



DCJS

DCJS

DCJS

DCJS

106169

S

S

DCJS

Department of Criminal Justice Services  
Commonwealth of Virginia



106169

106169

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Virginia Department of Criminal  
Justice Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

SUMMARY

OF

"SURVEY METHODS: RELATING TO

REVALIDATION OF

JOB-TASK ANALYSES"

February 23, 1987

Copyright, 1987  
Commonwealth of Virginia

Copyright, 1987  
Commonwealth of Virginia

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1-1
Format of the Summary, A Description .....	1-4
Using the Matrices .....	1-4
"Data on File," A Description .....	1-4
Staff Observations and General Comments .....	1-5
RESPONSES: SURVEY METHODS QUESTIONNAIRE .....	2-1
Questions .....	2-2, 2-4, 2-6
Response Matrix .....	2-3, 2-5, 2-7
"Data on File," Respondent Commentary .....	2-8
RESPONSES: FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONIC QUESTIONNAIRE .....	3-1
Questions .....	3-2, 3-4
Response Matrix .....	3-3, 3-5
"Data on File," Respondent Commentary .....	3-6

## F O R E W O R D

For more than fifteen years, mandated training has been a reality in Virginia. During those years we have been witness to, and a part of, considerable expansion and improvements in the development and regulation of training. This period was a time in which we progressed in both the operational and regulatory aspects of the training system.

We recognized however, that changes were taking place nationwide including increased emphasis on job-task analyses (JTA). At the same time, we were well aware of the need to continuously review and improve the training in our own state. To that end, we asked for and received input and cooperation from the criminal justice agencies, and began a process to develop a state-of-the-art training program.

The first step in the process was to accomplish a job-task analysis, which was completed in 1982. Extensive research and development were invested in that initial analysis, and the returns on the investments are impressive. Paramount among the several benefits are the validated, performance-based training and testing objectives which we developed directly from the JTA.

Additionally, the results of data collection and the effects of the JTA provided the impetus and the avenue for us to make several other positive changes, all of which complement our goal of upgrading the overall system. For example, we moved to eliminate the hours assigned to specific subject matter, and substituted total-program hours instead. This action invested the academy directors with the latitude to adjust for specific subject-matter emphasis and for regional considerations, without compromising the objectives.

Full documentation is another change born of the JTA. Documentation is now an integral and essential function in all phases of our training system. Academies document that every student has been instructed, tested and meets competency standards in each of the 435 objectives.

The JTA resulted in major changes in our testing procedures. Formerly, students were required only to attain a score of seventy percent on examinations, and emphasis was often on written tests. Quite obviously, a student could successfully complete training even though he may have tested deficient in crucial subject matter. With the advent of performance-based testing, considerable emphasis is on demonstrated competency and the students must successfully complete each of the objectives. Moreover, each academy must develop and implement written policy and detail the total process for both testing and retesting.

Considering all the proposed changes enumerated above, the next step was to institute performance-based training on a statewide basis. To assist with implementation, we developed and provided training classes for the academy instructors and staff, and helped them develop their system for administering the training. More recently we were able to develop, with the assistance of the training academies, model lesson plans which address every objective. Those lesson plans have been given to all of the academies as a minimum training guide, all of which resulted from the JTA process.

Although some states had prior experience and success with job-task analyses and performance-based training, the overall methodology was relatively new to us. Nevertheless, we're pleased with the changes and results which have been accomplished. Policy and procedures have also been established to assure that the efforts shall continue on a regular and ongoing basis.

We fully recognize the impact and contribution of the results of our JTA toward continued improvements, and that is a compelling reason why we're proceeding with revalidation. We hope the information compiled in this summary will contribute to that task, for us and you as well.

The Authors:

Lex T. Eckenrode, Division Director  
Division of Training and Standards  
Department of Criminal Justice Services

William R. Edmundson, Field Services Coordinator  
Division of Training and Standards  
Department of Criminal Justice Services

Legend:

In order to avoid repetition of long names and titles, the following initials and acronyms are used throughout this document.

JTA: Job-Task Analysis

RJTA: Revalidated Job-Task Analysis

IADLEST: International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training

Data on File: Column headings entitled: "Data on File," will be found throughout both matrices. "Data on File" provides a forum for respondents' written commentaries which were submitted in addition to the typical "yes-no" type answers. A section-page number (i.e., 3-8) appearing in those columns indicates that the respondent either wrote comments or explanations, or submitted documents as requested. The comments will be found on the page number as indicated in the column, and are grouped by Q-number. In some instances, complete JTA final reports were submitted. We will, of course, read and carefully consider these reports while developing our RJTA; however, when such voluminous material is beyond the scope of this document, the "data on file" section will refer the reader to the submitting agency.

U/C: Unsolicited Comment

INTRODUCTION

SECTION 1

## INTRODUCTION

The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services is pleased to present this summary of "Survey Methods: Revalidation of Job-Task Analyses."

