2013

Entry Level Assessment Center (ELAC) Predictors for Success as Law Enforcement Officers: A Pilot Study

Patrick Oliver
Cedarville University, poliver@cedarville.edu

Michael W. Firmin
Cedarville University, firmin@cedarville.edu

Entry Level Assessment Center (ELAC) Predictors for Success as Law Enforcement Officers: A Pilot Study

Patrick Oliver
Michael W. Firmin
Cedarville University

On multiple levels, predicting future success of aspiring law enforcement officers has proven challenging. Aamodt (2004) notes that significant challenges face researchers attempting to make accurate and meaningful predictions regarding police officer successful outcomes, based on empirical findings and data. Meta-analyses have shown varying levels of success, but the practical barriers of multiple variables, sampling issues, data collection consistency and follow-through, politics in some locales, and a lack of agreed upon final outcomes have made the endeavor to be particularly challenging.

Sproule and Berrley (2001) indicate that use of multiple measures typically enhances the predictive value of the screening techniques when selecting police officers. That is, rather than depending on a single variable (e.g., psychological testing), the use of multiple methods, such as ratings, observations, and behavioral performances, overall provides more accurate predictions of who will and will not ultimately success in law officer roles. Additionally, collecting data at various points in time also tends to enhance predictability—compared to appraisals a single point in time. And finally, length of criterion time affects predictability. That is, predicting who will succeed in the police officer job often is more difficult when attempting to forecast success, as the years of service increase, such as ten years after an initial hire.

White (2001) notes that multiple modalities of appraisal impact the predictive value of law enforcement selection. That is, not only do multiple measures enhance the selection process, so does the utilization of multiple techniques. For example, role playing exercises can capture a different subset of information than can, say, pencil & paper psychological testing. Similarly, the administration of a polygraph can yield a different quality of information regarding a potential recruit than does, say, a written questionnaire. The wider the modalities utilized in screening procedures, the theory goes, the better the police agency will be able to tap data of most significant use. Non-evasive appraisal methods, such as questionnaires or past employment records (Day, Davis, & Hill, 2009), when available and feasible to implement, have some advantages over evasive appraisal methods, including expense, time to administer, practice effects, and reliability of information obtained.

De Meijer, Born, Terlouw, and Van Der Molen (2008) draw attention to the fact that multicultural sensitivity is essential to consider when conducting future police officer selection. Various ethnic groups and culture groups share traditions, customs, and practices that deserve appropriate sensitivity when making appraisals regarding who and who will not succeed in future law enforcement positions (Shiraev & Levy, 2004). Researchers also must be cognizant of potential past and present discrimination or prejudice that explicitly or tacitly may impact police officer success.

Our present study undertakes an appraisal of a program designed to predict success in future law enforcement officers. We utilized a variety of both methods as well as modalities, and data was collected at various cross-sections of time. Our sample consisted mostly of Caucasian police officer hires, due to the nature of the available, although it included minority officers from three cultural backgrounds. As a pilot study, we utilized one time period as the basis for appraising the criterion for success, due to the grant requirement and need to report initial results. Nonetheless, we consider this a pilot study, with

tracking the officers in subsequent years as a possibility for future research as part of an ongoing, longitudinal project.

Method

Participants

Five pilot agencies were selected for participation based on their various sizes and types as a reasonably representative sample of Ohio's law enforcement. This variance was also based on the hypothesis that all law enforcement agencies regardless of agency size or type screen for a consistent set of job-related attributes. The following departments participated: Columbus Division of Police (CPD), Ohio State Highway Patrol (OSHP), The Ohio State University Police Department (OSU PD), the Montgomery County Sheriff's Department (MCSD), and the Zanesville Police Department (ZPD). These agencies agreed to participate in the study because they believe that their respective hiring accuracy potentially could be improved from knowing the results of the study. Each department was provided with access to the research findings and recommendations.

A group of newly hired law enforcement candidates from each pilot agency participated in this research project (n=109). The average age of candidates from the sample was in 28 years old. Demographics included mostly males (95), Caucasian (92), with a high school education (68). Some candidates possessed an associate or baccalaureate college degree (37), prior law experience (26), previous military experience (12). Minority candidates included African Americans (9), Hispanic (3), and Asian-American (2).

