sent out on May 8, 2017: the original one at 12:48 pm and the other at 1:24 pm, revising the original message. The original message stated, "FTOs are authorized to assist when probationary police officers assigned to the field training program make arrests" (see Appendix I). The revised message stated, "FTOs are authorized "and encouraged" to assist when probationary police officers assigned to the field training program make arrests" (see Appendix J). It seems the

Department was trying to emphasize that that not only were FTOs allowed but that the Department wanted them to help with arrest processing without regard to overtime which, as seen in this study, was an issue.

The Department management seemed to be making a concerted effort to encourage officers to stay and help the rookies and receive overtime without command interference. However, the respondents had a decidedly different perspective of what happened. R2 said he was not kicked out, but he stayed on his own time in order to avoid conflict. He recalls at least twice when he did that. R2 also recalled going home and FaceTiming the rookie to walk them through the paperwork. He reported that “overtime is the holy grail of the police department, and I did not want there to be an issue.”

R3 stayed in the Department for 2 hours on overtime the first few times he assisted a rookie with the arrest process. Then, it became 1-hour cash and 1-hour compensatory time, and it kept getting cut to where it was clear the supervisors did not want R3 or any FTO to stay and accrue overtime. When asked who assisted the rookie when he left, R3 replied that the rookie was assisted by whoever was available, even a non-FTO. R6 said he was allowed to stay at times, but after 2 or 3 hours, the supervisors made him hand off the processing to whoever was available, even a non-FTO. R7 said he was never told to leave assisting a rookie for overtime reasons.

Theme 4: Program Outcomes

The fourth theme to emerge was program outcomes. The following subthemes emerged from Theme 4:

- hiring methods;
- selection of qualified officers to be FTOs;

- appropriateness of probationary police officers successfully completing their probationary period; and
- qualification of supervisors assigned to the FTP.

Subtheme 1: Hiring Methods. The first subtheme for Theme 4 was hiring methods. In the Department, officers are considered sworn law enforcement officers from the day of hire, which begins a 2-year probationary period. Rookie is a term used to refer to officers still on probation. All the rookies referenced in this dissertation entered the FTP after graduating from the 6-month academy. The FTP lasts for 6 months, which corresponds to months 7–12 of the rookies' career.

R1 did not think anyone needed to be fired after the FTO training. However, he thought that “1 out of 10 needs at least an extended probationary period or more.” R2 said that, in his opinion, only about 2% of the rookies should be fired after completing the FTO program. R4 said that, from the rookies who completed the FTO program, about 30% should not be hired. Finally, R5 said that he has worked with about 15% of rookies who should not be hired. R6 said that all rookies he worked with should be hired:

I did not come across anyone that I trained that I wasn't comfortable with overall. The other officers said that the Rookies were fine, or after completing the training, they were on their way to where they needed to be, and being fired was not warranted.

Subtheme 2: Selection of Qualified Police Officers to be FTOs. As referenced earlier, Johnson and Cheatwood (1992) found that removing an FTO due to poor performance was extremely difficult. If a police department removes an FTO and as a result, the FTO no longer receives the monetary incentive of \$350, it is considered a form of discipline, and then the department must comply with the union and contractual rules that allow “for the retention of

inappropriate or inadequate personnel in the program” (Johnson & Cheatwood, 1992, p. 35). In Chapter 6, I discuss my recommendation to ensure the selection of proper officers to serve as FTOs.

Of the respondents, 50% thought FTOs were qualified, and 50% did not. When the respondents answered that yes, they thought the FTOs were qualified, it was simply a “yes” with no actual reasoning behind it; it was just their opinion. However, when the FTOs answered no, their answers came with clear, specific reasons why some FTOs were not qualified. For example, R1 said that, in his experience, most people did not believe the Department would hand out the incentives as promised and thus did not want to participate in the FTP. R1 said that “8 out of 10 times, it was someone’s that’s not qualified and just got thrown into it.” R2 stated that he did not think the Department selected qualified officers to be FTOs. He said that the people selected to be FTOs resulted from an administrative decision because the FTP had to be staffed, and no regard was given to the qualifications of the officers. In his words, “they picked people who were not bad, but they were not good.” R2 also stated that the training the FTOs go through was a waste of time because those officers “did nothing with the training.” R8 said the program started strong with qualified officers being FTOs, but now “that all pretty much faded, and everyone and anyone became an FTO.”

In contrast, R3 thought that most of the FTOs were qualified, and R6 agreed that the Department selected qualified officers. R4 was ambivalent but thought most officers were qualified. R5 felt maybe about half of RTOs were qualified and half were not.

Subtheme 3: Appropriateness of Probationary Police Officers Successfully Completing Their Probationary Period. R1 said he did make such recommendations twice. For one rookie, R1 recommended extended probation, and for another rookie, he recommended

extended probation and termination. He reported that, in both cases, none of his recommendations were followed. When I asked why his recommendations were not followed, he responded that he was never told. When he attempted to follow up with his supervisor, his supervisor said, “well, you know, it’s tough to do that.” R2 was unable to make such a recommendation because he never had a field training sergeant in his precinct. Recall that R2 was an FTO for 2 years before being sent to the FTO training, which means that for 2 years, the FTO program was not operating according to the program guidelines. R3, R5, R6, and R8 did not make any recommendations.

R4 did not make such a recommendation; however, he stated he wanted to make a recommendation for one rookie but never saw anyone else do it, so he did not bother. He said that he “never thought anyone would take us [FTOs] seriously.” R7 did not make any recommendations, partly because he did not have a field training sergeant. He was an FTO for about 1 year and did not have a field training sergeant the entire time he was an FTO. He did not think the Department would listen to an FTOs’ opinion alone.

Subtheme 4: Qualification of Supervisors Assigned to the Field Training Program.

R1 said that he had a field training sergeant in the past, but he has not had one in about 18 months; thus, he could not answer questions about his field training sergeant. Finally, R2 bluntly stated that the program was not followed, and evaluations of the rookies were never done because nobody was overseeing the program.

R3 said, “the last one, yes,” when asked if the field training sergeants were qualified for the position. When asked to clarify, he stated that he had not had a field training sergeant in a year since his last sergeant was transferred. When asked whom he reports to, he said nobody. R4 said he did not have one for a while, and when he did, he thought that the sergeant may have

been technically qualified, but he did not think the sergeant was in the best position suited for his personality because the field training sergeant “did not like new people.”

R5 thought that the field training sergeants were qualified for the position. R6 said that, for the majority of his time in the program, he never had a field training sergeant, and the position went unfilled in his precinct. He stated that other random sergeants just assumed the duties of the field training sergeant position in his precinct. R7 stated he did not have a field training sergeant at any point while he was an FTO for 1 year. Lastly, R8 said he thought his field training sergeant was qualified.

Summary of Interview Findings

The interviews revealed several key issues that will be discussed in Chapter 6. The first theme developed was safety. The second theme developed was reengagement. The third theme was program fidelity. The last theme was program outcomes. Theme 3 and Theme 4 both had four subthemes. Direct quotes have been used to highlight and inform the analysis, and the quotes have been edited for grammatical clarity.

Chapter Six: Discussion and Conclusion

This study sought to evaluate the Department's FTP to determine if the policies of the program were implemented and administered with fidelity according to the program's guidelines. Additionally, I sought to understand what characteristics of the program were predictive to examine if the program design was followed.

The FTP commenced in January 2015 and was designed to help probationary police officers (rookies) transition from the police academy to the field because the academy is a sterile environment and not capable of teaching actual policing (Getty et al., 2016). The Department also announced an incentive program for the FTOs who participate in the program. The incentives ranged from transfers to training to possible promotion.

Two primary research questions guided this dissertation using quantitative and qualitative data:

Research Question 1: Was the FTP implemented with fidelity according to the program design? If not, what variables were the best predictors of the programming aspect not being implemented correctly? Furthermore, are the various programmatic components that make up the FTP implemented with fidelity?

R1A: Were the arrest processing policies followed according to the program design? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1B: Were the policies followed concerning one FTO and two new officers assigned together responding to jobs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

R1C: Was the policy of one FTO and two rookies responding to jobs viewed as safe by the FTOs? And what, if any, variables were the best predictors of FTOs believing this policy was followed?

Research Question 2: What influenced how and why officers became FTOs?

Research Question 1: Findings

As a result of Chapter 4, comprised of quantitative data, and Chapter 5, comprised of qualitative data, three quantitative findings have emerged as new contributions to the literature. The quantitative sample was comprised of 49 participants, and qualitative interviews were conducted with eight participants. The following discussion throughout this section applies specifically to the sample department studied and cannot necessarily apply in a generalizable way to all departments.

Finding 1

The first notable finding in relation to R1A (arrest processing) was that the FTP was not administered according to the policy manual or guidelines regarding arrest overtime. It is important to note that, when viewing the results of the analysis, the Chief of Department sent out a memo clarifying that FTOs should stay with the rookies on overtime without a cap to assist in the arrest processing. Of the 49 survey respondents on the survey, 28 respondents (57.14%) said they were told to hand off an arrest to a non-FTO, thus completely disregarding the Chief of Department's memo. In contrast, 21 respondents (42.8%) said the overtime policy was followed. I performed a binary logistic regression to examine the impact of seven predictor variables and the probability of predicting the outcome variable of the FTO being told to leave the arrest processing assistance of the rookie. Gender was the only significant predictor of who answered "yes" or "no" to Question 23 (arrest processing), and gender was the only significant predictor

for who would answer that they were told to hand off the arrest ($p = .023$). Further examination of the odds ratio for gender determined that being female increased the probability that officers would answer “yes” by 16.87 times that a supervisor did tell the FTOs that any officer or different FTO could take over an arrest processing due to overtime.

Finding 1 was not entirely unexpected. A possible explanation for this can be the personality differences between men and women. Many studies show how policing is a male-dominated profession, and women are perceived as not physically capable (Prenzler & Sinclair, 2013) or are given duties by gender (Garcia, 2003). Skolnick (1993) discussed the working personality of police, termed as police officer’s values and attitudes. Berg and Budnick (1986) found that, although improvements for women in policing have improved overall, there is still a “major obstacle for women in law enforcement to overcome and one not generally associated with other occupations, is the police personality” (p. 316). This finding highlights that there are still strides to make in gender equality in policing, and administrators should perhaps consider what incentives are desired by officers of different genders to design the FTP more appropriately.

