

THE REDESIGN OF ADVANCED PATROL TRAINING FOR POLICE CONSTABLES IN ONTARIO: MAKING USE OF EVALUATION TO MAXIMIZE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Gregory P. Brown
Ontario Police College
and Department of Sociology, Nipissing University
North Bay, Ontario

Ron Hoffman
Ontario Police College
Aylmer, Ontario

Abstract: The use of evaluation to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of the Ontario Police College in the delivery of a refresher training program for police officers is described. Confronted by a growing backlog of patrol officers requiring refresher training and ongoing financial constraints, in 1997 the College, in co-operation with Ontario police services, initiated a comprehensive refresher training needs analysis. A multi-stage, multi-method strategy was employed in the research. The results of the needs analysis were used to redesign the curriculum, format, and delivery of the Advanced Patrol Training (APT) refresher course for patrol constables. As a result of the APT redesign, the number of police officers receiving refresher training increased by an average of 657% annually (*effectiveness*), while costs associated with the APT course decreased by 50% (*efficiency*). The evaluation, design, and delivery of the APT course has become a model for other police training programs in Ontario.

Résumé: L'article décrit l'utilisation de l'évaluation pour maximiser l'efficacité et l'efficience de la prestation d'un programme de recyclage à l'intention des policiers au collège Ontario Police College. Face à une accumulation croissante de policiers ayant besoin d'un cours de recyclage ainsi qu'à des contraintes financières continues, le collège, en collaboration avec des services de police de l'Ontario, a effectué en 1997 une analyse complète des besoins de formation de recyclage. La recherche se basait sur une stratégie à étages multiples et à méthodes multiples. Les résultats de l'analyse des besoins ont servi à la reprise de la

conception du cursus, du format, et de la prestation du cours de recyclage, Advanced Patrol Training (APT), à l'intention des agents de police. En raison de la nouvelle conception du cours APT, le nombre de policiers ayant reçu un cours de recyclage a augmenté de 657% en moyenne par année (*efficacité*), alors que les coûts associés au cours APT ont diminués de 50% (*efficacité*). L'évaluation, la conception, et la prestation du cours APT servent de modèle à d'autres programmes de formation de policier en Ontario.

Wagner and Hollenbeck define organizational *effectiveness* as the "measure of an organization's success in achieving its goals and objectives" (1998, p. 303). In government organizations, where the delivery of services may be mandated, an important measure of effectiveness is the level of service coverage, assessed against some fixed standard (Chambers, Wedel, & Rodwell, 1992; Wholey, 1986).

Organizational *efficiency* is determined by comparing resources consumed to the quantity and quality of products or services produced (Jones, 1998; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1998). Where services are mandated by law and/or where the financial benefits of services may be intangible, efficiency can be evaluated in terms of cost-effectiveness, by comparing the cost of different strategies to achieve organizational outcomes and goals (Posavac & Carey, 1997).

In this article, the use of evaluation to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of the Ontario Police College in delivering a refresher training program to police constables in the province of Ontario is described. Beginning with a detailed examination of the training problem, a comprehensive analysis of patrol officers' needs for training in Ontario was undertaken. Following implementation of a new refresher training course for patrol officers, an evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the training was conducted which demonstrated a 657% annual increase in the level of service coverage coupled with a 50% reduction in resource utilization by the college.

The evaluation, design, and delivery of this police training program has become a model for other police training programs in Ontario, including the redesign of in-service training for police recruits by the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Service, and the design of in-service training for patrol sergeants by the Durham Regional Police Service (currently underway). In addition, the evaluation framework has been employed in the design of training for investigators of the Office of the Public Guardian of Ontario.

BACKGROUND

Established in 1963, the Ontario Police College is the central training facility for police officers in Ontario. By statute, all police recruits, municipal and provincial, must attend the college for basic constable training. Other types of advanced or specialized police training are delivered on a regular basis by the college, according to statute/regulation or at the request of police services.

In the late 1970s, a refresher training course for police constables was implemented by the college (to be known later as “Advanced Patrol Training” or APT). Composed largely of lectures on law and police procedures and techniques, the three-week course was designed primarily as an update for patrol duty officers. However, owing to the length of the course and the on-campus format, less than 300 constables were trained each year, of an estimated 12,000 officers province-wide performing patrol duties.

In 1988, in response to calls from community stakeholders and police services for better training for police officers, a new six-level police training system was introduced at the college that provided for two courses of on-campus training for patrol officers beyond the basic recruit training.