Procedure

The project objective was to determine whether the use of an Entry Level Assessment Center (ELSA) could predict enforcement candidate performance on particular job related dimensions. We hypothesized that candidates who received assessment center "readiness" ratings of 59% or better would be later rated as better as better officers during basic training, field training, and up to the conclusion of their probationary period, than would candidates who received lower rankings. This assessment was made by comparing the consultant's ELSA ratings to ratings made by each candidate's FTO or supervisor during their performance evaluations on job related dimensions.

A group of Ohio law enforcement management consultants developed a profile of each law enforcement candidate's knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and traits—utilizing an Entry Level Assessment Center (ELAC). The law enforcement agencies then evaluated their candidates during each candidate's time of service up to the conclusion of their one-year probationary period.

The ELAC was developed from research grant funding as a means of appraising common successful behaviors and traits for law enforcement officers regardless of agency size or type. The candidates were evaluated after having been hired, but before basic academy and/or field training. The overall evaluations by assessors were compared to basic training, field training, and job performance.

Through the ELAC, each candidate participated in Written Problem-solving, Fact-finding, and Leaderless Group exercises in a single day. Between three and six assessors evaluated each candidate's performance in each exercises, using a Dimensions Inventory (DI). The order of participation in the three exercises varied across candidates. Subsets of the candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities also were evaluated by each assessor on the Knowledge, Sills, and Abilities Inventory (KSA). In the field, each candidate was rated weekly, throughout his or her probationary period by his or her respective FTO or supervisors, on both the DI and KSA. Most of the field evaluations were conducted by the FTO's.

Instruments

Written Problem Solving Exercise (WPSE). The purpose of administering the WPSE was to test the candidate's skill in perceiving a problem and then being able to gather sufficient data to document a solution to the issue. Critical to this process was the candidate's formal writing ability and the capability of translating mental processes into a documented form. The WPSE was designed for the candidate to formulate situational data and related facts into a workable plan of action in a specific time frame.

Fact-finding Exercise (FFE). The purpose of the FFE was to give the candidate an opportunity to demonstrate his or her problem-solving and decision-making abilities. The exercise provided the candidate with facts, information, or situational data which must be analyzed and/or interpreted. The

candidate was required to form opinions, make recommendations, and reach conclusions on the information provided. The candidate must make implement his or her recommendations within the designated time frame.

Leaderless Group Exercise (LGE). The LGE involved the candidates held a timed group discussion in which they attempted to reach a joint solution to one or more problems which were given to them by assessors. In these settings, the candidates displayed their potential organizational abilities through personal influence of others, the willingness to listen to the ideas of others, and the ability to negotiate a workable solution. An essential element of this exercise was a candidate's demonstrated ability to interact with others in a positive manner. The group discussion allowed assessors the opportunity to observe and evaluate candidate behavior in a group setting.

Dimensions Inventory (DI). The DI is a five-item instrument intended to assess the extent to which a candidate exhibits the desired behavior in the dimensions of Commitment to Service, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Problem Resolution, Written & Oral Communication, and Situational Proactive Control. Each item was assessed on a 5-point scale with anchors ranging from "inadequate" to "outstanding." A "not able to rate" option also was provided. The inventory was used in order to rate candidates' performance in each of the ELAC exercises as well as in the field. Reliability of the DI was assessed via Cronback's Coefficient Alpha. Analyses were conducted, both overall and also for each exercises, with relatively high levels of internal consistency (overall=.87; range=.79-.90).

Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Inventory (KSA). The KSA is a 16-item inventory intended to assess qualities thought to be requisite for successful performance as a law enforcement officer. Each item of the instrument is based on a 5-point rating scale, ranging from "much less than acceptable" to "much more than acceptable." A "not able to rate" option also was provided. The instrument was used to rate each candidate's level of the desired knowledge, skills, and abilities during the ELAC and in the field. Reliability of the instrument was assessed via Chronbach's Coefficient Alpha and was found to be relatively high (.90).

Potential Research Data Patterns

Data for the officers from the five respective agencies were collected both at the ELAC, at the Academy, and in the field. ELAC data consisted of assessor ratings of each candidate's responses to each of the three training exercises, as well as an assessment of each candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities. Ratings of candidates on the desired behavioral dimensions continued in the field, as did candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities. Additionally, candidates' final probationary period evaluations were collected for Ohio State Highway Patrol (OSHP). Similar evaluations were not available for other agencies.