Finding 2

The second notable finding in relation to RQ1 was that the policy of one FTO and two rookies assigned together in a patrol car when responding to jobs was not followed. Of the 49 survey respondents, 42 respondents (85.7%) said this policy was not followed. Seven respondents (14.2%) said the policy was followed. Age and months serving as an FTO were the only two significant predictors ($p < .05$). More specifically, age ($p = .025$) and months serving as an FTO ($p = .044$) were significant. The strongest predictor was months serving as an FTO. Examination of the odds ratio for months revealed that each month an officer served as FTO

increased the probability of the officer responding “yes” to Q37 (one FTO to two rookies) by .933 times. Age was the other predictive variable. Age was positively correlated with the “yes” response. Examination of the odds ratio for age revealed that for every year an officer aged, the probability of the officer responding “yes” to this question increased by 1.385 times.

This finding is also not entirely surprising. Age and time as an FTO would allow someone to speak up and break the “blue wall;” in other words, older FTOs with more experience are more likely to express misgivings about the program. FTOs are the officers whose safety is at risk; thus, it is reasonable that these officers would be more vocal in pointing out the program’s flaws, especially where their safety is concerned.

Finding 3

The third notable finding in relation to Research Question 1 was that the FTOs did not think it was safe to respond to calls for service with two rookies. Thirty-four respondents (69.3%) said it was unsafe, and 15 respondents (30.6%) said it was safe. The only significant predictor was if the respondent attended the FTO training before they became an FTO ($p < .05$). More specifically, this variable was significant at ($p = .017$). Examination of the odds ratio revealed that if officers said “yes,” they did attend training before they became an FTO, the officer was 7.535 times more likely to respond with “yes,” they did feel the policy was a safe practice.

Of the 49 respondents, 29 (59.1%) said they did not attend the FTO training before being an FTO, and 20 (40.8%) did attend the training before being an FTO. On average, FTOs who did not receive training waited an average of 22.4 months before attending training, with the longest reported waiting time being 72 months and the lowest being 3 months.

Overwhelmingly, FTOs in the Department did not think the policy of having one FTO to two rookies was safe. It may be that the FTO training served to reassure officers that this policy was a safe practice or that having three people in the car while responding to jobs was safer than the usual two people. In this study, the Department did not send many people to training before they began working as an FTO. The Department could have assured the officers of the safety of this particular policy had they trained all officers first. This confirms Hartman's (1979) finding that prior to assuming the FTO role, the officers must be trained.

Research Question 2 Findings

Finding 1

The first notable finding in relation to Research Question 2 was that officers were drafted into the FTP against their will. It became apparent during the interviews that there were three ways officers became FTOs. Some were drafted into the program, whereas others volunteered. Lastly, some officers thought they would be drafted and intercepted the draft by cutting side deals with their supervisors and assuring themselves of some benefit.

Of the 49 survey respondents, only 19 respondents (38.7%) volunteered to be an FTO, and 30 respondents (61.2%) did not volunteer. I discovered a counterintuitive finding when comparing the survey data to the interview data. Four of the interviewees volunteered for the FTP, and four did not. However, only two would be an FTO again from the four who volunteered, representing a 50% return rate. However, 100% of the four who did not volunteer said they would be an FTO again. This relates to Hartman (1979), who said that, for an FTO program to be successful, there must be two conditions met: (a) the FTO has to want to be an FTO, and (b) the FTO is trained before training others. The finding that even nonvolunteers believe in the program's goals even when the program was not administered correctly or

according to the guidelines holds implications for further research and improvement within FTPs.

Finding 2

The second notable finding in relation to Research Question 2 was that officers joined the FTP as a result of three things: belief in the goal of training rookies, incentives, and a combination of the prior two reasons. During the interviews, several key ideas emerged regarding why officers became FTOs or, even if they did not volunteer, why they would do it again. The commonality between all the responses was helping the rookies regardless of any incentives. The same words kept cropping up: “help the rookies,” “the right thing to do even with a really poor framework,” “I have a great time doing it,” “incentives would be nice, sure.” Furthermore, one interviewee stated that having “productive coworkers was obviously a benefit as well.”

Practically, this finding implies that the Department can have a successful program because many FTOs believe in the mission of training the rookies correctly and are willing to do so even without being awarded. It would behoove the Department officials to take note of this finding for further improvement of the FTP.

Finding 3

The third notable finding in relation to Research Question 2 was that many FTOs did not have a field training sergeant. Clearly, officers were becoming FTOs without their nonexistent field training sergeant permission as there was no sergeant to give permission.

This finding contradicts Hartman (1979), who stated that, as the frontline supervisor, FTO sergeants must have a say on who joins the program as an FTO. When asking the FTOs if they felt their field training sergeant was qualified, several interviewees stated that they never

had a field training sergeant, or they did, but the sergeant either left or got promoted and was not replaced. R2 shared that he never had a field training sergeant for the entire 2 years that he served as an FTO. R3 said he had not had a field training sergeant for a year or more. Other respondents made statements like “he doesn’t like new people,” “for the first few years we didn’t have one,” or “we never had one.” Several FTOs shared that they always had a field training sergeant, and they thought their field training sergeant was qualified. Of 49 respondents, 20 FTOs (40.8%) said their field training sergeant was qualified, 10 FTOs (20.4%) said their sergeant was not qualified, and 19 FTOs (38.7%) responded unknown or undecided. The FTOs’ and the field training sergeants’ roles are intertwined, and it would benefit the Department to ensure that who becomes an FTO should only do so with the knowledge and permission of the FTO Sergeant.

Findings Relevant to This Study

Award Rate of Training, Transfers, and Promotional Incentives

Training. The Department’s memo establishing the FTP incentives stated, “FTOs who are not already qualified will receive Department training related to patrol functions” (see Appendix F). The Department initially offered seven pieces of training to the FTOs, with one additional training, Auto Crimes Training, added about a year later for a total of eight training options. When asked about the initial seven training options, all of the 49 respondents shared that they did not participate in the Truck Enforcement Training and Bicycle Training. Out of the remaining six pieces of training, four FTOs (8.1%) participated in the Field Testing of Marijuana training, two FTOs (4.8%) participated in the Stationary Radar training, one FTO (2.4%) participated in the Methods of Instructions training, and three FTOs (6.12%) participated in the Criminal Investigative Course. Nineteen FTOs (38.7%) were unaware of these training options,

and 19 FTOs (38.7%) had received some of these pieces of training prior to entering the FTO program but had not participated in any training since becoming an FTO.

Over 77% of FTOs were either unaware of incentives or did not receive any incentives, making the 20% incentive award rate not look so bad. Of the FTOs who were interviewed, just 2.16% received supposedly mandatory training to be given to all FTOs.

Auto Crime Training was added about a year after the FTP started as an incentive for the FTOs. The Chief of Department issued a memo on November 3, 2015, stating that eight slots per month would be set aside for FTOs. The only caveat was that the FTOs were required to attend the FTO training before attending the Auto Crime Training. However, the current study results indicated that 30 FTOs (61.2%) did not attend the FTO training prior to working as an FTO and that the average time spent working as an FTO prior to being sent to the FTO training was 22 months; thus, it appears unlikely that FTOs would have received the prerequisite, making it impossible for them to participate in the Auto Crime Training.

Of the 49 FTOs, 10 (20.4%) had received the Auto Crime Training, and 18 FTOs (36.7%) had not. Twenty-one FTOs (42.8%) were unaware of this incentive. This finding implies a disconnect between the Department management and the frontline supervisors charged with implementing the policies of the FTP.

Transfers. The Department also offered transfers as an incentive for FTOs. After four classes of mentorship (2 years), FTOs are eligible for assignment to the precinct of their choice as soon as a position is open in that precinct.

Of the 49 respondents, only 15 FTOs (30.6%) were eligible for this incentive, and 26 FTOs (53.6%) were unaware of this incentive. Eight FTOs (16.3%) were not eligible for this incentive because they had not been an FTO for 2 years at the time of the study. Six FTOs

(12.2%) did not request this incentive while eligible, presumably because they did not want to transfer and were content to remain at their current precinct. Five FTOs (10.2%) were eligible and did request a transfer, two of the five FTOs who requested the transfer were transferred, and three out of the five who requested the transfer did not end up being transferred.

From the FTOs who were transferred, the average time from requesting the transfer and being transferred was 12 months, with a low of 1 month and a high of 24 months. From the FTOs who requested and did not receive a transfer, the average time since the application was submitted was 19 months, with a low of 9 months and a high of 24 months.

Some eligible officers did not request a transfer, which could mean that this incentive was not a desired one and should be reexamined via a focus group with the FTOs. Additionally, it does not instill confidence in the system when FTOs are eligible, request the transfers, wait over 2 years, and are still not transferred.

Promotion to Detective. Thirty-nine respondents (79.59%) said they did not know anyone who was promoted to detective due to the FTP, and only 10 respondents (20.4%) knew someone who had been promoted to a detective rank as a result of the FTP. Of the 49 respondents, only two respondents (4.08%) stated they had been promoted to a detective rank as a result of the FTP.

The data indicated that a small number of minor incentives, such as training, were awarded; however, promotion incentives, such as promotion to detective, were not awarded. A possible explanation for this could be the monetary aspect of the salary increase from police officer to detective. Further research is needed on this issue.

Discussion

Policing is more of an art than a science (Bayle & Bittner, 1984), so it can be challenging to pinpoint precisely how the Departments' values and culture are expected to be transmitted via the FTOs rookies. Prior literature indicates that police academy graduates do not internalize police department values (Conti & Nolan, 2013). Additionally, rookies who experience a conflict between what they learned in the academy and how they are being trained on the streets by the FTOs can lead to over 88% of rookies experiencing stress, which is counterproductive (Haarr, 2005). FTPs were designed to be a bridge between the academy and the real world to solidify the transmission of police department values to rookie officers (Chappell, 2007; Van Maanen, 1973)

Incentives are a common practice associated with training programs, particularly those programs that require a more skilled or seasoned professional to assist and scaffold another individual who is new to the profession. Prior literature on incentives does support the concept of organizational incentives to improve a company through behavioral changes of the employees (Dermol & Cater, 2013). For example, Condly et al. (2003) found that incentives resulted in over a 20% increase in workers' performance and that "money was found to result in higher performance gains than non-monetary, tangible incentives" (p. 46). Financial incentives are "effective; they improve performance quantity, they improve performance quality" (Shaw & Gupta, 2015, p. 289).

At the same time, some researchers have found that incentives can have a detrimental effect. For example, Kuvaas et al. (2017) argued that "contingent tangible incentives" (p. 244) are a form of coercive control. Kuvaas et al. found that employees will come to neglect the rewarded tasks and ignore the tasks that are not rewarded. Similarly, Kohn (1993) found that

monetary incentives reduce risk-taking and creativity because the employee who wants the incentive will comply strictly with the regulation to obtain the incentive.

However, there is a gap in the literature when searching for research that examined monetary incentives or nonmonetary incentives in FTPs. Only one study, Johnson and Cheatwood (1992), examined the use of a monetary incentive for FTOs, which ended with the program being terminated. However, the department under research in this study used nonmonetary incentives such as training, possible promotions, and transfers.