Following generally accepted principles, the department recognized the necessity for periodically revalidating our initial Job-Task Analysis (JTA), which was completed in 1982. Accordingly, it was determined that the Revalidated Job-Task Analysis (RJTA) should be completed during 1987.

In the Fall of 1986, with the revalidation plan still in the embryonic state, we recalled our experiences in developing and implementing the initial JTA, and the subsequent reviews of technical and legal issues, as well as discussions with IADLEST members. It was with those experiences in mind that we began to carefully consider our plan of action. The total plan must include a documented and defensible process, encompassing intensive and concentrated efforts toward properly determining the survey population size, instrument construction, survey techniques and statistical methods. Obviously, formulation of such planning relies heavily upon collection and careful consideration of information from reliable sources. Certainly, IADLEST could not be overlooked as a unique source of experience and empirical information.

Eliminating or reducing the probability of successful challenge has been problematic, and is compounded by the fact that RJTA (and even JTA) development is in its infancy in the criminal justice system; only six states reported having completed an RJTA, with none reported as having been tested in court. Quite naturally, we felt compelled to take a harder look at methodology before investing more effort in a long-term, high-impact project.

One solution has been to rely upon consultants; however, even those "experts" often disagree on methodology, and their experience with criminal justice is comparatively limited since the oldest JTA identified is dated in 1975 (Texas). We will, of course, continue to utilize the products of consultants, but since some JTA's have been in existence for more than a decade, we decided to collect information from those states that would permit us to gauge the effectiveness of the methods used to develop and implement those JTA's, and how well the processes have withstood legal challenges. Our intent, and a distinct advantage of course, is to incorporate the JTA and RJTA strengths and avoid the weaknesses in our own. Certainly, consideration was given that the resulting empirical data, properly applied, may enhance the credibility factor in the event of a challenge.

In order to gather the relevant data, a survey questionnaire was mailed on February 23, 1987, to all state directors of the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training. As of March 25, 1987, completed questionnaires from 47 states had been collected. Six states were identified as having completed the revalidation of their initial JTA's, and a follow-up telephone questionnaire was developed to gather additional data from those six states. The additional questions were intentionally omitted from the first questionnaire for two reasons: first, they apply exclusively to an RJTA, and secondly, to avoid burdening all states with an excessive number of questions.

The data compiled in this document are intended only for such guidance or other consideration which the reader deems appropriate in research or as possible influencing factors in developing, implementing or revalidating a Job-Task Analysis. By no means is the report intended as an authoritative dissertation, nor does it serve as instructional material. Rather, it merely attempts to collect and collate the survey methodologies, conditions, status and legal experiences of the several states with respect to their analyses and revalidations, and to redistribute those data in one compiled document. No attempt has been made to validate the data, and no suggestions are made or implied as to specific application.

While conscientious effort has been made toward collection and summarizing the data as accurately as possible, we recognize that errors and omissions can happen; we apologize should such occur.

We offer sincere thanks to those directors and their staffs who took the time to respond to our survey questionnaires. We fully acknowledge that without their cooperation, this summary would not be possible. We are pleased to return the information, in compiled form, to the criminal justice community.

#### FORMAT OF THE SUMMARY: A Description

The summary is divided into three sections. Section 1, the Introduction, provides background information and purpose. It also provides descriptive and user information concerning the summary, and concludes with staff observations and comments concerning the results of the survey.

Section 2 addresses the initial, written questionnaire which was mailed to all IADLEST members on February 23, 1987. For the most part, the answers are detailed in matrix form with the questions appearing on a facing page. The matrices are immediately followed by the respondents' written comments. Section 2 should be of interest to agencies which are considering developing a JTA.

Section 3 shares the same format as used in Section 2; however, it is concerned with a follow-up telephonic survey which was directed to only those agencies which have completed a revalidation of their job-task analyses. Both Section 2 and 3 should be of particular interest to those agencies contemplating revalidation. Moreover, the combined data throughout the summary provides a background of information against which one may wish to reassess an already completed JTA or RJTA in view of the identified legal implications.

#### USING THE MATRICES

Beginning on page 2-2, are the first seven of sixteen questions from the "Survey Methods" questionnaire. On the facing page (p2-3), responses to each of the seven questions are outlined in matrix form, with the corresponding "Questions," or "Q," number appearing at each column heading. This same format continues throughout the "Survey Methods" survey, and also is applied to the "Follow-up Telephonic" Survey, beginning on page 3-1.

#### DATA ON FILE: A Description

Column headings entitled: "Data on File," will be found throughout both matrices. "Data on File" provides a forum for respondents' written commentaries which were submitted in addition to the typical "yes-no" type answers. A section-page number (i.e., 3-8) appearing in those columns indicates that the respondent either wrote comments or explanations, or submitted documents as requested. The comments will be found on the page number as indicated in the column, and are grouped by Q-number. In some instances, complete JTA final reports were submitted. We will, of course, read and carefully consider these reports while developing our RJTA; however, when such voluminous material is beyond the scope of this document, the "data on file" section will refer the reader to the submitting agency.