Six-level Ontario Police Training System (1988)

Level I: Police service orientation and in-service training prior to attending the Ontario Police College. One to two weeks in length.

Level II: Basic recruit training program at the Ontario Police College, 60 days in length.

Level III: In-service training and coach officer training at police service. Normally three months in duration.

Level IV: Two- to three-week program at the Ontario Police College occurring 18 months after completion of basic recruit program.

Level V: In-service training.

Level VI: Three-week program at the Ontario Police College.

According to this system, on completion of Level II basic constable training at the Ontario Police College, all police officers were to receive an additional period of Level IV training eighteen months later; a further period of Level VI training was to follow three years later, which was to be repeated thereafter at five-year intervals. The Level IV and Level VI training consisted primarily of lectures on law and police procedures and techniques, two to three weeks in length, delivered on-site at the college. Constables who received their training prior to 1988 would continue to receive periodic refresher training via the APT course.

The new six-level police training system placed an impossible burden on the college. Despite additional funding, by 1995 it was clear that the college could not meet the demand for Level IV and Level VI training. Most important, with resources now diffused over two separate levels of training (Levels IV and VI) and the APT course, the number of patrol officers who had not received any refresher training in the recent past was growing rapidly. Concerns about job performance and morale were raised by police services.

THE PROBLEM

The number of police constables trained at Level II basic training and the number of those constables trained or untrained at Levels IV and VI in the period 1988–97 are shown in Table 1. Other constables from the pre-1988 period who were taking the APT course are shown separately in the table.

Between 1988 when the new six-level police training system was introduced and 1997, the backlog of patrol constables requiring training grew by a total of 5,580 (Level IV + Level VI). In addition, an estimated¹ 4000 constables trained prior to 1988 still required some form of refresher training. In total, in 1997 the estimated training backlog of patrol officers requiring refresher training had ballooned to 9,580, or nearly 80% of officers performing patrol duties. Clearly, given the calls from community stakeholders and police services for better training for police officers, immediate action to deal with the refresher training backlog problem was needed.

Several factors contributed to the refresher training backlog problem. First, due to limited staff resources, a maximum of 20 courses of 24 officers each, either Level IV or Level VI, could be delivered each year, for a total of 480 officers trained, falling far below re-

quirements. Second, the format of the Level IV and Level VI training and the APT course, each of which was on-site lecture format and two or three weeks in length, served to tie up staff resources in only a small number of courses. Third, the format and length of the courses meant that few police services were capable of or willing to deliver the training in-service, thereby restricting course offerings to the Ontario Police College. Finally, long-term growth in the number of police officers in Ontario, in particular those on patrol duty, placed an increasing demand on the college for refresher training.

ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM

In February 1997, representatives of police services from across Ontario met at the Ontario Police College to address the refresher training backlog problem. The representatives were advised by college management that ongoing funding constraints required that the solution to the problem be both effective and efficient, requiring no additional use of resources.

Table 1
Patrol Refresher Training (Level IV, VI, and APT)
Actual Figures, Trained and Untrained, 1988–97

Year	Basic Constable	Level IV		Level VI		APT
	Trained	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained	
1988	1463					
1989	942					
1990	1373	1125	-338			
1991	620	983	+41			
1992	491	892	-481			
1993	500	468	-152	36	-1086	559
1994	654	0	-491	11	-684	173
1995	713	161 ^b	-339	43 ^b	-899	296
1996		558	-96	180	-262	567
1997		202 ^a	-511	91 ^a	-282	272 ^a
Total	6756	4389	-2367	361	-3213	1867

Notes: ^aFigures estimated based on current (1997) conditions. ^bNo Toronto officers since 1994.

As a first step in addressing the refresher training problem, the police service representatives proposed to concentrate the available training resources in a single refresher training course. As a second step, the representatives proposed that a comprehensive training needs analysis be conducted to support the design and implementation of such a course.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A research team composed of the Level IV and Level VI instructors, one member of the Research and Evaluation Unit at the college, and two officers seconded from police services was assigned the task of designing and carrying out the training needs analysis.

The research team, in consultation with college management and the police service representatives, defined four questions or goals that the needs analysis must address:

1. What are the needs for refresher training for patrol officers?
2. How often should patrol officers get refresher training?
3. What is the best way to deliver refresher training to patrol officers?
4. What police service and/or government organizational requirements must be addressed by the refresher training?

A multi-stage, multi-method strategy was employed to conduct the research.