Prior literature on police departments mainly focuses on how the rookies in an FTP evaluated their FTOs and vice versa (Doerner et al., 1989) or the relationship between FTOs and their rookies via allegations of misconduct (Getty et al., 2016). Further studies have evaluated the FTOs' characteristics as well as the rookies (Warners, 2010) or how rookies viewed their FTO (Fagan, 1985).

Several studies have examined rates of force between FTOs and non-FTOs (Sun, 2003a) or attitudes held by FTOs compared to non-FTOs regarding their supervisor and the community (Sun, 2002b). In addition, Sun (2003b) examined the proactivity rate between FTOs and non-FTOs. Finally, Doerner and Patterson (1992) examined the role race and gender play in how rookies evaluate their FTOs.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

My first recommendation is for police departments to formulate an incentive program that is more precise and based on gender. In the present study, female FTOs only comprised 18.3% of the FTOs studied. Why more women are not FTOs remains uncertain, and the Department leaders must be aware of this discrepancy to make programmatic shifts with the

recruitment process for the FTP so the FTP can continue to serve the needs of the Department and the overall community. It is recommended the Department establish a focus group of female officers to gather in-depth information about what recruitment efforts or incentives could be more effective in recruiting more female officers into the FTP.

Recommendation 2

My second recommendation is that the Department leaders consult the FTOs when crafting either a new FTP or evaluating the old one. As the officers implementing the FTP, the FTOs are ideally suited to give feedback on the program. New laws, rules, and regulations are constantly being passed, changed, and updated; thus, the enforcers of said laws should also be constantly updated. FTOs can become distracted by the various different issues that police deal with and can overfocus on a specific area. For example, FTOs can end up teaching rookies more technical skills, such as the use of the radio and radio codes, which are easily quantifiable and achievement is more readily revealed (Eisenberg, 1981). The FTOs are the ones who can keep the FTP on track by tracking the inertia of the program and focusing on specific skill sets that rookies may be lacking.

Recommendation 3

My third recommendation is that the Department requires and ensure that all FTOs attend the FTO training prior to acting or becoming an FTO. Moreover, the FTO training must be competent; unqualified officers should not be training rookies. Warners (2010) conducted research on FTOs and found that over half of the FTOs studied reported being in some state of unreadiness. Regardless of whether the FTO participated in FTO training, police departments must have a mechanism to ensure that the training has been internalized. One possibility would

be for FTOs to participate in quarterly refresher training or focus groups to address new laws, rules, and regulations and any items that may be a concern to the FTOs.

Recommendation 4

My fourth recommendation is that all FTOs be evaluated prior to entering the FTP and periodically afterward to ensure the rookies receive training from the best qualified FTO. Mandatory screening processes help ensure that the most qualified officers become FTOs (Meehan, 2001). An FTO's primary role is to train the rookie. At the extreme, FTOs can recommend the rookie for termination if the rookie is not suitable for police work; thus, who the FTO is and whether or not they are qualified is a critical component of the FTP. Oettmeier (1982) stated that violations of laws, rules, and regulations of the police department or behavior that has been addressed and not corrected could all justify a rookie's termination. Therefore, it is critical that the FTOs are (a) qualified and knowledgeable of the laws, rules, and regulations to make that decision, and (b) periodically reviewed to ensure the FTO remains qualified and interested in remaining in the FTP.

Recommendation 5

My fifth recommendation is that FTPs only include police officers who want to be FTOs rather than drafting officers into the program. The quality of the FTOs matters a great deal to the future of policing. FTOs can be mission-critical for a police department looking to "change police culture and redefine the goals of policing" (Sun, 2003a, p. 275). Hartman (1979) stated very clearly that negative repercussions would follow if an officer is selected unwillingly to be an FTO. An FTO must want to serve and do so willingly and have the proper experience on the job (Hartman, 1979).

Recommendation 6

My sixth recommendation is that the police department ensures that FTOs have a field training sergeant without exception. The present study results indicated significant gaps in the Department where some FTOs had never had a field training sergeant, had not had a sergeant in years or thought their sergeant was unsuited for their position. Of the 49 respondents, 20 of them (40.8%) thought their sergeant was qualified for their position. Ten respondents (20.4%) said that their sergeant was not qualified for their position, and 19 respondents (38.7%) were undecided. Recall that during the interviews, several interviewees stated that they either (a) never had a field training sergeant or (b) had a sergeant, but when the sergeant either retired or transferred, the position went unfilled for years.

As the frontline supervisor, the sergeant is the first stop for a rookie or an FTO. Sergeants' role in the police department ranges from making assignments to disciplining a wayward officer; the sergeant is the essential supervisor (Muir, 1977). Additionally, the sergeant is the supervisor whom the FTOs are in contact with the most. Due to the nature of the FTP, FTOs are expected to have a closer relationship with the sergeant (Sun, 2003a).

FTOs have to conduct evaluations on each rookie they train, which could be several a month and deal with any issues that come up that need to be addressed immediately. For example, if a rookie is caught committing an illegal act or sleeping on the job, the FTOs would be expected to notify the sergeant right away rather than wait for the next evaluation period. Police officers are given a gun and the power to make arrests; thus, a field training sergeant must be available at all times.

Recommendation 7

My seventh recommendation is that the Department ensures that the FTOs' recommendations regarding the rookies are handled appropriately. In the current study, one of the respondents stated that he never recommended anyone for termination because he did not think the Department would listen. Fagan (1985) studied an FTP where rookies were always trained by multiple FTOs. Fagan found that if the first two FTOs recommended termination for the rookie, the department would "follow their recommendation" (p. 144). What is the point in having an FTO who thinks their recommendations will not be followed? What does that say about how the department views their FTOs and the FTP?

Recommendation 8

My eighth recommendation is that the police department ensures that the incentives are awarded in a timely fashion to the appropriate FTOs. Despite the poor framework of the Department's FTP, many of the study respondents—even officers who did not get any incentives or who did not volunteer to be an FTO—said they would be an FTO again because they thought helping rookies was the right thing to do. The Department absolutely needs to give out the incentives to encourage officers to apply to enter the FTP. However, the Department must also ensure only the most qualified officers are selected and encourage FTOs to remain in the program. An added benefit to giving out the incentives is that other officers will see incentives being awarded, which may encourage them to apply to the FTP.

Recommendation 9

My ninth recommendation is that the field training sergeant has the authority, ability, and knowledge to schedule FTOs for training and oversee the incentives process. The position of field training sergeant was not created until May 4, 2017, over 2 years after the FTP started. Prior

to the institution of field training sergeants, rookies were supervised by the regular sergeants in coordination with the training sergeant, who was responsible for coordinating with the Department management. This diffusion of responsibility may have been the cause of the lackadaisical method in which many of the incentives were awarded.

Limitations

As with all research, this study's limitations are constrained in generalizability and applicability to the field of policing as a whole. I researched one specific department; thus, the results may not be generalizable. The sample size of $n = 49$ may also be too small to apply to any other department. This field of research may benefit from a more extensive study with multiple departments. Additionally, the cultural and geographic differences between departments may require further research. Training methods within each department may also play a role in evaluating other FTPs.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research has contributed to the body of literature in policing. I used summative data in that the data on training and participation in the FTP were already gathered. Future researchers may want to try and gather formative data because FTOs and rookies work together on a daily and weekly basis. Formative data may serve as a way to monitor unique training programs that use a mentor–mentee framework.

Future Research Recommendation 1

My first research recommendation is that researchers repeat this study with the permission of the Department. This study was done without a letter of support from the Department; therefore, the exact population of FTOs remains unknown, which can affect the

results. Also, some FTOs may have chosen not to participate in the anonymous survey for fear of reprisal.

Additionally, I was unable to fully explore some of the issues that arose during this study. Some FTOs were awarded incentives that were not department-issued. For example, some respondents stated they were allowed to take an extra week's vacation, but vacation was not an official incentive. A repeat study will allow for most, if not all, participants to provide feedback in real-time, allowing for a better analysis of the data. A repeat study may also reveal issues that did not come to light in this study.

Future Research Recommendation 2

My second research recommendation is that a separate simultaneous study examining the rookies' perspectives of their FTOs be conducted. The Department's FTP was a 6-month program, with the rookies rotating every 2 months into a different tour and schedule. The Department has three main tours: 7 a.m.–3 p.m., 3 p.m.–11 p.m., and 11 p.m.–7 a.m. Doerner and Patterson (1992) examined an FTP where rookies anonymously evaluated their FTOs at the end of each of the four phases. The rookies were asked to provide feedback on a wide variety of FTO characteristics, ranging from the level of interest displayed in teaching to the FTO's knowledge of the job. The FTO supervisor then reviewed the rookies' evaluations, discussed any issues with the FTO, and issued the FTO's personal evaluation.

It is imperative that the FTOs who are training the next generation of police officers be exemplary. A supervisor may view the FTO in a complementary manner; however, the rookies' perspectives may shed light on parts of the FTO's training methodology or personality that the supervisor is unaware of.

Future Research Recommendation 3

My third research recommendation is there should be a study conducted to determine a baseline of what constitutes a qualified officer and to examine if the incentives are attracting those officers. This will allow the Department to determine if the incentives currently offered are substantial enough to attract qualified officers to become FTOs.

Conclusion

After reviewing the literature, it was evident that there was a gap in the literature surrounding FTPs in policing, especially FTPs that use any sort of incentive-based method to attract FTOs. I conducted a program evaluation of an FTP using a multipronged approach. First, I distributed a quantitative-based survey to examine if the FTP was implemented with fidelity. Second, I conducted a semistructured interview with eight FTOs to gain a deeper understanding of the failures of the program and its implementation.

I used statistical tests to analyze the dataset. The data clearly indicated that the FTP was not implemented with fidelity whatsoever, and four significant findings emerged from this study. I made nine significant recommendations for improvement of the FTP and two suggestions for future research, which may help inform how this topic may continue to evolve.

This study is not meant as a condemnation of the Department's FTP. Generally speaking, new programs are notoriously difficult to implement. The findings and recommendations were only meant to advise police departments on how to improve the FTP because improvement is sorely needed.

References

- Balfour, D. L., & Wechsler, B. (1991). Commitment, performance, and productivity in public organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14(4), 355–367.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3380952>
- Banks, D., Hendrix, J., Hickman, M., & Kyckelhahn, T. (2016). *National sources of law enforcement employment data* (NCJ No. 249681). Bureau of Justice Statistics.
<https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/nslead.pdf>
- Baro, A. L., & Burlingame, D. (1999). Law enforcement and higher education: Is there an impasse? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 10(1), 57–73.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511259900084451>
- Bartol, C. R. (1991). Predictive validation of the MMPI for small-town police officers who fail. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 22, 127–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.22.2.127>
- Bayley, D. H., & Bittner, E. (1984). Learning the skills of policing. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 47(4), 35–59. <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3779&context=lcp>
- Beaver, R. W. (2006). Field training issues for administrators. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 75(9), 11–24
- Bennett, R. R. (1984). Becoming blue: A longitudinal study of police recruit occupational socialization. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 12(1), 47–58.
- Berg, B., & Budnick, K. J. (1986). Defeminization of women in law enforcement: A new twist in the traditional police personality. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*, 14(4), 314–319.