Staff Observations  
and  
General Comments

Our original intent in collecting the information in this document was to identify national trends, methodologies, problems and successes relating to job-task analyses (JTA) and revalidation. Our purpose was to analyze the responses for any influencing factors or applicability which may affect the development of our in-progress JTA revalidation.

As we reviewed the compiled data, we naturally drew certain conclusions; more often, perhaps, we were left with questions. As researchers know, however, questions can sometimes be more significant than conclusions. The readers, we're sure, will also draw conclusions, and their interpretations may well differ from ours. However, our comments are not intended as a comprehensive analysis or as a critical review. On the contrary, we have simply summarized some of the information in an attempt to understand and apply the data to our own RJTA, and to share our observations with the readers. Along with our generalized comments, we also summarized a few basic statistics which we thought might be of general interest.

Of 47 states responding to the questionnaire, 30 reported a job-task analyses had been completed, with four others in progress and expected to be completed in 1987. The fact that 72 percent of the respondents have JTA's in existence or under development leaves little doubt as to the importance the states attach to the evaluation process. We noticed also that of the 30 existing JTA's, 25 have been used to develop performance-based objectives (PBO's) and testing, and four more are in progress. Obviously, a 97 percent completion rate says something about the importance of PBO's.

Interestingly, only six states reported having revalidated their initial JTA, and two more are in progress, accounting for only 26 percent of the total JTA's in existence. The explanation for the low number was at first elusive. The implication that an RJTA was considered unimportant was inconsistent with the importance the states had attached to the initial JTA, as implied by its 72-percent completion rate. The question was at least partially resolved by a review of the JTA completion dates; JTA's are generally revalidated after four or five years. Thirteen of the JTA's were less than five years old, and two in progress account for 50 percent of the total. It appears that some others were delayed due to economic and staffing difficulties. In addition, one state has completed the performance objectives, but not testing objectives, while another conducted the JTA only for the purpose of applicant testing. The importance of the RJTA appears to remain intact.

No state reported a legal challenge directly relating to the methodology used in developing and implementing a JTA or RJTA. However, one respondent reported litigation relating to the absence of a JTA; the particulars of the case are outlined on page 2-9. We appreciate that state's willingness to share the information.

On the questionnaire, a question was posed as follows: "As a result of your revalidation, did you determine that the validated tasks: (a) remained the same, (b) some new ones were added, (c) some originally validated tasks were no longer valid, (d) some previous tasks, originally considered not valid, were validated, and (e) other."

In developing that question, we had two important purposes in mind. First, the answers could give us an idea of whether the law enforcement job was changing considerably. For example, if all respondents answered: "b, c or d," a good possibility of change would be indicated. Answer "a" might indicate a reasonably static condition. Our second purpose was to anticipate, to some degree, the results we could expect from our own RJTA. If the results of our RJTA were completely out of line with the answers from the other states, perhaps the officers' job is different in Virginia. Experience, however, indicates the difference would more likely be attributable to our RJTA methodology. Actually, four of five respondents answered "a" (remained the same), which gives some indication of stability. The fifth state answered "e" and commented that no comparison was made because the initial JTA was considered inadequate.

Finally, we didn't get much encouragement with respect to borrowing or exchanging computer software. At present, it appears much of the software belongs to consultants or contractors, or it's otherwise not physically feasible to exchange it. For readers who contemplate conducting an analysis, it is suggested that software will be a budgetary consideration.

SURVEY METHODS QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 2

## SURVEY METHODS QUESTIONNAIRE

February 23, 1987

- NOTE:
1. This questionnaire was directed to all states. Only those states listed in this section responded to the questionnaire.
  2. For responses, refer to p. 2-3.
  3. Wherever the matrices (pp. 2-3, 2-5, and 2-7) indicate "Data on File," those responses will be found on p. 2-8, et seq. Locate specific data by referring to "Q" number.

### QUESTIONNAIRE

- Q1. Has your state conducted a Job-Task Analysis (JTA) for entry-level law enforcement officers? Year completed: 19\_\_\_\_
- Q2. If the answer to question #1 is "no," please do not answer further questions, but please return the questionnaire.
- Q3. Has your state used the JTA to establish validated performance-based training objectives and performance-based test objectives?
- Q4. Has your state conducted a follow-up--or REVALIDATION--of the original JTA? Year completed: 19\_\_\_\_
- Q5. Has your state experienced litigation or legal challenge directly relating to the:
- a. Original Job-Task Analysis
  - b. Revalidation of the JTA
- Q6. If the answer to question 5 is "yes," please provide information indicating the legal basis, and the result or disposition. (Use extra sheets if necessary or enter a brief explanation below):
- Q7. If the answer to question 5 is "yes," did the challenge or litigation result from: (check all that apply)
- a. Statistical methodology
  - b. Insufficient population surveyed
  - c. Phraseology used in task questions
  - d. Survey instructions
  - e. Methods used to derive training objectives from the JTA
  - f. Methods used to develop task questions
  - g. Failure to revalidate the initial JTA
  - h. Other - please define:

For questions, refer to p. 2-2.  
Question #2 omitted.