Stage One

In Stage One of the research, a content analysis of police training reports, training curricula, and police training journal articles, along with the results of two recent community consultation surveys completed by the college, was conducted. The analysis was conducted to identify all references to learning requirements (knowledge, skills, abilities) required for patrol officers (cf. Cronshaw, 1991; Kriebel, 1996). A complete list of all identified learning requirements was created and circulated to members of the research team, college management, and an ad hoc advisory group composed of six training officers from police services. Based on this consultative process, an inventory of 118 different learning requirements necessary to perform the job of patrol officer was constructed.

The patrol officer learning requirements inventory was the basis for the construction of a training needs questionnaire. In response to the question "How important is it that a constable be skilled in each of these learning requirements?" respondents were asked to rate each of the 118 learning requirements on a three-point scale, ranging from 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, to 3 = very important. In response to the question "Which learning requirements must be included in patrol refresher training?" respondents were asked to put a check mark beside only those items they believed were important to include in refresher training. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate how frequently they believed patrol officers should receive refresher training and the best ways to deliver the training.

As a check on the validity of the training needs questionnaire data (McKillip, 1998; Rossi & Freeman, 1993) and to probe for additional information about refresher training, the research team decided to follow administration of the questionnaire with a semi-structured interview. During the interview, respondents were prompted for their views concerning refresher training, preferred methods of delivery, barriers to receiving the training, and recommended length of training.

Information obtained from the training needs questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews would, the research team believed, provide answers to the first three questions to be addressed by the training needs analysis. To obtain information in answer to the fourth question, the research team decided to conduct key informant interviews (Chambers et al., 1992; McKillip, 1998) with individuals in policing and government organizations knowledgeable about police training requirements.

Stage Two

In Stage Two of the research a purposive (Babbie, 1995; Henry, 1998) sample of eleven different police services, designed to be representative of the different sizes (small, medium, large) and geographical locations (n, s, e, w) of police services throughout Ontario, was selected by the research team. Each selected police service was contacted by letter and telephone and asked to arrange for a member of the research team to administer the training needs questionnaire and conduct interviews with patrol constables, training officers, patrol supervisors, and any other service personnel that might be able to provide information about the needs for patrol refresher training.

The on-site police service research sessions consisted of a brief introduction and explanation of the research followed by administration of the training needs questionnaire to a group (usually constables coming on shift) or to individuals (supervisors and senior police management). Questionnaire administration was followed by the semi-structured interview conducted with the group or on an individual basis. In one case, the training needs questionnaire was delivered by courier service to a police service in the far north, and the completed questionnaires were then returned to the college.

A total of 98 questionnaires were completed, and 30 separate group or individual interviews were conducted. A breakdown of the key characteristics of the Stage Two sample is shown in Table 2.

As a result of the on-site visits by the research team and the fact that the research was internally administered and promoted by the

Table 2
Stage Two Sample Characteristics

Questionnaire Respondents (N = 98)		Number	Respondents
Size of Police Service	small (< 50)	5	10 (10%)
	medium (51–100)	2	8 (8%)
	large (100 +)	4	54 (55%)
	OPP	1	5 (5%)
	Toronto	1	21 (21%)
Geographical Distribution	north	3	14 (14%)
	south	4	40 (41%)
	east	2	32 (33%)
	west	4	12 (12%)
Length of Service	less than 5 years		14 (14%)
	5 – 20 years		50 (51%)
	more than 20 years		34 (35%)
Current Rank	constable		62 (63%)
	sergeant		29 (30%)
	staff sergeant		5 (5%)
	other		2 (2%)
Current Assignment	patrol		61 (62%)
	training branch		7 (7%)
	traffic		3 (3%)
	other duties		27 (28%)

chiefs of police, the response rate for the questionnaires exceeded 90%. The questionnaire data were subjected to a descriptive statistical analysis, while the data obtained from the interviews were coded and categorized manually (Huberman & Miles, 1998; Weber, 1990).

As a further check on the validity of the results obtained at Stage Two of the research, interviews were conducted with two individuals from other police services not included in the research sample. However, the interview results were not included in the research in order to avoid contamination (Rossi & Freeman, 1993) or bias in the research sample results.

Stage Three

In Stage Three of the research, a strategic sample of seven police services was selected by the research team. The research sample was designed both to be representative of the different sizes and geographical locations of Ontario police services and to target key informants believed to be particularly knowledgeable about the organizational requirements for patrol refresher training. Each selected site was contacted and asked to arrange for a member of the research team to conduct individual semi-structured interviews with senior police personnel, Police Services Board members, and/or other senior personnel. Additional key informant interviews were conducted with representatives of the Ontario Provincial Police training academy, the Toronto Police Service C.O. Bick College training academy, and the Policing Standards and New Programs Branch of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services.