- Bergman, B. (2017). Reflexivity in police education: Voices of Swedish police officers on field training of probationers. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Policing*, 4(1), 68–88.
- Berlin, M. (2013). An overview of police training in the United States, historical development, current trends and critical issues: The evidence. In P. Stanislas (Ed.), *International perspectives on police education and training* (pp. 23–41). Routledge.
- Birzer, M. (2003). The theory of andragogy applied to police training. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(1), 29–42.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639510310460288>
- Bradford, D., & Pynes, J. (1999). Police academy training: Why hasn't it kept up with practice? *Police Quarterly*, 2(3), 283–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F109861119900200302>
- Brand, R. F., & Peak, K. (1995). Assessing police training curricula: Consumer reports. *The Justice Professional*, 9(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.1995.10383048>
- Caro, C. (2011). Predicting state police officer performance in the field training officer program: What can we learn from the cadet's performance in the training academy? *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(4), 357–370.
- Chapman, C. (2012). Use of force in minority communities is related to police education, age, experience, and ethnicity. *Police Practice and Research*, 13(5), 421–436.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2011.596711>
- Chappell, A. T. (2007). Community policing: Is field training the missing link? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 30(3), 498–517.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510710778868>

- Chappell, A. T. (2008). Police academy training: Comparing across curricula. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(1), 36–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510810852567>
- Chappell, A. T., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2010). Police academy socialization: Understanding the lessons learned in a paramilitary–bureaucratic organization. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 39(2), 187–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241609342230>
- Condly, S. J., Clark, R. E., & Stolovitch, H. D. (2003). The effects of incentives on workplace performance: A meta-analytic review of research studies. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 16(3), 46–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.2003.tb00287.x>
- Connor, G. (2000). FTO: “Fundamental” training officer. *Law & Order*, 48, 27–28.
- Conti, N., & Nolan III, J. J. (2005). Policing the platonic cave: Ethics and efficacy in police training. *Policing & Society*, 15(2), 166–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460500071705>
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Mixed methods research design*. Sage.
- Dermol, V., & Cater, T. (2013). The influence of training and training transfer factors on organisational learning and performance. *Personnel Review*, 42(3), 324–348.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481311320435>
- Detrick, P., & Chibnall, J. T. (2006). NEO PI-R personality characteristics of high-performing entry-level police officers. *Psychological Services*, 3(4), 274–285.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1541-1559.3.4.274>
- Doerner, W. G., Speir, J. C., & Wright, B. S. (1989). An analysis of rater–ratee race and sex influences upon field training officer program evaluations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 17, 103–114.

- Doerner, W. G., & Hunter, R. D. (2006). Post-FTO performance evaluations of rookie police officers. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 4(1–2), 113–128.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J222v04n01_05
- Doerner, W., & Patterson, E. (1992). The influence of race and gender upon rookie evaluations of their field training officers. *American Journal of Police*, 11(2), 23–36.
- Douglas, S., & Meijer, A. (2016). Transparency and public value—Analyzing the transparency practices and value creation of public utilities. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(12), 940–951. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1064133>
- Dubnick, M. (2003). Accountability and ethics: Reconsidering the relationships. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 6(3), 405–441.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-06-03-2003-B002>
- Edwards, B. D. (2019). Perceived value of higher education among police officers: Comparing county and municipal officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 30(4), 606–620.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2019.1621360>
- Eisenberg, T. (1981). Six potential hazards inherent in developing and implementing field training officer (FTO) programs. *Police Chief Magazine*, 48, 50–51.
- Engelson, W. (1999). The organizational values of law enforcement agencies: The impact of field training officers in the socialization of police recruits to law enforcement organizations. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 14(2), 11–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02830064>
- Fagan, M. M. (1985). How police officers perceive their field training officer. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*, 13(2), 138–152.

- Fagan, M., & Ayers, K. (1985). Professors of the street - Police mentors. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 54(1), 8–13.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage.
- Ford, R. (2003). Saying one thing, meaning another: The role of parables in police training. *Police Quarterly*, 6(1), 84–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098611102250903>
- Fyfe, J. J. (1979). Administrative interventions on police shooting discretion – An empirical examination. *Journal of Crime Justice*, 7(4), 309–323. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(79\)90065-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(79)90065-5)
- Garcia, V. (2003). “Difference” in the police department: Women, policing, and “doing gender.” *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19(3), 330–344.
- Germann, A. C. (1969). Community policing: An assessment. *Journal of Criminal Law and Police Science*, 60, 89–96.
- Getty, R., Worrall, J., & Morris, R. (2016). How far from the tree does the apple fall? Field training officers, their trainees, and allegations of misconduct. *Crime & Delinquency*, 62(6), 821–839. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0011128714545829>
- Gibbs, J. (2016, October 18). *Meaning of police legitimacy differs among groups*. Pennsylvania State Data Center. https://pasdc.hbg.psu.edu/sdc/pasdc_files/researchbriefs/PoliceLegitimacy_RB_2016.pdf
- Glomseth, R., Gottschalk, P., & Solli-Sæther, H. (2007). Occupational culture as determinant of knowledge sharing and performance in police investigations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 35(2), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsl.2007.03.003>
- Goldstein, H. (1997). *Policing a free society*. Ballinger.

- Haarr, R. (2005). Factors affecting the decision of police recruits to “drop out” of police work. *Police Quarterly*, 8(4), 431–453.
- Haarr, R. N. (2001). The making of a community policing officer: The impact of basic training and occupational socialization on police recruits. *Police Quarterly*, 4(4), 402–33.
- Hartman, T. L. (1979). Field training officer (FTO): The Fairfax County experience. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 48(4), 22–25.
- Henson, B., Reyns, B., Klahm, C., & Frank, J. (2010). Do good recruits make good cops? Problems predicting and measuring academy and street-level success. *Police Quarterly*, 13(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098611109357320>
- Ivkovic, S. K. (2003). To serve and collect: Measuring police corruption. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 93(2), 593–650. <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7125&context=jclc>
- Johnson, R., & Cheatwood, D. (1992). Do monetary incentives in a field training program build morale. *The Police Chief*, 59(11), 35–36.
- Kaminsky, G. (2000). *The field training concept in criminal justice agencies*. Prentice-Hall.
- Kaur, H., & Chavez, N. (2020, June 5). *What we know about the four ex-police officers charged in George Floyd’s death*. CNN. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/05/us/minneapolis-officers-background-george-floyd-trnd/index.html>
- Kelling, G., & Moore, M. (1989). *The evolving strategy of policing*. U.S. Department of Justice and the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- King, W. R., & Lab, S. P. (2000). Crime prevention, community policing, and training: Old wine in new bottles? *Police Practice and Research*, 1(2), 241–252.

Kohn, A. (1993). Why incentive plans cannot work. *Harvard Business Review*.

<https://hbr.org/1993/09/why-incentive-plans-cannot-work>

Kroll, A., & Moynihan, D. P. (2018). The design and practice of integrating evidence:

Connecting performance management with program evaluation. *Public Administration Review*, 78(2), 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12865>

Kuvaas, B., Buch, R., Weibel, A., Dysvik, A., & Nerstad, C. G. L. (2017). Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 61, 244–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.05.004>

Lewis, W. (2015). *Developing and implementing a field training officer program*. Fire Engineering. <https://www.fireengineering.com/firefighting/developing-and-implementing-a-field-training-officer-program/#gref>

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Lyons, W. (2010). *The politics of community policing*. University of Michigan Press.

Marion, N. (1998). Police academy training: Are we teaching recruits what they need to know? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 21(1), 54-79.

Mastrofski, S. D., & Ritti, R. R. (1996). Police training and the effects of organizations on drunk driving enforcement. *Justice Quarterly*, 13(2), 291–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829600092951>

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A systematic review of the research evidence. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9(3), 245–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-013-9175-2>

- McC Campbell, M. S. (1987). *Field training for police officers: The state of the art*. National Institute of Justice. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/105574.pdf>
- McElvain, J. P., & Kposowa, A. J. (2008). Police officer characteristics and the likelihood of using deadly force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 505-521
- Meehan, M. (2001). Performance evaluations of field training officers. *Police Chief*, 68(11), 25-31
- Morehouse, T. (1972). Program evaluation: Social research versus public policy. *Public Administration Review*, 32(6), 868–874. <https://doi.org/10.2307/974647>
- Muir, W. K. (1977). *Police: Street corner politicians*. University of Chicago Press.
- Oettmeier, T. N. (1982). Justifying FTO (field training and evaluation program) terminations. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 10(1), 64-73.
- Oliva, J., & Compton, M. (2010). What do police officers' value in the classroom? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(2), 321–338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011044911>
- Paoline, E., III, & Terrill, W. (2007). Police education, experience, and the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(2), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806290239>
- Piotrowski, S. J., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2007). Citizen attitudes toward transparency in local government. *American Review of Public Administration*, 37(3), 306–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074006296777>
- Police Executive Research Forum. (2001). *A problem-based learning manual for training and evaluating police trainees*. https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/pto_overview_introduction.pdf

- Prenzler, T., & Sinclair, G. (2013). The status of women police officers: An international review. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 41(2), 115–131.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2012.12.001>
- Reno Police Department. (2004). *Reno Police Department's Police Training Officer Program: Basic manual*. https://www.renospd.com/formAdmin/content/pdfs_lib/PTO_2_0_Manual.pdf
- Rydberg, J., & Terrill, W. (2010). The effect of higher education on police behavior. *Police Quarterly*, 13(1), 92–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109357325>
- Scott, J. (2010). Survey: The status of field training. *The Police Chief*, 77(11).
- Shaw, J. D., & Gupta, N. (2015). Let the evidence speak again! Financial incentives are more effective than we thought. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 281–293
- Skolnick, J. H. (1993). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in a democratic society* (3rd ed.). Macmillan.
- Smith, S. M., & Aamodt, M. G. (1997). The relationship between education, experience, and police performance. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 12, 7-14
- Smith, B. W. (2006). Ethno-racial political transition and citizen satisfaction with police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 28(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510510597889>
- Sun, I. (2002a). Field training officer evaluations of executives: Evidence from two police departments. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, 2(4), 107–118.
<https://www.iletsbeiforumjournal.com/images/Issues/FreeIssues/ILEEF%202002-2.4.pdf>

- Sun, I. (2002b). Police officer attitudes toward peers, supervisors, and citizens: A comparison between field training officers and regular officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02898971>
- Sun, I. (2003a). Officer proactivity: A comparison between police field training officers and non-field training officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(3), 265–277. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(03\)00007-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00007-2)
- Sun, I. (2003b). A comparison of police field training officers and nontraining officers' conflict resolution styles: Controlling versus supportive strategies. *Police Quarterly*, 6(1), 22–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098611102250573>
- Sward, S., & Wallace, B. (1996, July 31). Bad records taint San Francisco's cop trainers: Dozens have been sued, disciplined for force. *SF Gate*. <https://www.sfgate.com/news/article/PAGE-ONE-Bad-Records-Taint-S-F-s-Cop-Trainers-2973111.php>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2003, September). *Principles of good policing: Avoiding violence between police and citizens*. U.S. Department of Justice. <http://www.justice.gov/archive/crs/pubs/principlesofgoodpolicingfinal 092003.pdf>
- Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization*, 32, 407–418.
- Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (2002). *The police in America: An introduction* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Walker, S., & Katz, C.M. (2013). *The police in America: An introduction* (8th ed.) McGraw-Hill.
- Warners, R. H. (2010, November). The field training experience: Perspectives of field training officers and trainees. *The Police Chief*, 76(11), 58–64.