RESPONSE DATA

Survey Methods Questionnaire  
February 23, 1987

QUESTION NO.:	Q1				Q3				Q4				Q5-a		Q5-b		Q6 * Data on File	Q7								Q7h * Data on File
	STATE	Yes	No	In Prog. Yr.	Yes	No	In Prog.	Yes	No	In Prog.	Yr.	Yes	No	Yes	No	a		b	c	d	e	f	g	h		
ALASKA	X			83	X				X				X													
ARIZ.		X							X																	
ARK.		X							X																	
CALIF.	X			79	X				X				X													
COLO.		X							X																	
CONN.	X			80	X			X			82	X		X												
DEL.		X							X																	
FLA.	X			81	X			X			83	X		X												
GA.	X			77	X					X		X		X												
IOWA	X			81		X			X				X													
IDAHO		X							X																	
IND.	X			85			X		X				X													
KANS.	X			78	X				X				X													
KY.	X			83	X			X			85	X		X												
LA.		X							X																	
MASS.	X			79	X			X			86	X		X												
MAINE	X			81	X				X				X													
MD.	X				X				X				X													
MICH.	X			79	X				X				X													
MINN.	X			77	X				X				X													
MISS.		X							X																	
MO.			X	87					X																	
MONT.	X			82					X				X													
N.C.	X			83	X				X				X													
NEBR.	X			84	X				X				X													
NEV.		X							X																	
N.DAK.	X			82		X			X				X													
N.H.		X							X																	
N.J.		X							X																	
N.MEX.	X			83	X				X				X													
N.Y.			X	87	X				X				X													
OHIO	X			84	X				X				X													
OKLA.	X			87	X				X				X													
OREGON	X			87			X		X				X													
PA.	X			81	X				X				X													
R.I.			X	87			X		X														X	p.2-9		
S.C.	X			85	X			X			87	X		X												
S.DAK.		X							X																	
TENN.	X			87	X				X				X													
TEXAS	X			75	X			X			84	X		X												
UTAH			X	87					X																	
VA.	X			82	X					X	87	X		X												
VT.	X			81	X				X				X													
WASH.		X							X				X													
WIS.	X			80	X				X				X													
W.VA.		X							X																	
WYOMING	X			86			X		X				X													

\*NOTE: If a section/page number appears in any "Data on File" column (see Q6 and Q7h), the information will be found on the page number indicated. Otherwise, no data was provided.

(continued on p. 2-5)

(Continued from p. 2-2)

For responses, see p. 2-5.

- Q8. During the REVALIDATION, did you add new task questions to the survey which were not on the original JTA?
- Q9. If the answer to question 8 is "yes," who developed the new task questions? (Check all that apply):
- a. Staff members
  - b. The advisory committee
  - c. Selected subject-matter experts
  - d. Consultant or contractor
  - e. Other - please specify (use extra sheet if necessary)
- Q10. During the REVALIDATION, did you survey:
- a. The same departments as were surveyed during the original JTA
  - b. An entirely different group of agencies
  - c. Departments/agencies at random
- Q11. Approximately, what was the number of patrol-level law enforcement personnel in your state who were eligible to participate in your ORIGINAL JTA survey?
- Q12. During the ORIGINAL JTA, to approximately how many patrol-level officers was the survey questionnaire administered?
- Q13. During the REVALIDATION, to approximately how many patrol-level officers was the survey questionnaire administered?

(Continued from 2-3)  
For questions, refer  
to p. 2-4.