Table 1 presents the average number of assessments made for the candidates of each agency, both during the ELAC and in the field. The training exercises are identified as "Fact Finding," "Written Problem Solving," and "Leaderless Group." Continued field assessment of the desired behaviors and traits is identified as "Post-test Dimensions." The EALC evaluation of a candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities is identified as "KSA Pre-test." Continued field assessment of a candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities is identified as "KSA Post-test." As is evident from Figure 1, a relatively large amount of data was collected, both during the EALC and in the field.

Analysis of the data indicate possible limitations in the Post-Test Dimensions and KSA Post-test data (i.e., collected in the field). During the data entry phase of the research project, three patterns of responses were noted. The first, Pattern A, involves FTOs or evaluators responding "0" (not able to rate) to most of the items on an instrument. This pattern of responding reduces the amount of information that potentially can be obtained from an instrument. On instruments with a substantial number of items, the amount of lost information is likely to be relatively small. On an instrument with a small number of times, however, the amount of lost information, when a single items is marked "0," can be more substantial.

Pattern B involves FTOs or evaluators responding with the same value across all items. For example, on a five-item form, a FTO or evaluators might respond with, say, 3, 3, 3, and 3. Naturally, responding in this fashion would make the task of completing forms on multiple candidates relatively quick and easy.

However, it also reduces the ability to differentiate among candidates. Pattern C involved what appeared to be some inconsistencies in responses over time. FTOs or evaluators sometimes rated the same candidates on multiple occasions. Although it was difficult to quantify, to what extent it may have occurred some FTOs or evaluators seemed to respond in patterns when rating the same candidate (it was more unlikely among candidates). This sometimes involved general upward trends for officers who improved with training, inverted Us for officers for those who peaked at some point in training, and those with U-shaped patterns (officers experienced a low point during the training period).

Of the three types of response patterns, A and B appear to have occurred the most frequently and had the most significant impact on the data. In particular, Pattern A occurred for 53% of the Post-Dimensional data and for 30% of the Post-test KSA CPD data. This means that significant proportions of the data were simply "missing" for CPD candidates. In fact, 13 candidates had 100% of their Post-Dimensions data missing, four had 80% missing and six had 60% - 70% missing. For any candidate, such high proportions of missing data resulted in an unreliable potential picture of that candidate's performance. Consequently, candidates with more than 40% of their respective post-test Dimensions or KSA Inventory data missing were excluded from all subsequent analysis.

Results

The goal of the research study was to determine to what degree scores from the ELAC potentially could predict law enforcement candidate performance on job related dimensions. To answer this question, we developed "percentage rank" scores for each candidate for both the Dimensions and KSA data. The Dimension Percentage Rank (DPR) scores were obtained in a multi-step process. For each candidate and each training exercise, sum scores were obtained by adding together the five items on the DI. The sum scores were then converted to percentage scores, by dividing each sum score by the number of values that comprised that score—multiplied by five, the maximum range of the DI scale.

This protocol produced multiple percentage scores for each candidate, one for each rater for each exercise. Within each exercise, the percentage scores were averaged across assessors, resulting in one percentage score for each exercise. Finally, a DPR score was obtained by averaging each candidate's three exercise percentage scores. Assessment center KSA, Post-test Dimension, and Post-test KSA percentage rank scores were obtained in a similar fashion. These scores indicate how, on average, the assessors perceived the candidate.

Percentage rank scores for the OSHP final evaluation data were obtained in a different percentage fashion. These data consisted of ratings of "Below Expectations," "Meets Expectations," and "Exceeds Expectations" on eight dimensions: Quantity of work produced, Quality of work produced, Timeliness, Team effort/Cooperation, Directing and coordinating the work of others, Dealing with demanding situations, Adhering to procedures, and Communicating with others. For each candidate, each rating was converted to a numerical score with below expectations equal to 1, meets expectations equal to 2, and exceeds expectations equal to 3. For each candidate, the eight numerical ratings were then summed and converted to percentage rank scores, following the procedure presented earlier. These scores indicate how the candidates were perceived by their FTSs or evaluators and the end of the one-year probationary period.

Once percentage rank scores were calculated for all available data, a three-categorized selection scale was derived, based on the following percentage rank ranges: Less than 59% = "Not ready," 59% - 75% "Currently Ready," and greater than 75% "Very Ready."

Once ELAC, field percentage rankings, and the final probationary rankings were calculated, they were compared. Figures 2 and 3 present the results for the assessment/FTO rankings.