White, M. (2008). Identifying good cops early: Predicting recruit performance in the academy.

Police Quarterly, 11(1), 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098611107309625>

Wood, N., & Sereni-Massinger, C. (2016). Linking educational institutions with police officers

training programs. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(2), 139–146.

<https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v10i2.3443>

Wright, B. S., Doerner, W. G., & Speir, J. C. (1990). Pre-employment psychological testing as a

predictor of police performance during an FTO program. *American Journal of Police*,

9(4), 65–84.

Appendix A: Chief of Department Memo

Report Under
OCD#1-0375-17

March 2, 2017

From: Chief of Department
To: Chief of Patrol
Chief of Housing
Chief of Transit
Subject: **FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM**

1. In order to improve the overall training of Probationary Police Officers (PPOs) and continue their training into the post academy months, the **Field Training Program** was developed. The goal of the Field Training Program is to acclimate the PPO to understanding basic precinct and patrol functions. The program is designed to foster opportunities to improve the communication, cooperation and collaboration among PPOs and officers to address community concerns and enhance the safety and security of the community. Operations Order 8, series 2015, provides a more detailed procedure concerning the Field Training Program.

The following details are being provided to clarify the overall understanding of this program:

- I. **Field Training Officer (FTO):** Qualified Police Officers selected to provide guidance, instruction and mentorship to Probationary Police Officers upon their assignment to a precinct/police service area/transit district.
 - a. The FTO (1) and PPOs (2) will be assigned to an RMP. They should be assigned as a Training Auto, Sector Car or Response Auto (NCO Commands)
 - b. Two-day training will continue to be conducted at the Police Academy for all FTOs familiarizing them with the Program and its goals.
- II. **Alternate FTO:** Will carry out the duties and responsibilities of FTO when FTO becomes unavailable.

Note: Same criteria used to select the FTO will be used to select the Alternate.
- III. **Community Partner:** Volunteers who facilitate and nurture relationships between Probationary Police Officers and members of the community that they are serving.
 - a. Each Community Partner should be provided opportunities to meet with PPOs at least once a month, or more frequently as command conditions warrant.
- IV. **Precinct Executive Officer:** Precinct Executive Officers will oversee the Program and address any issues that arise. They will also ensure that the program is being conducted properly.
- V. **Field Training Sergeant:** A uniformed member of the service in the rank of sergeant assigned by the command, where there is a minimum of four field training officers and eight probationary police officers.

2. The below listed guidelines **will be followed** while officers are assigned as FTOs and PPOs in the Field Training Program:

- The primary assignment for the PPOs should be RMP patrol as a training auto, sector or response auto (NCO commands) with their FTO.
- The FTO will work with the same two PPOs during their 60 period:
 - Assist the PPOs when an arrest is made
 - Review any summonses written and instruct the PPOs on any deficiencies
 - Review reports taken and instruct PPOs on proper documentation
 - When handling jobs, the FTO should discuss proper tactics prior to responding and review tactics after the job is completed

3. When the FTO or designated alternate is unavailable the PPOs may be assigned as follows:

- Lieutenant and/or Sergeants Operator
- Telephone Switchboard Operator
- Cell Attendant
- Stationhouse Security, **WITH** a Senior Officer (two person post)
- Foot Post, **WITH** a Senior Officer (two person post)
- Assist Domestic Violence Officer
 - a. When assigned to Precinct Domestic Violence personnel, PPOs will learn how to make contact with complainants i.e., telephone calls, home visits or interviews at the command, conferrals with precinct detective squad and special victims units prior to conducting home visits. PPOs will review safety tips and tactics associated with Domestic Violence home visits/ 911 calls for help. PPOs will learn how to properly serve and file orders of protection.
- Patrol with Neighborhood Coordination Officer (NCO), PPOs will learn sector integrity, community engagement, identify crime and quality of life problems and address sector conditions.
 - a. In compliance with Operations Order 25, series 2015, "Neighborhood Based Policing", which requires NCOs and steady sector cars to be permanently assigned to a steady sector, all NCO-based commands are permitted to assign four (4) officers to a steady sector or NCO (i.e. the NCO, his/her partner, and two PPOs or FTO/Steady Sector, his/her partner, and two PPOs).

❖ PPOs **Will Not** be assigned to a **solo foot post**

Note: For the purpose of this memo a uniformed member of the service will be considered "**Senior**" upon successfully completing probationary period (more than 2 years of service), supervisors should also consider the Officers reputation, work ethic, attendance record and knowledge of department rules and regulations.

4. Probationary Police Officers will work with Traffic Safety Officers for a minimum of 5 tours and learn how to engage the community while conducting traffic safety car stops and become familiarized with Vision Zero plan of action. PPOs will become aware of Traffic Safety bulletins and issues summonses when appropriate. Traffic Safety Officers will expose PPOs to TVB hearings and assist those PPOs with the development of proper testimony techniques.

5. During the Field Training Program, it is important to introduce the PPOs to various aspects of community interaction with the Department. During field training, the PPOs, along with their FTO, will:

- Meet with school principals and school safety agents
- Observe "Operation ID" efforts and seminars conducted to educate the community regarding theft of electronics
- Conduct Crime Prevention surveys with the Crime Prevention Officer
- Attend community events (i.e. breakfasts, fundraisers) to become familiar with the residents of the command
- Meet with Community Boards
- Meet with Elected Officials, Clergy, etc.
- Attend Business Improvement District (BID) meetings
- Attend community events (i.e. National Night Out, festivals, council meetings, Civic Association Meetings)
- Be introduced to any other community organization at the Commanding Officer's discretion (i.e. Community Partners)

6. Upon successful completion of the Field Training program, the following will be complied with to continue the necessary oversight and ensure probationary police officers have proper guidance.

- PPOs **Will Not** be assigned to a **solo foot post**.
- PPOs **Will Not** be assigned to a foot post with an Officer which has less than **18 months** of service.
- PPOs **Will Not** be assigned to RMP patrol with an Officer which has less than **18 months** of service.
- Probationary Police Officers may be assigned to Hospitalized Prisoners.

Note: Only those that have successfully completed the field training program.

7. Patrol Borough Commanders and Precinct Commanding Officers will be held strictly accountable for ensuring that the guidelines are being followed and that all Precinct Supervisors are aware of and understand these guidelines. The Patrol Services Bureau will be conducting periodic inspections of commands to ensure full compliance. Any issues or deficiencies noted will be addressed during the next appropriate Comstat meeting.

of C

ie Office

9. **FOR YOUR INFORMATION.**

Appendix B: Operations Order 8

OPERATIONS ORDER

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM	
DATE ISSUED:	NUMBER:
01-28-15	8

1. The Department's Field Training Program was initiated to support the development of probationary police officers as they transition from their academic and tactical training to their field assignments. The program is designed to foster opportunities to improve the communication, cooperation and collaboration necessary to effectively address community concerns and enhance the safety and security of the community.

2. Therefore, effective immediately, to ensure probationary police officers receive comprehensive field training, the following procedure will be complied with:

PURPOSE To provide probationary police officers with a well-rounded field training program consisting of crime-prevention strategies and community partnership.

DEFINITIONS PROBATIONARY POLICE OFFICER (PPO) – Entry-level police officers serving a probationary period of not less than two years. The probationary period may be extended an additional six months, if necessary, to allow time for further review and evaluation of a probationer's suitability as a police officer.

FIELD TRAINING OFFICER (FTO) – Qualified police officers selected to provide guidance, instruction, and mentorship to probationary police officers upon their assignment to a precinct/police service area/transit district.

COMMUNITY PARTNER – Members of the community who have volunteered to facilitate and nurture relationships between probationary police officers and members of the community that they are serving. These partners include clergy, community leaders and representatives from businesses, non-profit groups, cultural institutions and neighborhood associations.

PROCEDURE When a probationary police officer graduates from the Police Academy and is assigned to a precinct/police service area/transit district:

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

1. Manage the field training program within the precinct/police service area/transit district.
2. Confer with community partners regarding opportunities to foster and maintain relationships with probationary police officers on a regular basis.
 - a. Community partners should be provided with opportunities to meet with probationary police officers at least once a month, or more frequently as command conditions warrant (on the second and third platoons only) to:
 - (1) Introduce probationary police officers and field training officers to community leaders

OPERATIONS ORDER

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM	
DATE ISSUED:	NUMBER:
01-28-15	8

1. The Department's Field Training Program was initiated to support the development of probationary police officers as they transition from their academic and tactical training to their field assignments. The program is designed to foster opportunities to improve the communication, cooperation and collaboration necessary to effectively address community concerns and enhance the safety and security of th

2. Therefore, effective immediately, to ensure probationary police officers receive comprehensive field training, the following procedure will be complied with:

PURPOSE To provide probationary police officers with a well-rounded field training program consisting of crime-prevention strategies and community partnership.

DEFINITIONS PROBATIONARY POLICE OFFICER (PPO) – Entry-level police officers serving a probationary period of not less than two years. The probationary period may be extended an additional six months, if necessary, to allow time for further review and evaluation of a probationer's suitability as a police officer.

FIELD TRAINING OFFICER (FTO) – Qualified police officers selected to provide guidance, instruction, and mentorship to probationary police officers upon their assignment to a precinct/police service area/transit district.

COMMUNITY PARTNER – Members of the community who have volunteered to facilitate and nurture relationships between probationary police officers and members of the community that they are serving. These partners include clergy, community leaders and representatives from businesses, non-profit groups, cultural institutions and neighborhood associations.