The characteristics of the Stage Three sample are shown in Table 3.

The data obtained from the Stage Three interviews were coded and categorized manually for the purposes of analysis (Huberman & Miles, 1998; Weber, 1990).

RESULTS

Of the 118 learning requirements identified on the training needs questionnaire administered at Stage Two of the research, 69 (58%) were rated as very important by more than 50% of the respondents; 21 of the 69 were identified by respondents as must be included in refresher training. Ninety-six (98%) of the respondents agreed that

patrol constables should receive regular refresher training. Responses to the questions on how often patrol officers should receive refresher training and the best way of delivering the training are shown in Table 4.

The majority of questionnaire respondents (59%) did not offer an opinion or did not answer the question on course length. Respondents were almost evenly split between on-site course delivery at the Ontario Police College (54%) and in-service delivery (47%). A distaste for virtually all of the various alternate delivery formats described on the questionnaire was demonstrated by respondents.

The information collected in the Stage Two interviews assisted both in validating and, in some cases, clarifying the data collected with the training needs questionnaire. Most of those interviewed expressed the belief that course length was best decided by those responsible for the course. With respect to course format, the patrol officers expressed the opinion that if training is delivered intermit-

Table 3
Stage Three Sample Characteristics

Interview Respondents (N = 30)		Number	Respondents
Size of Police Service	small (< 50)	2	6 (20%)
	medium (51–100)	1	6 (20%)
	large (100 +)	3	9 (30%)
	OPP	1	1 (3%)
	Toronto	1	7 (23%)
	Policing Standards	1	1 (3%)
Geographical Distribution	north	1	6 (20%)
	south	4	16 (53%)
	east	2	5 (17%)
	west	1	3 (10%)
Position Distribution	Police Services Board member		6 (20%)
	Police Chief		4 (13%)
	Deputy Chief		3 (10%)
	Chief Superintendent		1 (3%)
	Superintendent		2 (7%)
	Staff Inspector		4 (13%)
	Inspector		4 (13%)
	Sergeant		5 (17%)
Manager (Policing Standards)		1 (3%)	

tently, as discrete modules or by video or computer, it would not get done, as officers have too many other tasks. In the opinion of patrol officers, refresher training should be delivered in one discrete, comprehensive package, ideally at the Ontario Police College or at a site where in-service distractions could not easily intrude.

Results from Stage Three of the research are shown in Table 5.

A majority (97%) of the key informant sample expressed the belief that refresher training for patrol constables is needed. No clear preference for training frequency was identified. Only 14 (47%) expressed an opinion about course location; among those who did respond, in-service training was preferred. A strong preference for instructor-led, scenario-based training was expressed by the key informant sample; the format of choice among the small number (40%) who responded to interview questions about course format was modular

Table 4
Need and Delivery Characteristics - Patrol Refresher Training^a

Stage Two Sample (N = 98)

		Responses
Need for Refresher Training?	Yes	96 (98%)
	No	2 (4%)
Frequency of Refresher Training?	Never	0
	Once a year	17 (17%)
	Every 2 years	28 (26%)
	Every 5 years	51 (52%)
	Every 10 years	1 (1%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)
Course Delivery?	OPC course	54 (55%)
	In-service	46 (47%)
	1 – 2 day modules	33 (34%)
	OPC + modules	45 (46%)
	Information updates	25 (26%)
	Remote video	21 (21%)
	CBT	16 (16%)
	Self-study	15 (15%)

^a Respondents were given a list of options regarding course delivery and asked to indicate yes or no to each option. Numbers and percentages reported for course delivery options are for those in favour of that particular option.

training. Like the Stage Two respondents, few of the key informants offered an opinion as to the length of the training.

Many of the key informants reported in the interviews that they did not feel qualified to express an opinion about course location, format, delivery, or length, as they had no direct experience with police training methods or had not served in patrol functions for some time. Instead, the key informants felt more comfortable in pointing out organizational requirements and issues that would need to be addressed by the training. The necessity of including a community policing component in the refresher training along with updates in law and case-law decisions and training in dealing with the mentally ill were expressed as requirements. The need to devise a cost-efficient way to deliver the training was expressed by a majority of the key informants; with tight budgets and staffing requirements, it is difficult to free up officers to attend lengthy training courses, particularly in off-site locations.