RESPONSE DATA

Survey Methods Questionnaire  
February 23, 1987

QUESTION NO.:	Q8			Q9					Q10			Q11	Q12	%	Q13	%
	Yes	No	N/A	a	b	c	d	e	a	b	c	n=	n=	Q12 Q11	n=	Q13 Q12
ALASKA												1,100	300	27.3		
ARIZ.																
ARK.																
CALIF.												40,000	1,720	4.3		
COLO.																
CONN.		X								X		6,000	800	13.3	300	37.5
DEL.																
FLA.		X								X		8,224	6,741	82.0	500	7.4
GA.																
IOWA			X									2,500	250	10.0		
IDAHO																
IND.			X									6,000	300	5.0		
KANS.												4,880	300	6.1		
KY.		X								X		3,000	3,000	100.0	3,000	100.0
LA.																
MASS.	X			X	X					X		4,500	1,127	25.0	1,500	133.1
MAINE												1,400	950	67.9		
MD.												12,500				
MICH.			X									12,600	4,200	33.3		
MINN.			X									7,000				
MISS.																
MO.																
MONT.												1,100	900	81.8		
N.C.												6,475	1,619	25.0		
NEBR.			X									3,800	365	9.6		
NEV.																
N.DAK			X									1,200	300	29.1		
N.H.																
N.J.																
N.MEX.													406			
N.Y.			X									2,400	2,400	100.0		
OHIO												3,000	2,600	86.6		
OKLA.			X													
OREGON			X											50.0		
PA.			X									12,000	255	2.1		
R.I.			X									2,000				
S.C.	X			X	X	X						5,000	4,388	87.8	505	11.5
S.DAK.																
TENN.												7,000	500	7.1		
TEXAS	X					X				X			4,000		3,377	84.4
UTAH																
VA.			X									1,090	285	26.1		
VT.												600	385	64.4		
WASH.																
WIS.												9,500	1,700	17.9		
W.VA.																
WYOMING			X									1,300	400	30.8		

\*NOTE: If a section/page number appears in the Q9 column, the information will be found on the page number indicated. Otherwise, no data was provided.

7

(Continued from p. 2-4)

For responses, see p. 2-7.

Q14. Are the results of your revalidated JTA computerized?

Q15. If the answer to #14 is "yes," what language was used?

Q16. Please provide information concerning--or a copy of--the guidelines and/or procedures which you used to develop and proceed with the REVALIDATION survey. Any information which will assist us in verifying the accuracy and reasonableness of our planned direction will be appreciated. If your REVALIDATION has been completed, a copy of your final report will also be appreciated.

(Continued from p. 2-5)  
 For questions, refer to  
 p. 2-6.

RESPONSE DATA

Survey Methods Questionnaire  
 February 23, 1987

QUESTION NO.:	Q14		Q15 *	Q16 *	READER'S NOTES
	STATE	Yes	No	Data on File	
ALASKA					
ARIZ.					
ARK.					
CALIF.					
COLO.					
CONN.			X		
DEL.					
FLA.			X		p.2-10
GA.					
IOWA					
IDAHO					
IND.					
KANS.					
KY.	X		p.2-9	p.2-10	
LA.					
MASS.			X		p.2-10
MAINE					
MD.					
MICH.					
MINN.					p.2-10
MISS.					
MO.					
MONT.					
N.C.					
NEBR.					
NEV.					
N.DAK.					
N.H.					
N.J.					p.2-10
N.MEX.					
N.Y.					
OHIO	X		p.2-9		
OKLA.			X		
OREGON					
PA.					
R.I.			X		
S.C.			X		p.2-11
S.DAK.					
TENN.			X		
TEXAS	X		p.2-9	p.2-11	
UTAH					
VA.					
VT.					p.2-11
WASH.					
WIS.					
W.VA.					
WYOMING					

\*NOTE: If a section/page number (i.e., 3-1) appears in any "Data on File" column, additional information will be found on the page numbers indicated. Otherwise, no data was provided.

"DATA ON FILE"

SURVEY METHODS QUESTIONNAIRE  
February 23, 1987

- NOTE: 1. This section outlines the responses which correspond to the "Data on File" columns of the matrix entitled: Survey Methods Questionnaire, February 23, 1987.
2. If a comment is preceded by "U/C" it is an unsolicited comment which the respondent considered relevant.

Q No.	State	Response
Q3		HAS YOUR STATE USED THE JTA TO ESTABLISH VALIDATED PERFORMANCE-BASED TRAINING OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE-BASED TEST OBJECTIVES?
	FLA.	(No). (U/C). Performance-based training objectives were developed. Test objectives not yet completed.
	IOWA	(No). (U/C). The JTA was conducted for the purposes of the development of a mandated entry-level, written and physical agility tests.
	IND.	(No). (U/C). The JTA has not yet been used to establish validated objectives, however, this is in progress.
PA.	(Yes). (U/C). We have a pilot curriculum now in use at 6 of 19 training centers. We hope to have a final product in place statewide in January, 1988.	
Q4		HAS YOUR STATE CONDUCTED A FOLLOW-UP--OR REVALIDATION--OF THE ORIGINAL JTA?
	CALIF.	(No). (U/C). Our approach has been to collect supplemental, more detailed job information for each specific selection or training standard we establish (reading/writing tests, physical ability standards, etc.).
GA.	(No). (U/C). Revalidation project just beginning.	