Figure 4 presents these ratings for individual departments. Figure 6 presents the results for the assessor/probationary period rankings.

Figures 2 and 3 present the Dimensions and KSA Inventory Information, both overall and for each departmental designation, for candidates who remain employed with their respective law enforcement agencies. Column 2 of both tables presents the number of candidates (n) rated as being not ready, currently ready, and very ready by the ELAC assessors. The highlighted values on the diagonal represent ratings where FTO and ELAC rating are the same.

The Overall Ratings sections of Figures 2 and 3 show the overall level of agreement is not high for either the Dimensions (48%) or the KSA information (51%). Further, the Not Ready dimension of both tables indicates that the not ready designation accounts for most of this disagreement, with FTOs or evaluators rating over 80% of the candidates seen as not ready by the ELAC assessors as either Currently Ready or Very Ready. A much greater level of agreement occurred when ELAC assessors rated a candidate as currently ready. Here, agreement ranges from approximately 70% to 81%.

The same trends are repeated in the Departmental Designation Ratings sections of figures 2 and 3. Again, the overall level of agreement is not high, ranging from 44% to 50% for AOD and OSHP, respectively, for KSA information. The greatest level of ELAC assessor/FTO or evaluators disagreement occurred to the Not Ready designation. A range of 73% to 92% of those candidates rated Not Ready by the assessors were rated as either Currently Ready or Very Ready by the FTOs.

As might be expected, much greater levels of agreement occurred when the ELAC assessors rated a candidate as Currently Ready. The percentages of agreement ranged from 68% (OSHP Dimensions) to 91% (OSHP KSA information). The Very Ready category results continued with the same kind of "mixed" picture of agreement/disagreement. For the Figure 2 Dimension data, complete agreement was obtained regarding the number and percentages of candidates who were Very Ready, whereas, for Figure 3 KSA data, there was complete disagreement. In both instances, the number of candidates identified as Very Ready was small (1 and 2, respectively).

Figures 4 and 5 present the Dimensions and KSA data for each department. As might be expected, CPD and OSHP demonstrate the same agreement/disagreement trends present in Tables 2 and 3. MCSD, OSU PD, and ZPD vary somewhat from these trends: Irrespective of assessment center assessor ratings, candidates in these agencies were rated as Currently Ready or Very Ready by their respective FTOs or evaluators.

As previously noted, 24 candidates separated from service to their respective agencies. Available information indicated that these separations occurred for various reasons: Ten candidates separated for personal reasons, four were due to injury, two were due to firearms qualification failure, and two separations were due to administrative dismissals. Given that an important function of any hiring assessment process is the identification of individuals not likely to succeed, attention is warranted regarding how effective the ELAC process was at identifying individuals who were likely to self-select out or to be terminated from service.

Figure 6 presents the correspondence between the ELAC assessors' ratings for both the Dimensions and KSA Inventories and the candidates' reasons for separating. Generally, the process seems to have accurately identified the people in this candidate pool who were likely to fail. Of the four candidates who separated because of firearms disqualifications and/or administrative removal, three were identified as Not Ready in both the Dimensions and KSA data. Additionally, candidates rated as Currently Ready or Very Ready by ELAC assessment center assessors tended to separate almost exclusively for personal reasons or injury.

Figure 7 presents the correspondence between the assessment center assessor's ratings and the final probationary evaluations for currently employed OSHP candidates for both the Dimension and KSA data. As was true for the FTO or evaluators ratings, the overall level of agreement is not high, for either the Dimensions (43%) or the KSA (54%) data. Again, the Not Ready category accounts for most of this disagreement. A range of 90% to 95% of the candidates rated as being Not Ready on the Dimensions and KSA data by the assessment center assessors were rated as being Currently Ready at the end of their probationary period. More agreement occurs when the assessors rate candidates as being Currently Ready or above. The percentages of agreement ranged from 85% (Dimensions) to 90% (KSA data).

Discussion

We hypothesized those candidates who received percentage rank scores of 59 % or higher would be rated as better officers by their FTOs or evaluators than were candidates who received lower percentage rank scores. The results of this study provide support for this hypothesis. When candidates receive such scores, there is general agreement that they are ready for law enforcement service across both the Dimensions and KSA data, thus supporting the hypothesis.