Table 5
Need and Delivery Characteristics - Patrol Refresher Training^a

Stage Three Sample (N = 30)		Responses
Need for Refresher Training?	Yes	29 (97%)
	No	1 (3%)
Frequency of Refresher Training?	As needed	8 (27%)
	Once a year	2 (7%)
	Every 2 - 3 years	10 (33%)
	Every 5 years	5 (17%)
	Don't know / missing	5 (17%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)
Course Delivery?	OPC course	5
	In-service	9
	Modules	10
	Instructor/scenarios	21
	CBT	3
	Video	3
	Inter/intranet	4
Distance education	1	

^a Many of the Stage Three respondents did not feel qualified to offer an opinion regarding course delivery format — consequently, there is a substantial amount of missing data.

When asked what one message they would want carried back to the Ontario Police College regarding refresher training for patrol constables, the key informants responded with a clear theme: “get it into the 1990s,” “make use of the technology,” and “the customer service approach is critical.” These comments, in combination with the results from Stage Two and Stage Three of the research, set the stage for the design of an innovative and, by demand, effective and efficient refresher training course for patrol constables in Ontario.

OUTCOME OF THE TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS

In September and October of 1997, the new refresher training course for patrol officers, billed as the new Advanced Patrol Training course, was piloted in two offerings at the Ontario Police College and at two in-service locations. One week (five days) in length, the new APT course was composed of a core curriculum of legal updates and scenario-based skills training, while allowing for the insertion of customized training modules to fit police services’ local requirements (e.g., community policing / problem-solving techniques, hate crimes, dealing with the mentally ill, seizing and securing weapons, testifying in court, etc.). In addition to the basic course, provisions for the distribution of course information and updates via e-mail and Internet were under development at the time the course was piloted.

A train-the-trainers approach was employed to teach training officers at the police services to co-ordinate and deliver the course themselves, with the assistance of detailed lesson plans and ready access to support from college staff. Course evaluations of the pilot APT courses were overwhelmingly positive; evaluations by senior personnel at the host police services were positive as well, as the in-service format and one-week length reduced personnel replacement costs for the services.

In November 1997, following consultation with Ontario Police College management and representatives of the police services, the APT course began to be offered widely to Ontario police services in three delivery formats: on-site at the college, in-service using college instructors, and in-service making use of the service’s own college-trained instructors. A comparison of the number of police officers trained on the APT course for the years 1998 and 1999, and estimated for 2000, with the combined training numbers for all three of earlier refresher training courses, is shown in Table 6.

It is clear from the data reported in Table 6 that the redesigned APT course has had a significant effect in increasing the number of patrol officers receiving refresher training; so much so that it is projected that the entire patrol refresher training backlog will be eliminated by the year 2003.

MAXIMIZING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Based on the data reported in Table 6, the average annual increase in the number of officers trained in the redesigned APT course is 657%.² At the same time, APT program staffing was reduced from five full-time instructors to three; seconded instructor commitments were reduced to part-time; and course administration costs were reduced with the implementation of electronic and CD distribution of course materials, for a total estimated net reduction in course delivery costs of 50%.

Student evaluations of the APT course continue to be extremely positive. Police service evaluations of the course are positive as well; almost all police services in Ontario have sent patrol officers on the APT course and/or have provided in-service APT courses; more than 225 different in-service training sites operated in 1999. The Ontario Provincial Police plan to offer APT training to virtually all patrol officers in the service throughout 1999 and 2000, and other police services are planning similar strategies.

The refresher training needs analysis and redesign of the APT course resulted in a significant increase in both effectiveness (measured by

Table 6
Training Numbers (Actual and Projected)^a

Comparison of previous refresher training numbers with redesigned APT numbers							
Course	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Level IV, VI, and previous APT	184	500	1305	475			
Redesigned APT				90 ^b	1000	6000	7000

^a Redesigned APT pilot courses. ^b Respondents were given a list of options regarding course delivery and asked to indicate yes or no to each option. Numbers and percentages reported for course delivery options are for those in favour of that particular option.

level of service coverage) and efficiency (measured by net reduction in course delivery costs). In comparison with the costs of previous refresher training courses and with the costs of other similar training programs delivered by the Ontario Police College, the redesigned APT course is the most cost-effective (measured by the cost to level of service coverage; Rossi & Freeman, 1993) solution to the refresher training backlog problem.