PROCEDURE When a probationary police officer graduates from the Police Academy and is assigned to a precinct/police service area/transit district:

- EXECUTIVE OFFICER**
1. Manage the field training program within the precinct/police service area/transit district.
 2. Confer with community partners regarding opportunities to foster and maintain relationships with probationary police officers on a regular basis.
 - a. Community partners should be provided with opportunities to meet with probationary police officers at least once a month, or more frequently as command conditions warrant (on the second and third platoons only) to:
 - (1) Introduce probationary police officers and field training officers to community leaders

**SQUAD
SUPERVISOR
(continued)**

15. Ensure probationary police officers are provided with opportunities to foster and maintain relationships with community partners at least once a month (on the second and third platoons only).
16. Prepare an evaluation for each probationary police officer via the Online Evaluation System three times during the field training program.
 - a. An evaluation must be conducted at the completion of 60 days, 120 days and 180 days.
 - b. Confer with the probationary police officers' assigned field training officer before completing the evaluation.
 - c. Utilize the **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation** for the 60-day and 180-day evaluation.

NOTE

If it is determined that a probationary police officer is performing below standards after the first 60-day evaluation period, the probationary police officer will not be placed on performance monitoring. The training sergeant will be consulted with and a remedial program will be developed to address the deficient area(s). If necessary, the training sergeant will contact the Training Bureau and request the probationary police officer be provided with remedial training in the area(s) where he/she is performing below standards.

*If it is determined that a probationary police officer is performing below standards after the 180-day evaluation period, the commanding officer or designee must submit a report on **Typed Letterhead** to Chief of Personnel with all pertinent facts related to the probationary police officer's performance. The report will be forwarded with a copy of the **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation**.*

- d. Utilize the 10-month **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** for the 120-day evaluation.

**PLATOON
COMMANDER**

17. Be responsible for the preparation and review of the **Field Training Program Guideline Checklist**.
 - a. Assess probationary police officer's performance during each training module.
 - b. When warranted, ensure that additional training is provided to achieve minimum standards.

NOTE

The responsibility for preparing the Checklist rests evenly with each of the three platoon commanders.

18. Direct squad supervisor prepare **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation** for the 60-day and 180-day evaluations and the 10-month **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** for the 120-day evaluation for each probationary police officer.
 - a. Review and sign-off on **EVALUATIONS**, as required.

**FIELD
TRAINING
OFFICER/
SQUAD
SUPERVISOR/
PLATOON
COMMANDER**

19. Discuss each interim performance evaluation/probationary **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** with the probationary police officer.

**TRAINING
SERGEANT**

20. Ensure that any identified probationary police officers receive remedial training, when necessary.
a. Contact the Training Bureau and request that the probationary police officer be provided with remedial training in the area(s) where he/she is performing below standards.

**ADDITIONAL
DATA**

OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Probationary police officers will be assigned to each of the three platoons for rotating 60-day periods. Each probationary police officer will be evaluated by their assigned squad supervisor at the conclusion of each 60-day period. The field training officers will remain in their assigned tour throughout the 180-day training period.

The field training officers must be routinely assigned to their field training duties with their respective probationary police officers with exceptions only when compelling Department needs arise.

*The **Field Training Program Guideline Checklist** consists of 12 training modules regarding the duties and responsibilities incumbent upon a police officer. The **Checklist** must be completed by the end of the 180-day field training program.*

The probationary period should be utilized to closely scrutinize the member's performance to assess his or her abilities as a police officer. When a probationary police officer's performance is below standards and less formal measures prove inadequate, supervisors should carefully document the member's performance by utilizing the Minor Violations Log, Command Disciplines, and when appropriate, Charges and Specifications. The probationer will be notified of the observed performance deficiencies and instructed on proper Department procedures. Written documentation that the probationer was instructed and counseled will be maintained in the member's personal folder.

**RELATED
PROCEDURES**

*Evaluation of Probationary Police Officers (P.G. 205-49)
Field Training Incentives (Operations Order 53, series 2014)*

**FORMS AND
REPORTS**

***Field Training Program Guideline Checklist**
Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION*

3. Commanding officers will ensure that the contents of this Order are brought to the attention of members of their commands.

BY DIRECTION OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER

DISTRIBUTION
All Commands

OPERATIONS ORDER NO. 8

Page 5 of 5

Appendix C: Survey Informed Consent and Survey Questions

C1: Informed Consent

Perspectives from Field Training Officers in a large police department in the United States

Q1 Project Title: Perspectives of Field Training Officers within a large Police Department in the United States: Promises Kept or Broken?

Investigator(s): Yale Margolis, Dr. Jeremy Phillips

Informed Consent Statement

Project Overview:

Participation in this research project is voluntary and is being done by Yale Margolis as part of his Doctoral Dissertation to understand the perspectives of the Field Training Program from the Field Training Officers.

Your participation in a survey will take about 5 minutes to complete. There is minimal risk of participation in this survey. Risks can consist of discomfort or anxiety when answering or reflecting on responses. You may withdraw from the survey at any time for any reason. The results may lead to suggestions that can improve upon the existing program, especially the incentives aspect to you as the participant, and this research will allow a better understanding of how the Field Training Program is perceived by the officers who are training the new recruits.

You may ask Yale Margolis any questions to help you understand this study. If you don't want to be a part of this study, it won't affect any services from West Chester University. If you choose to be a part of this study, you have the right to change your mind and withdraw from the

study at any time for any reason. If you would like to take part, West Chester University requires that you click the “I Agree” box indicating that you consent to take part in the survey.

What is the purpose of this study?

To understand the perspectives of the Field Training Program from the perspective of the Field Training Officers.

If you decide to be a part of this study, you will be asked to do the following:

A survey will take about 5 minutes of your time.

Are there any experimental medical treatments?

No

Is there any risk to me?

Possible risks or sources of discomfort include discomfort or anxiety when answering or reflecting on responses. If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw from the survey at any time for any reason.

Is there any benefit to me?

Benefits to you may include: The results may lead to suggestions that can improve upon the existing program, especially the incentives aspect for the Field Training Officers.

How will you protect my privacy?

The session will **not** be recorded. Your records will be private. Only Yale Margolis, Jeremy Phillips, and the IRB will have access to your responses.

Records will be stored on:

Password Protected File/Computer

Email and IP addresses will not be collected as part of the data to protect your anonymity.

Your records will be confidential. Only the researchers listed on this form and the West Chester University of Pennsylvania IRB office will have legal access to any information. Password encrypted file within Qualtrics Password protected file/computer Records will be destroyed after

manuscript development, but no less than three years. Records will be destroyed three years after the study completed

Do I get paid to take part in this study?

No

Who do I contact in case of research-related injury?

For any questions with this study, contact:

Primary Investigator: Yale Margolis at 347-742-5507 or ym900330@wcupa.edu

Faculty Sponsor: Jeremy Phillips at 610-436-2016 or jphillips2@wcupa.edu

What will you do with my Identifiable Information/Biospecimens?

The data will be destroyed three years after the research is completed. If you would like to take part, West Chester University requires that you agree by clicking I agree below.

For any questions about your rights in this research study, contact the ORSP at 610-436-3557.

Q2 By clicking I agree below you are indicating you are at least 18 years old, I have read this consent form and agree to participate in this research study, and either have been or currently am a Field Training Officer. Please print a copy of this page for your records.

☐ I Agree (1)

☐ I do not Agree

C2: Survey Questions

Q3 What is your age?

Q4 What is your gender?

☐ Male (1)

☐ Female (2)

☐ Other (3)

Q5 What is your ethnicity? Please select the one you identify with the most.

☐ White (1)

☐ Black or African American (2)

☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)

☐ Asian (4)

☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)

☐ Hispanic (6)

☐ Other (7)

Q6 How many YEARS in the department do you have?

Q7 Did you volunteer to be a Field Training Officer?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (3)

Q8 Are you currently a Field Training Officer at the time of this survey? If not you will be skipped automatically to the next applicable question.

☐

Yes (1)

☐

No (2)

Skip To: Q10 If Are you currently a Field Training Officer at the time of this survey? If not you will be skipped... = No

Q9 If you are currently a Field Training Officer, for how long have you been a Field Training Officer? Please answer in MONTHS.

Q10 If you are no longer a Field Training Officer, then for how long were you a Field Training Officer? Please answer in MONTHS.

Q11 Did you attend the Field Officer Training before beginning to work as a Field Training Officer?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Skip To: Q13 If Did you attend the Field Officer Training before beginning to work as a Field Training Officer? = Yes

Q12 How long were you working as a Field Training Officer before being sent to the training? Please answer in MONTHS.

Q13 The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship (2 years) before being entitled to some of the incentives that are offered.

If you have completed four classes of mentorship, have you requested a transfer to the Precinct of your choice as stated in Operations Order 53 issued 12-30-2014, Option B.

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

☐ I was unaware of the incentives (3)

☐ I was aware of the incentives but have not yet applied (4)

☐ I have not completed the required 4 classes of mentorship at the time of this survey (5)

Skip To: Q16 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship (2 years) be... = No

Skip To: Q16 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship (2 years) be... = I was unaware of the incentives

Skip To: Q16 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship (2 years) be... = I was aware of the incentives but have not yet applied

Skip To: Q16 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship (2 years) be... = I have not completed the required 4 classes of mentorship at the time of this survey

Q14 If you have requested a transfer to the Precinct of your choice, have you been transferred at the time of this survey?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q15 How long has it been since you submitted the request for a transfer? Please answer in MONTHS.

Q16 The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship before being entitled to some of the incentives that are offered.

If you have completed four classes of mentorship, have you been APPLIED an interview with a

specialized unit of your choice such as ESU, Harbor, Counter-Terrorism, or the Detective Bureau as stated in Operations Order 53 Option C?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ I was unaware of the Incentives (3)
- ☐ I was aware of the incentive but have not yet applied (4)
- ☐ I have not completed the required 4 classes of mentorship at the time of this survey (5)

*Skip To: Q19 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship before being...
= No*

*Skip To: Q19 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship before being...
= I was unaware of the Incentives*

*Skip To: Q19 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship before being...
= I was aware of the incentive but have not yet applied*

*Skip To: Q19 If The Field Training Program Incentives requires completion of 4 classes of mentorship before being...
= I have not completed the required 4 classes of mentorship at the time of this survey*

Q17 If you have applied for an interview, have you been interviewed yet at the time of this survey?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q18 How long has it been since you submitted the request for an interview? Please answer in MONTHS.

Q19 Have you received ANY of the Field Training Program Training Incentives as stated in Operations Order 53 issued 12-30-2014, Option A, listed below AFTER becoming a Field Training Officer? Please select all that apply.