However, when candidates receive ELAC percentage rank scores less than 59%, FTOs and probationary supervisors strongly disagree with these assessments. Indeed, FTOs or evaluators agreed that these candidates were not ready for law enforcement service less than 19% of the time. Probationary supervisors disagreed even more, indicating that, at most, these candidates were not ready for service 11% of the time.

A number of possible explanations exist for the disparity between ELAC and FTO/supervisor ratings of the not ready for service category. One possible explanation is that the disparity reflects the differing amounts of information available to assessor and FTOs/supervisors. FTOs and supervisors deal with the candidates over extended periods of time. Consequently, these individuals' evaluations are based on larger samples of behavior. FTOs and supervisors may also be considering factors associated with successful performances that are not identified by the assessment center instruments.

A second, possible explanation is that the disparity may reflect a difference in focus. Traditionally, law enforcement screening procedures have focused on identifying candidates who demonstrate aberrant behaviors that are likely to result in job failure. FTOs or evaluators carry this screening process into the field where they, too, focus on identifying individuals who display aberrant behavior. The ELAC approach applied in this study had a very different focus. Assessment center assessors sought to identify and select individuals who possessed the traits, behaviors, knowledge, skills, and abilities thought likely to lead to success as law enforcement officers. Both of these perspectives are necessary, but they are not necessarily complementary. To this degree, they likely will lead to different decisions about who will and will not make a good law enforcement officer. This, if high levels of agreement are to occur (predicting law officer success), and then there must be prior agreement among all those involved in selection and training regarding the primary area(s) of focus.

A disparity also was evident between the assessors' and FTOs'/supervisors' ratings for the Currently Ready category. As high as 23% of the candidates, who were judged as being Currently Ready by the assessors, were judged as being Not Ready by the FTOs/supervisors. Again, the amount of available information and focus of evaluation are likely to underlie this disparity. What the disparity also suggests, however, is that judgments as to who is likely to be a successful officer cannot be made on the basis of ELAC data alone. The assessment center provides an informed prediction as to which candidates will be successful. This prediction must then be substantiated by continued field training and evaluation. Together, these two processes are likely to result in the selection of better officers than is relying on either process alone.

Finally, it appears that ELAC rankings may be useful in identifying candidates who are likely to require administrative separations from service. In these data, approximately 75% of those who separated for firearms qualification failure or administrative removal received ELAC rankings of Not Ready. Additionally, those candidates who received assessment center assessor rankings of Currently Ready or Very Ready separated almost exclusively for personal reasons or injury. Studies of much larger groups of candidates would need to occur before a definite link could be established between ELAC rankings and administrative separations from service.

Limitations and Future Research

All good research identifies the limitations of a study and reports weaknesses of the research (Price & Murnan, 2004). While the present sample of 109 individuals was sufficient for the level of analysis presented in the present article, we consider it entirely a pilot study. The present funding grant allowed for a sample of Ohio agencies and future research should focus on larger, regional samples—or optimally, a national sample of law enforcement agencies. While we believe the present study possesses a measure of external validity (to the degree that other police agencies reflect the demographics of the present one), clearly a broader sample will allow for more robust generalizations.

As noted, most of the participants in the present sample were Caucasians. Future researchers should expand the study, utilizing samples with more substantial numbers of minority representation. Obviously, minority groups differ significantly among one another on multiple dimensions (Mio, Barker-Hackett, & Tumabing, 2006). Consequently, researchers should give attention to potential difference among various minority groups, rather than simply comparing differences between "minorities" and "non-minorities."

We note the potential of the Hawthorne effect at work with the present research participants. This is a phenomenon occurring in some research endeavors when subjects know beforehand that a study is being conducted. Sometimes they do not act the same as they would in other situations, when they believe they are not being studied. Naturally, potential ethical principles require careful exploration whenever subjects do not provide upfront, informed consent. University IRB boards may not approve such research designs, although the possibility should be investigated in any event.

And finally, as previously noted Patterns B and C had some level of impact on the findings in the present study. Future researchers should be more keenly aware than we were at the time of data collection for the potential of eventual "missing data" among supervisors and others working in the field. Naturally, law enforcement officers and supervisors lead busy professional lives and experience a variety of competing demands for their time. Eliciting full cooperation, including plenary support from agency administration, should be part of the study's design from the outset, when securing population samples. As previously noted, we compensated for missing data, at points, via removing cases with 40% (or greater) of participants with missing data. Future researchers are counseled to lower the amount of unusable data in future studies.