Q No.	State	Response
Q6	R.I.	<p>IF YOUR STATE HAS EXPERIENCED LITIGATION OR LEGAL CHALLENGES TO THE JTA OR RJTA, PLEASE PROVIDE BASIS AND DISPOSITION.</p> <p>The reason we are conducting a JTA is because of past legal suits. We were ordered by the federal court to conduct the JTA.</p> <p>(Note: See also Q7-h, for more detail.)</p>
Q7h	R.I.	<p>(Question paraphrased): IF YOU HAVE EXPERIENCED LEGAL CHALLENGE, PLEASE PROVIDE SPECIFIC DETAIL AS TO CAUSE.</p> <p>A physical agility component at the police academy was challenged. A female student failed a phase of the physical agility component, then challenged the entire physical program in federal court. The court then ordered a JTA to be conducted.</p> <p>(Note: See Q-6 for more information.)</p>
Q8	S.C.	<p>DURING THE REVALIDATION, DID YOU ADD NEW TASK QUESTIONS TO THE SURVEY WHICH WERE NOT ON THE ORIGINAL JTA?</p> <p>A completely new set of questions were used.</p>
Q15	<p>KY.</p> <p>OHIO</p> <p>TEXAS</p>	<p>IF THE RESULTS OF YOUR REVALIDATED JTA IS COMPUTERIZED, WHAT LANGUAGE WAS USED?</p> <p>S.A.S. (Statistical Analysis System). In analyzing the survey data, we utilized G.L.M. (General Linear Model, Duncan's Multiple Range Tests and Simple Mean.</p> <p>Basic</p> <p>CODAP (Comprehensive Occupational Data Analysis Program)</p>

Q No.	State	Response
Q16		PLEASE PROVIDE INFORMATION CONCERNING--OR A COPY OF-- THE GUIDELINES AND OR PROCEDURES USED TO DEVELOP AND PROCEED WITH THE REVALIDATION SURVEY, OR OTHER HELPFUL INFORMATION. A COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT WILL BE APPRECIATED.
	FLA.	Agency submitted complete developmental documentation which is too voluminous to summarize or copy. For a copy of this material or specific information, please contact the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, Division of Standards and Training.
	KY.	In order to maintain statistical consistency between the JTA and RJTA, experience reiterates the extreme importance of being consistent in the manner in which the surveys are administered to the officers at different times or locations. This is particularly applicable to the instructions given to the officers for completing the survey instruments.
	MASS.	An entirely new JTA was completed.
	MINN.	In returning the survey, a point of clarification is in order. The only job-task analysis done on Minnesota peace officers was done by the Minnesota Crime Control Planning Board in the late 1970s. This state agency was dismantled in the early 1980s once the Board's LEAA funding ran out. While this JTA was useful to us when our peace officer licensing system was established in 1978, no subsequent revalidation of the original study was ever done. Although there are no immediate plans to update the JTA, we would like to address the issue in the future.
	N.J.	Agency submitted complete developmental documentation which is too voluminous to copy. For a copy of this material, please contact Police Services, New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice.

Q No.	State	Response
Q16 cont'd.	S.C.	<p>This was not a revalidation of the original JTA in the usual sense of an RJTA; rather, completely different methodology was used. In order to validate our 1985 task-analysis-based training curriculum, we chose the methodology utilized by the University of South Carolina, College of Pharmacy and the Medical University of South Carolina. This survey consisted of questions dealing with every facet of the basic curriculum which the student was asked to rate on a scale ranging from very useful to not useful at all. Every 1985 basic school graduate was surveyed in an effort to ensure validity for the survey. At this time the final report has not been issued; however, preliminary results indicate that our curriculum is highly rated by the officers who graduate and seems to be answering their needs. According to the consultant who is handling the survey and validation study, the methodology used is statistically and procedurally correct. For a copy of the material or specific information, please contact the South Carolina Law Enforcement Academy.</p>
	TEXAS	<p>Agency submitted complete documentation which is too voluminous to summarize or copy. For a copy of this material or specific information, please contact the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education.</p>
	VT.	<p>Agency submitted complete documentation which is too voluminous to summarize or copy. For a copy of this material or information, please contact the Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council.</p>

FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 3

FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

March 1987

NOTES: This follow-up Telephone Questionnaire was directed only to those states which indicated a revalidated JTA was completed.

For responses, refer to pp. 3-3 and 3-5.

- QUESTIONNAIRE -

- Q1. During the original JTA, did you use an advisory committee to review the JTA as it progressed?
- Q2. During the revalidation, did you use an advisory committee?
- Q2a. (If applicable): During the revalidation, did the advisory committee consist essentially of the same persons or positions as served on the original JTA?
- Q2b. (If applicable): If the advisory committee changed significantly, either by positions of members or numerically, indicate the changes and reasoning.
- Q3. During the revalidation, did you use the original JTA survey document as the base for your revalidation? If "no," explain.
- Q4. During the revalidation, did you add any new task questions to the survey which were not on the original JTA?
- Q4a. If you answered yes to question no. 4, how did you determine or develop the new questions?
- Q4b. (If applicable): Were the new questions:
1. ( ) Added to the initial survey and administered as a single survey document?
  2. ( ) Administered as a separate document to a different group of officers?
  3. ( ) Other comments

(Questionnaire continued on p. 3-4)

RESPONSE DATA

Follow-up Telephone Questionnaire  
March 1987

For questions, refer to p. 3-2.