The success of the APT course derives directly from the training needs analysis. As identified in the research, both patrol officers and police management expressed a preference for a refresher training course that could be delivered either at the Ontario Police College or in-service; the in-service course would allow officers to return to their homes and families in the evenings and would reduce costs to the police services. Both patrol officers and management indicated a preference for a training course five days or less in length; a shorter course would mean officers were away from home less and away from regular duties for a shorter period of time. Both patrol officers and management provided direct input into the content of the training; in addition, the modular design of the course allows the flexibility to include locally focused training needs and concerns in the APT course. Finally, the train-the-trainer option for the APT course provides the opportunity for police services to gain experience and expertise in the delivery of refresher training, reducing dependence on the Ontario Police College.

To ensure that the APT course continues to meet mandated/legal requirements and the training continues to be of high quality, the instructors assigned to the APT course now serve primarily a course-development, co-ordination, and monitoring role, which includes regular visits to in-service sites delivering the APT course. All APT students complete course evaluation forms; the data are analyzed to reveal problems with the course and to identify opportunities for further development. Police service representatives continue to meet on a regular basis to discuss the APT course evaluation results, to review any concerns regarding the course, and to receive updates and information about changes to the course.

Finally, the redesigned APT course represents a substantial improvement in program logic (Rush & Ogborne, 1991; Wholey, 1983) over the previous refresher training delivery system. Prior to 1998, the outputs (target population, level of service coverage) and objectives (current knowledge, long-term performance improvement)

were not well-defined; training was provided on an as-needed basis, and considerations of effectiveness and efficiency were secondary at best. Prompted by the refresher training backlog problem, a key contribution of the training needs analysis was to direct attention beyond program outputs to a focus on short- and long-term training objectives as identified in the needs analysis. Consequently, in the subsequent redesign of the APT training course, target population (patrol constables), outputs (all patrol officers at least every five years), and short-term (demonstrated knowledge, skills acquisition as tested) and long-term objectives (transfer of learning to job setting) are now coherently linked (cf. Rush & Osborne, 1991). Comprehensive assessment of the long-term objectives of the APT training is the next step in the refresher training evaluation process.

CONCLUSION

The successful evaluation, redesign, and delivery of the Advanced Patrol Training course has become a model for other police training programs in Ontario. Recently, the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Service employed the same evaluation approach in the redesign of in-service training for recent recruits, which led to the introduction of a novel, fully integrated coach officer-recruit training program at the service. Currently, the Durham Regional Police Service is applying the evaluation approach in the design of in-service training for patrol sergeants. The Office of the Public Guardian of Ontario has employed the evaluation approach in the design of an in-service course for investigators.

The redesign of the Advanced Patrol Training course is a testimony to the contribution that evaluation can make to maximizing the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations.

NOTES

The views expressed are solely those of the authors and not of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Ontario.

1. Based on the following information: In 1996–97, the OPP alone requested a total of 2,008 positions for the APT course. At that time, the OPP represented approximately one quarter of police personnel in the province. Given that, in 1996–97, Toronto accounted for an-

other one quarter of police personnel, but did not send constables to the APT course, there remained, conservatively, perhaps another 2000 officers in the remaining half of police personnel that required APT training.

2. Calculated as the percentage change in the average Level IV, VI, and previous APT training numbers over 1994–96 versus the annual average new APT training numbers, 1998–2000.

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Chambers, D.E., Wedel, K.R., & Rodwell, M.K. (1992). *Evaluating social programs*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cronshaw, S.F. (1991). *Strategic job analyses on four police jobs*. Toronto: Strategic Planning Committee on Police Training and Education, Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services of Ontario.
- Henry, G.T. (1998). Practical sampling. In L. Bickman & D.J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 101–126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Huberman, A.M., & Miles, M.B. (1998). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 179–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, G.R. (1998). *Organizational theory* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kriebler, J.H. (1996, August). Job task analysis: Recommendations for law enforcement. *The Police Chief*, 49–54.
- McKillip, J. (1998). Needs analysis: Process and techniques. In L. Bickman & D.J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 261–284). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Posavac, E.J., & Carey, R.G. (1997). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Rossi, P.H., & Freeman, H.E. (1993). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rush, B., & Ogborne, A. (1991). Program logic models: Expanding their role and structure for program planning and evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 6(2), 95–106.
- Wagner, J.A., & Hollenbeck, J.R. (1998). *Organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wholey, J.S. (1983). *Evaluation and effective public management*. Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.
- Wholey, J.S. (1986). Using evaluation to improve government performance. *Evaluation Practice*, 7, 5–13.