References

Aamodt, M. (2004). *Research in law enforcement selection*. Boca Raton, FL: Brown Walker Press.

Day, G., Davis, R., & Hill, B. (2009). *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 24*, 108-112.

De Meijer, L, Born, M., Terlouw, G., & Van Der Molen, H. (2008). Criterion-related validity of Dutch police-selection measures and differences between ethnic groups. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 16,* 321-332.

Mio, J. S., Barker-Hackett, L., & Tumabing, J. (2006). *Multicultural psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Price, J. H., & Murnan, J. (2004). Research limitations and the necessity of reporting them. *American Journal of Health Education, 35*, 66-67.

Shiraev, E., & Levy, D. (2004). *Cross cultural psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sproule, C. F., & Berley, S. (2001). The selection of entry-level corrections officers: Pennsylvania research. *Personnel Management, 30*, 377-418.

White, R. (2001). Ask me no questions, tell me no lies: Examining the uses and misuses of the polygraph. *Public Personnel Management, 30*, 483-493.

Figure 1

Average Number of Assessments Per Candidate for Each Law Enforcement Agency

	Dimension Assessments				**KSA Assessments**		
Law Enforcement Agency	***Fact Finding***	***Written Problem Solving***	***Leader-less Group***	***Post-Test Dimensions***	***KSA Pre-test***	***KSA Post-test***	***Total Number of Assessments***
CPD	4.84	4.95	4.88	4.44	4.49	9.67	19.12
MCSD	5.00	5.00	5.00	28.50	5.00	30.00	43.50
OSHP	3.05	3.00	3.00	1.10	3.00	3.84	10.16
OSU PD	3.00	2.60	3.00	9.00	2.80	9.00	17.60
ZPD	12.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	13.00	18.00

Figure 2

Correspondence of Dimensions Inventory Assessment Center Assessor and FTO or evaluators Ratings for Currently Employed Candidates

Assessment Center Assessor Ratings Dimension Inventory Ratings		**FTO/ Supervisor Dimension Inventory**		
Rating Category	*n*	*Not Ready n (%)*	*Currently Ready n (%)*	*Very Ready n (%)*
		Overall Ratings		
Not Ready	27	**5 (18.52)**	16 (59.26)	6 (22.22)
Currently Ready	33	5 (15.15)	**23 (69.7)**	5 (15.15)
Very Ready	1	0	0	**1 (100.00)**
		Department Designation Ratings		
AOD				
Not Ready	12	**1 (8.33)**	9 (75.00)	2 (16.67)
Currently Ready	14	2 (14.29)	**10 (71.43)**	2 (14.29)
Very Ready	1	0	0	**1 (100.00)**
OSHP				
Not Ready	15	**4 (26.67)**	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)
Currently Ready	19	3 (15.79)	**13 (68.42)**	3 (15.79)
Very Ready	0	0	0	**0**

Note: Data for four currently employed candidates are missing.

Figure 3

Correspondence of KSA Inventory Assessment Center Assessor and FTO Ratings for Currently Employed Candidates

Assessment Center Assessor KSA Ratings		**FTO/ Supervisor KSA Inventory Ratings**		
Rating Category	*n*	*Not Ready n (%)*	*Currently Ready n (%)*	*Very Ready n (%)*
		Overall Ratings		
Not Ready	36	**6 (16.7)**	24 (66.67)	6 (16.67)
Currently Ready	43	7 (16.28)	**35 (81.40)**	1 (2.33)
Very Ready	2	0	2 9100.00)	**0**
		Department Designation Ratings		
AOD				
Not Ready	17	**3 (17.65)**	13 (76.47)	1 (5.88)
Currently Ready	22	5 (22.73)	**16 (72.73)**	1 (4.55)
Very Ready	1	0	1 (100.00)	**0**
OSHP				
Not Ready	19	**3 (15.79)**	11 (57.89)	5 (26.32)
Currently Ready	21	2 (9.52)	**19 (90.48)**	0
Very Ready	1	0	1 (100.00)	**0**

Note: Data for four currently employed candidates are missing.