Question No.:	Q1		Q2		Q2a			Q2b	Q3			Q4		Q4a		Q4b		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	N/A	Data* on File	Yes	No	Data* on File	Yes	No	Data* on File				
STATE																		
CONN.	X		X			X		p.3-7	X				X					
FLA.	X			p.3-6			X		X					p.3-8				
KY.	X			X			X		X				X					
MASS.	p.3-6		X			X		p.3-7		X	p.3-8	X		p.3-8			X	
S.C.	X			X			X			X	p.3-8	X		p.3-8			X	
TEXAS		p.3-6		X			X		X				X	p.3-8				

NOTES: 1. Follow-up Telephonic questionnaire was directed only to those states which indicated a revalidated JTA was completed.

\* 2. If a section-page number appears in any column, additional information will be found on the page number as indicated. Otherwise, no data was provided.

(Matrix continues on p. 3-5)

(Continued Follow-up Telephone Questionnaire, March 1987)

For responses, refer to p. 2-5.

- Q5. During the revalidation survey, the number of departments surveyed was:
- a.  approximately the same number of departments as in the original JTA
  - b.  approximately \_\_\_\_\_ percent of the original number
- Q6. How did you determine the number of officers to be surveyed during the revalidation as opposed to the number surveyed during the initial JTA?
- Q7. As a result of your revalidation, did you determine that the validated tasks: (check all that apply)
- a.  remained about the same
  - b.  some new ones were added
  - c.  some originally validated tasks were found to be no longer valid
  - d.  some previous tasks, which originally were not considered valid, were validated during the revalidation
  - e.  other comments
- Q8. In analyzing the results of the revalidation survey, did you use the same software package or method as used for the original JTA?
- a. Will your agency share the software?
    - 1.  Yes
    - 2.  No
    - 3.  Not feasible
- Q9. Referring to the written survey of February 6, 1987, to which you responded, did you experience any legal challenges concerning your job-task analysis on the revalidation, and, if so, please provide results and disposition. If you responded affirmatively, do you have further comments that may help us formulate our survey?

(Continued from p. 3-3)

RESPONSE DATA

Follow-up Telephone Questionnaire  
March 1987

For questions, refer to p. 3-4.

Question No.:	Q5		Q6	Q7					Q8		Q8a			Q9	READER'S NOTES
	a	b	Data* on File	a	b	c	d	e	Data* on File	Yes	No	Yes	No	N/F	
CONN.		20%	p.3-8	X										X	
FLA.		10%	p.3-8	X							p.3-9			X	
KY.	X		p.3-9	X						X	p.3-10			X	
MASS.		300%	p.3-9					X	p.3-9	X				X	p.3-10
S.C.		75%	p.3-9	X							X			X	
TEXAS	X		p.3-9	X							p.3-10			X	

\*NOTE: If a section-page number appears in any column, additional information will be found on the page number as indicated. Otherwise, no data were provided.

RESPONSE DATA

FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE SURVEY  
"Data on File"

- NOTE: 1. This section outlines the responses which correspond to the "Data on File" columns of the matrix entitled: Follow-up Telephone Survey, pages 3-3 and 3-5.
2. If a comment is preceded by "U/C" it is an unsolicited comment which the respondent considered relevant.

Q No.	State	Response
Q1	MASS.	DURING THE ORIGINAL JTA, DID YOU USE AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE JTA AS IT PROGRESSED?  (Yes). (U/C). The JTA in 1979 is not considered a JTA in the strict sense. Being dissatisfied with the results, we consider it no longer appropriate. Accordingly, the RJTA completed in 1986 is also not an RJTA in a strict sense; rather, it was completely restructured, did not address the 1979 study, and actually serves more as an original JTA or follow-up study than as a revalidation.
	TEXAS	(No). (U/C). Staff members reviewed the progress.
Q2	FLA.	DURING THE REVALIDATION, DID YOU USE AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE?  (No). (U/C). The analysis was not an RJTA in the usual sense as it was approached with completely different methodology. The agency used two approaches:  (1) In selected, representative agencies, supplemental surveys were sent to a different class of officers than were used on the JTA. These included officers on the job for two or more years (original JTA included one year or less), training officers, executives, etc. It was determined that tasks remained unchanged.

