

68-3/

# REPORT ON A CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS HELD JUNE 19 - 21, 1967

PREPARED FOR THE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



University Research Corporation Washington, D. C.



## REPORT ON A CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS HELD JUNE 19 - 21, 1967

PREPARED FOR THE
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

By:
Arnold S. Trebach
and
Richardson White, Jr.
University Research Corporation
1424 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

February, 1968

#### Preface

This report tells what happened at a conference on police-community relations held in June, 1967. It contains many suggestions on how to deal with police-citizen problems. The report also contains insights on the <u>process</u> of a training conference itself.

We have attempted to provide a portrait of the field of police-community relations within the context of a conference, rather than a black-and-white photograph. This is a report on the subject, not a set of conference proceedings. In the process of writing the report, of drawing the portrait, we have emphasized some points, de-emphasized others, criticized, and approved. Some of the criticism is directed at our own work, for we feel a professional responsibility to report our shortcomings so that we, and others, may do better next time. Criticism was also directed at others. We trust they share our professional approach in this regard.

All opinions expressed here are our own and we bear full responsibility for them. We welcome the comments of all those who read this report. They will be most helpful for the future.

We wish to express our thanks to the many persons who helped us in the conference and in the preparation of this report. Paul Estaver, our principal contact person and the project officer for OLEA, provided valuable guidance and assistance. Daniel Skoler, Associate Director, and Patrick Murphy, Assistant Director, OLEA, made major inputs of their talent and time. Lucia Hatch, of the URC staff, exercised her organizing skills in handling many of the arrangements for setting up the conference facilities and in editing this report.

Our thanks also go to the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, which prepared a bibliography of police-community relations materials, which was distributed at the conference.

Arnold S. Trebach, LL.B., Ph.D. President University Research Corporation Conference Chairman

Richardson White, Jr., M.S., LL.B Legal Staff Associate University Research Corporation

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Preparation	
	A. Pre-Conference Surveys	5
	B. Composition of the Agenda	8
	C. Preparation of the Evaluation	
	Design and Instruments	11
	D. Physical Accomodations	12
	E. Participants	12
III.	Conference Proceedings	
	A. Morning Session - June 19th	14
	B. Afternoon Session - June 19th	21
	C. Morning Session - June 20th	28
	D. Afternoon Session - June 20th	35
	E. Morning Session - June 21st	41
	F. Afternoon Session - June 21st	47
IV.	Evaluation	
	A. Introduction	52
	B. Topics Covered During the Conference	53
	C. Emphasis Given Conference Topics	59
	D. Effectiveness of Training Methods	61
	E. Facilities	66
٧.	Recommendations for Future Conferences	•
	A. Pre-Selected Topics	67
	B. Presentation of Pre-Selected Topics	69
	C. Topics Selected by the Conferees	70
	D. Organization of the Conference	71
	E. Conference Goals	72

#### VI. Attachments

- 74
- A. Agenda Questionnaire
- B. Biographical Questionnaire
- C. Conference Agenda
- D. Police-Community Relations Conference Survey
- E. Evaluation of Conference Resource Personnel
- F. Participants
- G. Federal Grant and Technical Assistance Programs
  Available to Police
- H. Preliminary Evaluation of Questionnaires
  Evaluating the Police-Community Relations
  Conference

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The National Crime Commission reported that the problem of police relations with the community, particularly the community residing in the inner city slums, is as serious as any which the police face today. 1 Earlier the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, recognized the imperative need to acquire greater knowledge and understanding of the problems which have alienated law enforcement agencies from the citizens whom they serve and to promote police capacity to deal effectively with them. OLEA therefore has supported research and demonstration projects to develop new methods for improving police and community relations. Many police departments, however, lack even the rudiments of a program for coping with citizen distrust and hostility. These include departments responsible for law enforcement in urban ghettos and slums where antipathy toward the police is greatest. Indicative of the degree to which many of these police forces are out of touch with their communities is their failure to establish community relations units or even to have assigned personnel part-time to develop communication with the community. In order to aid police agencies to lay the ground work for effective community relations programs, the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance established a special police-community relations development program. Under

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967), p. 99 (hereinafter cited as The National Crime Commission Report).

this program grants of up to \$15,000 are awarded to police departments in metropolitan areas with populations of 150,000 or more, to plan police-community relations projects. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, approximately thirty departments had received such planning grants.

Although aware of the need to better their relations with their communities, the recipients of these grants possessed little formal experience in developing or operating police-community relations programs. Nor were most either familiar with, or accustomed to, using sources of technical assistance and consultation outside of their department which could facilitate the planning process. OLEA therefore contracted with University Research Corporation to sponsor a training conference on police-community relations to be attended by representatives of the grantee-agencies and various resource personnel. The conference was scheduled for late spring -- June 19-21, 1967 -- shortly after the last of the grants was expected to have been awarded and before any of the projects had been in operation for a substantial period. Five objectives were sought:

- 1. To provide the grantees with basic information concerning police-community relations, including major issues, possible goals of community relations programs, various alternative means of attaining such goals, and problems likely to be encountered;
- 2. To provide a forum in which the police and civilian representatives of the grantees could use one another and outside consultants as resource people;

- 3. To create an awareness among the conferees of the advantages of working with one another on a common problem such as police-community relations;
- 4. To offer new insights into relevant aspects of human behavior, including police perceptions of the police role, and into problems associated with social change germane to police work; and
- 5. To suggest alternative strategies for setting up police-community relations units.