- ☐ Field Testing of Marijuana (1)
 - ☐ Stationery Radar (2)
 - ☐ Two or Three Wheel Scooter Certification (3)
 - ☐ Truck Enforcement (6)
 - ☐ Bicycle Training (7)
 - ☐ Method of Instruction (MOI) (8)
 - ☐ Criminal Investigative Course (CIC) (9)
 - ☐ I was unaware of these incentives (10)
 - ☐ I received some of these training prior to becoming a FTO and none of these trainings after (11)
-

Q20 Have YOU been promoted to Detective Specialist as stated in Operations Order 53 issued 12-30-2014, Option E as a result of becoming a Field Training Officer?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q21 How many people do you know who have been promoted to Detective Specialist as an incentive from the Field Training Program as per Operations Order 53, Option E, issued 12-30-2014? If you do not know anyone please type in 0.

Q22 Did you receive the Auto Crime Divisions four day training course as of the date of this survey which is one of the incentives for the Field Training Program as per Department Directive Serial#19237304, issued 11/03/2015?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

☐ I was unaware that I was eligible for this training (3)

Q23 Were you ever told by a supervisor to allow any officer or a different Field Training Officer to take over the arrest processing due to overtime? As stated in the Department Directive

Serial#26050528, issued 05/08/2017 which authorized overtime as arrest overtime for Field Training Officers as needed to process arrests.

- ☐ Yes another Field Training Officer (3)
 - ☐ Yes a NON Field Training Officer (4)
 - ☐ No (2)
-

Q24

Please select one answer regarding the following statement.

The department management supports the FTO program.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
 - ☐ Agree (2)
 - ☐ Disagree (3)
 - ☐ Strongly Disagree (4)
-

Q25

Please select one answer regarding the following statement.

The department selects qualified Police Officers to serve as Field Training Officers

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
 - ☐ Agree (2)
 - ☐ Disagree (3)
 - ☐ Strongly disagree (4)
-

Q26 Have you made a recommendation listed below for a recruit in the Field Training Program regarding their suitability as a Police Officer?

- ☐ Extended Probation (1)
- ☐ Remedial Training (2)
- ☐ Termination (3)
- ☐ I have not made such a recommendation (4)

Skip To: Q28 If Have you made a recommendation listed below for a recruit in the Field Training Program regarding... = I have not made such a recommendation

Q27 If a recommendation was made, was your recommendation followed?

- ☐ Yes (1)
 - ☐ No (2)
 - ☐ Unknown (3)
-

Q28 Does the department follow the recommendations of the Field Training Officers regarding termination, extended probation or remedial training for the recruits?

Please select one answer.

- ☐ Yes (2)
- ☐ No (3)
- ☐ Unknown (4)

Q29

What percentage of Recruits should not have been hired by the department? Please answer in numerical form. (Choose a number between 0-100). All answers will be understood to be percentages.

Q30 What percentage of Recruits will not be suitable for Police work even after completing the Field Training Program? (Choose a number between 0-100). All answers will be understood to be percentages.

Q31 Do you think your Field Training Sergeant is qualified for his position?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Undecided or Unknown (3)
-

Q32 Do you know if there was a criteria to be selected as a Field Training Officer?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Skip To: Q34 If Do you know if there was a criteria to be selected as a Field Training Officer? = No

Q33 If you knew there was a criteria, do you know what the criteria is?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
-

Q34 Did you become a Field Training Officer for a chance at one of the incentives such as promotion to Detective or transfer?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
-

Q35 Do you think that some officers became Field Training Officer solely for the chance at one of the incentives as previously mentioned?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Maybe (3)
-

Q36 If you had chosen to be a Field Training Officer, after having done so, would you do it again?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Unknown (3)
-

Q37 According to the design of the Field Training Program, Department Memo OCD#1-0375-17, there was supposed to be 1 Field Training Officer and 2 new officers in the RMP responding to jobs..

Was that followed?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
-

Q38 Do you think as a Field Training Officer, responding to jobs with 2 new officers was safe?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Appendix D: Interview Informed Consent

Project Title: Perspectives of Field Training Officers within a large Police Department in the United States

Investigator(s): Yale Margolis; Jeremy Phillips

Project Overview:

Participation in this research project is voluntary and is being done by Yale Margolis as part of his Doctoral Dissertation to understand the perspectives of the Field Training Program from the perspective of the Field Training Officers. Your participation will take about 60 Minutes to complete an interview. There is a minimal risk of discomfort include discomfort or anxiety when answering or reflecting on responses. If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw from the Interview at any time for any reason. There may be some benefits to you which may include results which may lead to suggestions that can improve upon the existing program, especially the incentives aspect for the Field Training Officers. The results may lead to suggestions that can improve upon the existing program and this research will allow a better understanding of how the Field Training Program is perceived by the officers who are training the new recruits.

The research project is being done by Yale Margolis as part of his Doctoral Dissertation to understand the perspectives of the Field Training Program from the perspective of the Field Training Officers. If you would like to take part, West Chester University requires that I give you this informed consent before starting the interview.

You may ask Yale Margolis any questions to help you understand this study. If you don't want to be a part of this study, it won't affect any services from West Chester University. If you choose to be a part of this study, you have the right to change your mind and stop being a part of the study at any time.

1. What is the purpose of this study?

- To understand the perspectives of the Field Training Program from the perspective of the Field Training Officers.

2. If you decide to be a part of this study, you will be asked to do the following:

- X
- X
- X
- X
- Interview
- X
- X
- X
- X
- X

- This study will take 60 Minutes of your time.
- 3. **Are there any experimental medical treatments?**
 - No
- 4. **Is there any risk to me?**
 - Possible risks or sources of discomfort include discomfort or anxiety when answering or reflecting on responses. If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw from the Interview at any time for any reason.
 - If you become upset and wish to speak with someone, you may speak with ORSP 610-436-3557
 - If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw at any time.
- 5. **Is there any benefit to me?**
 - Benefits to you may include the results may lead to suggestions that can improve upon the existing program, especially the incentives aspect for the Field Training Officers.
 - Other benefits may include suggestions that can improve upon the existing program and this research will allow a better understanding of how the Field Training Program is perceived by the officers who are training the new recruits.
- 6. **How will you protect my privacy?**
 - The session will be recorded.
 - Your records will be private. Only Yale Margolis, Jeremy Phillips, and the IRB will have access to your name and responses.
 - Your name will **not** be used in any reports.
 - Records will be stored:
 - Records will be destroyed Three Years After Study Completion
- 7. **Do I get paid to take part in this study?**
 - No
- 8. **Who do I contact in case of research related injury?**
 - For any questions with this study, contact:
 - **Primary Investigator:** Yale Margolis at 347-742-5507 or ym900330@wcupa.edu
 - **Faculty Sponsor:** Jeremy Phillips at 610-436-2016 or jphillips2@wcupa.edu
- 9. **What will you do with my Identifiable Information/Biospecimens?**
 - Not applicable.

For any questions about your rights in this research study, contact the ORSP at 610-436-3557.

Appendix E: Interview Questions

1. Did you volunteer to become a Field Training Officer? If yes, why, and if not, why not.
2. Are you currently an FTO?
3. If not, did you leave the program, or were you removed? Why as a follow up to both responses?
4. How long were you or have been an FTO?
5. Were you trained as an FTO before working as one?
6. If yes, then for how long were you working as an FTO before going to the training?
7. There was an incentive program offered to officers to were FTO. Were you aware of the incentives?
8. If aware of incentives, have you received any since becoming an FTO?
9. If aware and not received any incentives, why or why not?
10. Have you applied for eligible incentives?
11. Did a supervisor ever shift your trainee to a different officer to save overtime, contradicting the program directive?
12. Do you think the Department supports the FTO program?
13. Do you think the Department selects qualified officers to be FTO?
14. Have you ever recommended a rookie for termination? If yes, why, if no, why not?
15. Were your recommendations followed?
16. What percentage of rookies even after the FTO training should be terminated as unsuitable?
17. Do you think the FTO Sergeant overseeing the program in your precinct is qualified for that position?

18. What were the criteria for being selected as an FTO?

19. Would you choose to be an FTO again if given a choice?

Additional follow up questions would be asked for each participant as appropriate.

Appendix F: Operations Order 53

OPERATIONS ORDER

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM INCENTIVES	
DATE ISSUED:	NUMBER:
12-30-14	53

1. The Department's Field Training Program was developed to ensure probationary police officers receive comprehensive field training that will provide continuing guidance, mentoring and instruction upon their graduation from the Police Academy. As part of this program, field training officers (FTOs) are assigned to provide probationary police officers with a well-rounded education consisting of crime prevention strategies and community partnership.

2. In order to attract, motivate and retain qualified FTOs for the Field Training Program, the Department is offering the following incentives to police officers who apply and are selected for the Field Training Program:

- a. Training Opportunities: FTOs who are not already qualified will receive Department training related to patrol functions (e.g., Field Testing of Marijuana, Stationary Radar, Two and Three Wheel Scooter Certification, Truck Enforcement, Bicycle Training, Plainclothes, etc.) and other relevant training including the Police Academy's Method of Instruction Course and Criminal Investigation Course.
- b. Assignment to Precinct of Choice: After completing four classes of mentorship, FTOs who wish to leave the program will be assigned to their precinct of choice (any borough), as soon as a position in their selected precinct becomes available.
- c. Interview with Specialized Units: After completing four classes of mentorship, FTOs will be granted an interview with a specialized unit of their choice (e.g., ESU, Harbor, Counterterrorism, Detective Bureau, etc.). Being granted an interview does not guarantee selection.
- d. Career Points: FTOs who receive a 4.5 or higher on an interim **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** and on their annual **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** will receive one Career Point upon completion of each class of mentorship, for a maximum of five Career Points.
- e. Consideration for Promotion to Detective Specialist: FTOs who demonstrate dedication, superior achievement and outstanding service during their tenure as field training officers may be considered for promotion to the rank of detective specialist.

3. Police officers who are interested in becoming field training officers should contact the appropriate Bureau based on their current assignment (e.g., Patrol Services Bureau, Transit Bureau or Housing Bureau) and request an application. Applicants will be selected based on their leadership abilities, interpersonal skills, rapport with community residents and merchants, and knowledge of crime and quality of life concerns. Applicants must commit to the program for two years in keeping with the general practice of a two year commitment for members of the service assigned to specialized units.

4. Commanding officers will ensure that the contents of this Order are brought to the attention of members of their commands.

