




# Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board

## LESSON PLAN COVER SHEET

COURSE TITLE: <b>FTO Program Standard Evaluation Process (SEGs)</b>		HOURS: <b>3</b>	
DATE FIRST PREPARED: <b>12/10/1997</b>		PREPARED BY: <b>Sergeant Chris Hern, Mesa PD</b>	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED: <b>10/24/2000</b>		BY: <b>Sergeant Chris Hern, Mesa PD</b>	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED: <b>09/21/2002</b>		BY: <b>Ofc. Bill Everson, Mesa PD</b>	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED:		BY:	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED:		BY:	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED:		BY:	
DATE REVISED/REVIEWED:		BY:	
LIST ANY PREREQUISITIES: <b>N/A</b>			
LEAD INSTRUCTOR: <b>Ofc. Rico Encinas, Mesa PD</b>		BACK-UP INSTRUCTOR: <b>Ofc. Tony Fajardo, Mesa PD</b>	
APPROVAL NUMBER:			
COURSE DESCRIPTION: <b>The students will be shown the OIT Standard Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs). The course will study the Mesa PD SEGs and common evaluation errors. We will discuss objective and accurate documentation and how that documentation is developed. Samples of both proper and poor evaluations are discussed.</b>			
INSTRUCTOR REFERENCES: <b>Field Training and Evaluation and Concept Manual by Kaminsky &amp; Assoc. Inc., 1991 Mesa PD FTO forms Mesa PD SEGs Taped scenarios from San Jose PD, CA., Tucson PD, AZ, and Pima County Sheriffs Department, AZ.</b>		TRAINING AIDES, EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS: <b>Dry erase board and markers Handout: Mesa PD SEGs VCR and TV</b>	
		PRE-TEST: <b>No</b>	POST-TEST <b>No</b>
METHOD OF INSTRUCTION: <b>Lecture Student participation</b>			
SUCCESS CRITERIA: <b>Students gain a working knowledge of proper grading of recruits strictly by the Mesa PD SEGs.</b>			
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: <b>Upon completion of this course, the students will be able to:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Demonstrate the ability to rate fair and objectively with documentation to support ratings.</b></li> <li><b>2. Demonstrate a working knowledge and understanding of the SEGs.</b></li> <li><b>3. Differentiate between and define the scores 1-7 listed in the SEGs with 100% accuracy.</b></li> <li><b>4. View and accurately score video scenarios using the SEGs and evaluation process.</b></li> </ol>			
<b>AGENCY APPROVAL</b>	Name (Type or Print)	Signature	Date
<b>AZPOST APPROVAL</b>	Name (Type or Print) <b>LYNDON A. "LYNN" LARSON Basic Training Administrator</b>	Signature 	Date <b>August 2, 2000</b>

OUTLINE	NOTES
<p>A. INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instructor background               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Lead instructor</li> <li>b. Secondary instructor</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Purpose and Motivator               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In order to be a successful FTO and do the job correctly, you must master the FTO Program evaluation process.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Performance Objectives               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Demonstrate the ability to rate fair and objectively with documentation to support ratings.</li> <li>b. Demonstrate a working knowledge and understanding of the SEGs.</li> <li>c. Differentiate between and define the scores 1-7 listed in the SEGs with 100% accuracy.</li> <li>d. View and accurately score video scenarios using the SEGs and evaluation process.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
<p>TRANSITION: Let's talk about the OIT Evaluation Process.</p>	
<p>B. OIT EVALUATION PROCESS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rating system.           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</li> <li>b. What does the number 4 represent? (What are we rating our OIT against? <b>Answer:</b> A solo officer on his first day on his own.)</li> <li>c. Why not a "tenured" officer? <b>Answer:</b> To show a FAIR rating process. Is rating an OIT against the experience of a "tenured" officer really fair?</li> <li>d. What do we consider the numbers 2 &amp; 3 and 5 &amp; 6? <b>Answer:</b> These numbers are buffer numbers, and we use them to show progression or regression.</li> <li>e. Mandatory documentation required on 1 &amp; 7.</li> <li>f. The evaluation should identify areas of strengths and weakness. How many OITs get held back for low rating? <b>Answer:</b> None; it's for failure to respond to training. Your evaluation should "paint the picture."</li> <li>g. Remember your role as the Evaluator/Trainer; OITs' performance (good or poor) reflects the level of training they received from you.</li> <li>h. Remain a fair and impartial trainer.</li> <li>i. All FTOs must use SEGs as taught to achieve program standardization and consistency.</li> <li>j. FTO must have the SEGs out and refer to them while completing the DOR.</li> <li>k. Refer to SEG handout.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>SEG handout</p> <p>On dry erase board, write in a line: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 with 1, 2, &amp; 3 in red 4 in yellow 5, 6, &amp; 7 in green</p> <p>In order for a rating to qualify as a 1, 4, or 7, it <b>MUST</b> meet everything listed in that SEG that applies.</p> <p>Consider it a personal failure if your OIT does not meet the requirements of the program.</p> <p>Start by reading SEG for a 4 and grade up or down as appropriate. Remember, a 4 is a solo officer on his first day.</p>

OUTLINE	NOTES
<p>C. COMMON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ERRORS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Leniency:</b> This is when the Trainer/FTO assigns a score that is beyond what is deserved. This happens when a Trainer/FTO recognizes the performance as less than adequate, however considers it “okay” given the amount of experience the trainee has had.           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many have heard, or know of FTOs that rate harder in the Third and Fourth Phases compared to how they rate in the First and Second Phases?</li> <li>b. If all FTOs rated the same (per the SEGs), then there would not be a question of “opinions.”</li> <li>c. For every “opinion” in the FTO Program, there is a different FTO Program. Stick to the SEGs – what is in black &amp; white.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <b>Personal Bias:</b> This occurs when the Trainer/FTO allows personal feeling about the trainee to affect the ratings.           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. We do no one any favors by allowing bias to influence a rating.</li> <li>b. Improper ratings, in turn, make it harder for the next FTO who uses the SEGs properly.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <b>Central Tendency:</b> This is when a Trainer/FTO routinely bunches the scores to avoid mandatory documentation guidelines.</li> <li>4. <b>Halo Effect:</b> This occurs when one or two traits or behavior dominates the shift ratings.           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Seen when OITs with a great deal of prior experience enter the FTO Program.</li> <li>b. The FTO is in “awe” of the OIT due to the OIT’s experience.</li> <li>c. Remember you evaluations should be objective and center on what an individual does rather than who the individual is. Remember OITs want their performance, not their personality, discussed during a rating review.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The lazy trainer.</p> <p>Go for the joke: Note that this is different than the OIT that takes a bullet for you. That OIT gets all 7s for the day.</p>
<p>TRANSITION: Go into the SEGs for Mesa PD and allow for discussion.</p>	<p>Use SEG handout</p>
<p>D. DISCUSS AND BREAKDOWN THE SEGs AS THEY ARE WRITTEN. (Officers from other departments can use Mesa PD SEG techniques even if their department’s evaluation guidelines are different.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the SEG handout to illustrate the construction of the SEGs.</li> </ol>	
<p>TRANSITION: Time to demonstrate what your have learned.</p>	<p>Use SEG handout</p>
<p>E. SEG SCENARIO TAPES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. View and grade scenarios from video tape.</li> </ol>	

## OUTLINE

## NOTES

TRANSITION: In conclusion, I would like to review and answer questions.

F. CONCLUSION

1. Review performance objectives.
  - a. Drive home importance of sticking to just the SEGs of the FTO program.
  - b. Never forget what you were feeling when you went through the program yourself; it will make you a better trainer.
2. Answer students' questions.