Figure 4

Correspondence of Dimensions Inventory Assessment Center Assessor and FTO Ratings for Currently Employed Candidates by Department

Assessment Center Assessor Dimension Inventory Ratings		**FTO/ Supervisor KSA Inventory Ratings**		
Rating Category	*n*	*Not Ready n (%)*	*Currently Ready n (%)*	*Very Ready n (%)*
Columbus Police Department				
Not Ready	9	**1 (11.11)**	7 (77.78)	1 (11.11)
Currently Ready	13	2 (15.38)	**10 (76.92)**	1 (7.69)
Very Ready	1	0	0	0
Montgomery County Sheriff's Department				
Not Ready	1	0	0	1 (100.00)
Currently Ready	0	0	0	0
Very Ready	1	0	0	**1 (100.00)**
Ohio State Highway Patrol				
Not Ready	15	**4 (26.67)**	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)
Currently Ready	19	3 (15.79)	**13 (68.42)**	3 (15.79)
Very Ready	0	0	0	0
Ohio State University Police Department				
Not Ready	2	0	2 (100.00)	0
Currently Ready	1	0	0	1 (100.00)
Very Ready	0	0	0	0
Zanesville Police Department				
Not Ready	1	0	0	0
Currently Ready	0	0	1 (100.00)	0
Very Ready	0	0	0	0

Note: Data for four currently employed candidates are missing.

Figure 5

Correspondence of KSA Inventory Assessment Center Assessor and FTO Ratings for Currently Employed Candidates by Department

Assessment Center Assessor KSA Inventory Ratings		**FTO KSA/ Supervisor Inventory Ratings**		
Rating Category	*n*	*Not Ready n (%)*	*Currently Ready n (%)*	*Very Ready n (%)*
Columbus Police Department				
Not Ready	13	**3 (23.08)**	10 (76.92)	0
Currently Ready	20	5 (25.00)	**15 (75.00)**	0
Very Ready	1	0	1 (100.00)	**0**
Montgomery County Sheriff's Department				
Not Ready	1	**0**	0	1 (100.00)
Currently Ready	1	0	**0**	1 (100.00)
Very Ready	0	0	0	0
Ohio State Highway Patrol				
Not Ready	19	**3 (15.79)**	11 (57.89)	5 (26.32)
Currently Ready	21	2 (9.52)	**19 (90.48)**	0
Very Ready	1	0	1 (100.00)	**0**
Ohio State University Police Department				
Not Ready	2	**0**	2 (100.00)	0
Currently Ready	1	0	**1 (100.00)**	0
Very Ready	0	0	0	0
Zanesville Police Department				
Not Ready	1	**0**	1 (100.00)	0
Currently Ready	0	0	0	0
Very Ready	0	0	0	0

Note: Data for four currently employed candidates are missing.

Figure 6
Correspondence of Assessment Center Assessor Ratings and Reasons for Separation

Assessment Center Assessor Dimension Inventory Ratings		**Reasons for Separation from Service**			
Rating Category	*n*	*Personal n (%)*	*Injury n (%)*	*Firearms Qualifications Failure n (%)*	*Administrative Removal n (%)*
Dimensions Inventory Information					
Not Ready	6	3 (50.00)	0	2 (33.33)	1 (16 (16.67)
Currently Ready	12	7 (58.33)	4 (33.33)	0	1 (8.33)
Very Ready	0	0	0	0	0
KSA Inventory Information					
Not Ready	7	4 (57.14))	0	1 (14.29)	2 (28.57)
Currently Ready	9	4 (44.44)	4 (44.44)	1 (11.11)	0
Very Ready	2	2 (100.00)	0	0	0

Note: Data for four currently employed candidates are missing.

Figure 7
Correspondence of Assessment Center Assessor Dimensions and KSA Ratings with FTO final Probationary Evaluations for Currently Employed Candidates

Assessment Center Assessor Ratings		**FTO/ Supervisor Final Evaluations**		
Rating Category	*n*	*Not Ready n (%)*	*Currently Ready n (%)*	*Very Ready n (%)*
Dimension Inventory Ratings				
Not Ready	22	**1 (4.55)**	21 (95.45)	0
Currently Ready	20	3 (15.00)	**17 (85.00)**	0
Very Ready	0	0	0	0
KSA Inventory Ratings				
Not Ready	18	**2 (11.11)**	16 (88.89)	0
Currently Ready	22	2 (9.09)	**20 (90.01)**	0
Very Ready	1	0	1 (100.00)	**0**

Note: Data for one candidate is missing for the Dimensions data. Data for two candidates are missing for the KSA data.