BY DIRECTION OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER

DISTRIBUTION
All Commands

OPERATIONS ORDER NO. 53

Page 2 of 2

Appendix G: Finest Message No. 19237304

DATE: 11/03/2015
TIME: 13:51:00
SER#: 19237304

FINEST MESSAGE
General Administrative Information

TO: ALL COMMANDS
RE: AUTO CRIME TRAINING FOR FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS

AT THE REQUEST OF THE CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT, A PORTION OF THE SEATS IN THE AUTO CRIME DIVISION'S FOUR DAY TRAINING COURSE WILL BE ALLOTTED TO POLICE OFFICERS WHO ARE CURRENTLY DESIGNATED AS FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS (FTOS). THERE WILL BE EIGHT SEATS EVERY MONTH FOR UNIFORMED MEMBERS WHO ARE DESIGNATED AS FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS AND HAVE PREVIOUSLY ATTENDED THE FTO TRAINING. IF YOUR FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS ARE INTERESTED IN ATTENDING AUTO CRIME TRAINING, THE TRAINING SERGEANT SHOULD SUBMIT THEIR NAMES TO THE PATROL BOROUGH TRAINING COORDINATOR, WHO WILL COMPILE AND MAINTAIN A LIST OF INTERESTED UMOS. OFFICERS WHO HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED AUTO CRIME TRAINING SHOULD NOT BE PLACED ON THIS LIST. EVERY MONTH, THE PATROL SERVICES BUREAU WILL INFORM THE BOROUGH TRAINING COORDINATORS HOW MANY OF THE EIGHT FTO TRAINING SLOTS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM.

AUTHORITY: CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT
OPERATOR: _____
LOG #: OCD # 1L-05011-15
APRT

ADMN - SER#: 19237304

Appendix H: Operations Order 53

OPERATIONS ORDER

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING SERGEANT	
DATE ISSUED:	NUMBER:
05-04-17	23

1. The Department's Field Training Program was established to support the development of probationary police officers as they transition from their academic and tactical training to their field assignments. To ensure that the continued success of the Department's Field Training Program is achieved on a daily basis throughout the field training process and to maximize the oversight of the program, the position of field training sergeant has now been created for commands where there is a minimum of four field training officers and eight probationary police officers. Commands that do not meet the minimum personnel requirements to establish the position of field training sergeant will continue to comply with Operations Order 8, series 2015. However, commands that do not meet the minimum personnel requirements may also choose to establish the position of field training sergeant when commanding officers find the position will be beneficial to the success of the Field Training Program.

2. Therefore, effective immediately, in commands where a uniformed member of the service in the rank of sergeant is assigned as the field training sergeant, the following procedure will be complied with:

PURPOSE

To establish a supervisory position with a vested interest in the success of the command's field training program by ensuring guidelines are adhered to by command personnel, and probationary police officers receive proper instruction during their transition from academic and tactical training to their field assignments.

DEFINITIONS

FIELD TRAINING SERGEANT – A uniformed member of the service in the rank of sergeant assigned by the command, where there is a minimum of four field training officers and eight probationary police officers.

COMMUNITY PARTNER PROGRAM – An initiative with members of the community who have volunteered to facilitate and nurture relationships between probationary police officers and members of the community that they are serving. These partners include clergy, community leaders and representatives from businesses, non-profit groups, cultural institutions, neighborhood associations and residents.

PROCEDURE

When performing duties as the field training sergeant:

FIELD TRAINING SERGEANT

1. Report to the desk officer at the start of tour for entry in the Command Log as present for duty.
2. Perform tours of duty that will maximize oversight of the Field Training Program.
3. Liaise with the executive officer, and act as the executive officer's primary supervisory representative in managing the Field Training Program.
4. Confer with commanding officer, executive officer, platoon commanders and patrol sergeants regarding progression of personnel assigned to the Field Training Program.
 - a. Discuss potential candidates to act as future field training officers, when necessary.

**FIELD
TRAINING
SERGEANT
(continued)**

5. Assume responsibility for training probationary police officers, in the absence of the field training officer and alternate (e.g., vacation, court, military leave, etc.), for the effected tour(s) and platoon.
6. Coordinate the command community partner program, in conjunction with the operations coordinator.
 - a. Liaise with community affairs officer(s) to identify and review suitability of potential community partner candidates.
 - (1) Attempt to identify critics of the Department and offer the opportunity to become a community partner, in an attempt to foster support for the community partner program and the Department.
 - b. Ensure probationary police officers are provided with opportunities to foster and maintain relationships with the community partners at least once-a week.
 - c. Ensure that field training officers and probationary police officers are meeting with different community partners on a regular basis.
7. Coordinate the command's fifteen day orientation program for recruits, in conjunction with the operations coordinator.
 - a. Prepare schedule for recruits, prior to arrival at command, after conferring with command personnel and determining availability.
 - b. Schedule recruits for presentations by command personnel (e.g., domestic violence officer, detective squad, field intelligence officer, etc.), regarding their duties and responsibilities.
8. Obtain and allocate resources to ensure the continued success of the command Field Training Program (e.g., ensuring an RMP is available to field training officers and probationary police officers, when assigned as the field training auto).
9. Ensure all assigned personnel are regularly apprised of current community conditions and concerns.
10. Instruct field training officers and probationary police officers on new and existing procedures.
11. Coordinate with training sergeant to ensure officers assigned to the Field Training Program receive training, when necessary.
 - a. Ensure probationary police officers performing below standards are provided with appropriate remedial training.
 - b. Ensure field training officers are familiar with Operations Order 53, series 2014, "Field Training Program Incentives" and all available newly introduced training programs that will be beneficial to their careers and command operations.
12. Closely monitor and document performance of probationary police officers and field training officers.
13. Advise all command supervisors of administrative post changes of members of the Field Training Program for required command level training instruction (twice a month over a six month period with the lesson plans provided in the **Field Training Program Guide**).

**FIELD
TRAINING
SERGEANT
(continued)**

- a. Be responsible for the preparation and review of the **Field Training Program Guideline Checklist** upon completion of the lessons.
- 14. Prepare an **EVALUATION** for each probationary police officer via the Online Evaluation System three times during the Field Training Program.
 - a. An evaluation must be conducted at the completion of 60 days, 120 days and 180 days.
 - b. Confer with the probationary police officers' assigned field training officer before completing the evaluation.
 - c. Utilize the **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation** for the 60-day and 180-day evaluation.
 - d. Utilize the 10-month **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** for the 120-day evaluation.

**COMMANDING
OFFICER/
DESIGNEE**

- 15. Submit a report on **Typed Letterhead** to Chief of Personnel with all pertinent facts related to the probationary police officer's performance, if it is determined that the probationary police officer is performing below standards after the 180-day evaluation period.
 - a. Forward **Typed Letterhead** with copy of **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation**.

**FIELD
TRAINING
SERGEANT**

- 16. Prepare **EVALUATIONS** for each field training officer via the Online Evaluation System.
- 17. Establish an open dialogue with field training officers regarding the progression of probationary police officers, throughout the Field Training Program, regardless of platoon.
 - a. Assess probationary police officers based upon conferrals with platoon commanders, squad sergeants and field training officers, and attempt to remedy any deficiencies or recommend remedial training.
 - b. Personally supervise probationary police officers on a one-on-one basis for a tour or series of tours, allowing for direct instruction to address specific deficiencies, when necessary.

NOTE

An open dialogue between the field training sergeant and the field training officers ensures that probationary police officers receive necessary direction and attention, and are being properly evaluated throughout the Field Training Program. Interacting with and motivating field training officers is a necessary component to the program's success.

**OPERATIONS
COORDINATOR**

- 18. Direct field training sergeant to prepare **Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation** for the 60-day and 180-day evaluations, and the 10-month **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION** for the 120-day evaluation, for each probationary police officer.
 - a. Review and sign-off on **EVALUATIONS**, as required.

OPERATIONS ORDER NO. 23

**OPERATIONS
COORDINATOR
(continued)**

19. Direct the field training sergeant to prepare **EVALUATIONS** for the field training officers.
 - a. Review and sign-off on **EVALUATIONS**, as required.
20. Ensure field training officers are fairly evaluated based on their duties and responsibilities.

**ADDITIONAL
DATA**

The main purpose of the Field Training Program is to ensure that the field training officer is supplying the necessary instruction and training to the probationary police officer and providing them with a comprehensive understanding of his/her duties and responsibilities. Therefore, a major portion of the field training officer's evaluation should be based on the development of the probationary police officer, as well as the type of interaction the field training officer has with their probationary police officer.

All field training officers must complete a two day course of instruction and all field training sergeants must complete a five day course of instruction held at the Police Academy, scheduled by their Borough training coordinator.

**RELATED
PROCEDURES**

*Field Training Program (Operations Order 8, series 2015)
Field Training Program Incentives (Operations Order 53, series 2014)*

**FORMS AND
REPORTS**

*Field Training Program Guideline Checklist
Field Training Program Probationary Police Officer Interim Performance Evaluation
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Typed Letterhead*

3. Operations Order 8, series 2015, remains in **EFFECT**.
4. Operations Order 39, series 2016, is hereby **REVOKED**.
5. Commanding officers will ensure that the contents of this Order are brought to the attention of members of their commands.

BY DIRECTION OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER

DISTRIBUTION
All Commands

OPERATIONS ORDER NO. 23

Appendix I: Finest Message No. 26049714

DATE: 05/08/2017
TIME: 12:48:52
SER#: 26049714

FINEST MESSAGE
General Administrative Information

FROM: CHIEF OF PATROL
TO: ALL PATROL SERVICES COMMANDS

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING OFFICER OVERTIME

COMMANDING OFFICERS ARE REMINDED THAT FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS ARE AUTHORIZED TO ASSIST WHEN PROBATIONARY POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM MAKE ARRESTS. FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS ARE AUTHORIZED TO CODE THIS TIME AS ARREST OVERTIME, AS NEEDED.

AUTHORITY: CHIEF OF PATROL
OPERATOR:

AUTHORIZING TERMINAL: CPAB
PSB FINEST MESSAGE: #11

ADMN - SER#: 26049714

Appendix J: Finest Message No. 2605A528

DATE: 05/08/2017
TIME: 13:24:20
SER#: 26050528

FINEST MESSAGE
General Administrative Information

FROM: CHIEF OF PATROL
TO: ALL PATROL SERVICES COMMANDS

SUBJECT: FIELD TRAINING OFFICER OVERTIME - REVISED

COMMANDING OFFICERS ARE REMINDED THAT FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS ARE AUTHORIZED AND ENCOURAGED TO ASSIST WHEN PROBATIONARY POLICE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM MAKE ARRESTS. FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS WHEN ASSISTING WITH THESE ARRESTS SHOULD CODE THEIR OVERTIME AS "ARREST OVERTIME."

AUTHORITY: CHIEF OF PATROL
OPERATOR: _____

AUTHORIZING TERMINAL: CPAE
PSB FINEST MESSAGE: #11A

ADMN - SER#: 26050528