Q No.	State	Response
Q2 cont'd.	FLA. cont'd.	(2) The second approach involved a workshop. Again, from selected agencies, a group of officers, somewhat beyond entry-level, were assembled for a workshop. The group addressed the tasks and performance standards, assessed individual tasks for accuracy and appropriateness, and whether each was actually performed by entry-level officers. They considered the JTA to be valid.
Q2b	CONN.  MASS.	<p>(IF APPLICABLE) IF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY, [BETWEEN THE JTA AND RJTA] EITHER BY POSITION OR NUMERICALLY, DETERMINE THE CHANGES AND REASONING.</p> <p>The JTA originally was intended to establish job specification and a bank of 200 questions for job applicants. Due to problems with test items, a second opinion was sought in the form of a revalidation. A new consulting firm was contracted to assess the questioned validity of the JTA. Because questions were raised about the JTA, it was decided that, in the interest of uniformity and validity, it was best to appoint a different steering committee. The RJTA also focused on development of training rather than job specifications for applicant testing.</p> <p>The original JTA was performed by a consulting firm. During the RJTA, we decided we had qualified personnel from in-house and from the criminal justice community to serve on the committee.</p>
Q3	MASS.	<p>DURING THE REVALIDATION, DID YOU USE THE ORIGINAL JTA SURVEY DOCUMENT AS THE BASE FOR YOUR REVALIDATION?</p> <p>(No). We considered the original JTA to be inadequate, therefore, we developed completely new instruments.</p>

Q No.	State	Response
Q3 cont'd.	S.C	(No). Completely new instruments and questions were developed. [Note: See Q16, Section 2 of this report in the original written questionnaire, for additional information and explanation.]
Q4 & Q4a	<p>FLA.</p> <p>MASS.</p> <p>S.C.</p> <p>TEXAS</p>	<p>DURING THE REVALIDATION, DID YOU ADD ANY NEW QUESTIONS TO THE SURVEY WHICH WERE NOT ON THE ORIGINAL JTA? IF YES, HOW DID YOU DETERMINE OR DEVELOP THE NEW QUESTIONS?</p> <p>Some changes were made in the wording, but did not add new tasks.</p> <p>From studies in other states, subsequently reviewed by subject-matter experts.</p> <p>New questions were developed. Consultants provided the new questions. [Note: See Q3 above, and Q16 in Section 2, for more details.]</p> <p>The same functional areas were used, but some tasks were reworded for more specificity.</p>
Q6	<p>CONN.</p> <p>FLA.</p>	<p>HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS TO BE SURVEYED DURING THE REVALIDATION AS OPPOSED TO THE NUMBER SURVEYED DURING THE INITIAL JTA?</p> <p>The new consulting firm (not the same firm that conducted the original JTA) considered 100 officers to be sufficient, numerically, for the RJTA survey. However, due to questions previously raised concerning validity of the JTA, the new firm decided to be on the safe side, and surveyed 300 officers during the RJTA.</p> <p>The agency was advised by the local university which did the item analysis that at least 50 people would be required to maintain validity. The agency then decided to survey 500 officers to assure that not less than 50 responses were received for each of five, separate survey instruments for a required total of 250 personnel.</p>

Q No.	State	Response
Q6 cont'd.	KY.	In order to assure statistical consistency in the RJTA, the decision was made to replicate as exactly as possible the methodology which was used in the JTA; therefore, we surveyed approximately the same number on both analyses.
	MASS.	It was decided that we should survey all officers who completed the basic academy during a given period.
	S.C.	The target population was the graduates of basic training during a one-year period. The number of graduates determined the survey numbers.
	TEXAS	Both the JTA and the RJTA involved volunteers and, based on the nature of the two requests for volunteers, the numbers in both instances were about equal.
Q7		<p>AS A RESULT OF YOUR REVALIDATION, DID YOU DETERMINE THAT THE VALIDATED TASKS: (Check all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Remained about the same.</li> <li>b. Some new ones were added.</li> <li>c. Some originally validated tasks were found to be no longer valid.</li> <li>d. Some tasks which originally were not considered valid were validated during the revalidation.</li> <li>e. Other comments.</li> </ul>
	MASS.	(e) Since the first JTA was considered inadequate, comparisons were not made. [See Q3 for more information.]
	KY.	a. The RJTA reconfirmed the validity of the initial JTA.
Q8	FLA.	<p>IN ANALYZING THE RESULTS OF THE REVALIDATION SURVEY, DID YOU USE THE SAME SOFTWARE PACKAGE OR METHOD AS USED FOR THE ORIGINAL JTA?</p> <p>(No). (U/C). The software changed partly because the original was available from only one vendor, but mostly because the methodology involved in the RJTA was quite different than in the original.</p>

Q No.	State	Response
Q8 cont'd.	KY.  TEXAS	(Yes). (U/C). S.A.S. was used on both analyses.  (No). (U/C). During the JTA, the language used was CODAP (Comprehensive Data Analysis Program). The RJTA was performed by a private contractor, and the information is not available.
Q9	MASS.	DID YOU EXPERIENCE ANY LEGAL CHALLENGES CONCERNING YOUR JTA OR RJTA? PLEASE PROVIDE DISPOSITION OR COMMENTS.  Experienced several challenges relating to the curriculum, mostly relating to physical training. The curriculum challenges may relate back to the JTA but are not directly connected at this time. The original JTA was performed by a consulting firm.

WRE/vn  
042387