The remainder of this report describes the preparations which were made to achieve the conference's objectives and summarizes the principal topics and issues which were discussed. It concludes with an appraisal of the conference and offers recommendations for future action.

#### TT. PREPARATION

#### A. Pre-Conference Surveys.

A major element in setting up the conference consisted of an analysis of the relevant needs and characeristics of the grantee departments and of their expectations regarding the context and structure of the conference. It was anticipated that the information thus obtained would make it possible to develop an agenda which emphasized topics known to be of prime interest to most of the conferees. Subjects to which they were indifferent or antagonistic could be omitted or introduced more judiciously than would

otherwise be possible. Similarly, training methods which might be objectionable could be avoided. It also was hoped that by involving the participants in planning the conference, their interest in it, and commitment to making it a success, would be enhanced. Moreover, it was thought that the information would be useful in instructing the resource people not only in the particular issues to be covered but in the level of abstraction to use in their remarks.

The pre-conference information was collected in three ways: questionnaires were sent to all of the OLEA grantee-agencies invited to send representatives to the conference; URC staff made field visits to five of the grantees; and officials of OLEA and others experienced in police-community relations training were consulted.

Two questionnaires were used. One of these, the Agenda Questionnaire, 3 sought the invitees' views with regard to both the subject matter areas to be covered at the conference and the methods to be used in presenting material. In order to encourage responses, only seven questions were asked. The second instrument, identified as the Biographical Questionnaire, 4 requested such information as age, rank, educational attainments and the like. If the grantee department planned to send two representatives, both were requested to complete the form. Civilian representatives were asked to give comparable information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>These consisted of twenty-nine police departments and four non-police agencies which had received planning grants, and one department and two non-police agencies which had been awarded police-community relations action-project grants.

<sup>3</sup> See Attachment A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>See Attachment B.

The Biographical Questionnaire results were limited by the fact that only about one-third of the persons expected to attend returned completed copies. Those which were returned suggested that the participants varied widely in age, rank and education. They confirmed the assumption that none had been assigned officially to community relations work prior to the grant. Several had attended police-community relations seminars, however.

Eighteen, or nearly two-thirds, of the departments which had received planning grants returned completed Agenda Questionnaires. The responses varied greatly in length and detail, and the nature and function of police relations with the community were perceived quite differently in some cases. On the other hand, several patterns emerged. Virtually every respondent, for example, regarded improving communications between police and the community to be an important problem deserving discussion. This concern frequently was expressed as how best to explain the police position, but others saw the problem in terms of facilitating understanding on the part of the police as well as the community. Unorganized, riot-prone youths were seen as being particularly difficult to engage in meaningful communication by several. There tended to be agreement on the relevance of other problems as well. For example, a number suggested that it would be useful to discuss how to cope with the hostility or indifference of command or other personnel toward community relations In-service training was the most common solution recommended. Nearly all replied affirmatively to the question whether federal grant programs available to police and the techniques of "grantsmanship" should be reviewed.

Some seemingly significant issues were not mentioned, however. Although all but one of the grants to police departments technically were for planning community relations projects, for example, the process of planning was not proposed as a topic for discussion. Neither were the methods and problems involved in project evaluation. None suggested that police corruption, brutality and other abuses were relevant to the conference. When asked to describe programs which they considered successful, none of the departments indicated that they had modified their recruitment criteria, promotion or assignment policies, field interrogation techniques, or arrest practices as means of increasing public confidence and support.

However, because most of the projects had only recently started, few had either successful experiences or major problems to report. A number did list methods which they were starting or believed would be effective. Lectures to school children, creation of community councils, and lock-your-car and other public safety campaigns were among the techniques considered to be promising.

With respect to recommended training methods to be used at the conference, nearly all of the respondents favored small group discussions and many indicated that lectures and films would be useful. Over-lengthy lectures and role play were disapproved by several.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>For an examination of the relationship of such matters to police relations with minority groups and urban slum residents, see <u>The National Crime Commission Report</u>, Chapter 4, and the <u>President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force on the Police, Task Force Report: The Police</u>, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office (1967), Chapter 6.

URC staff also visited five departments which had received planning grants. 6 These departments were identified by the OLEA as being reasonably representative of the spectrum of problems and approaches to their solution The visits tended to confirm exhibited by the grantees. the results of the Agenda Questionnaire survey. community relations personnel in all five departments, for example, indicated that they spend the bulk of their time contacting various neighborhood councils, civic groups, businessmen's associations, minority group leaders and other influential persons to learn about citizen grievances, explain their department's position and where feasible, to assist in resolving them. Although the departments varied widely in the degree of concern exhibited, all expressed doubts about whether they were reaching the people most angry with the police. They were uncertain whether they were in contact with the real leaders of the ghetto populations, and in two cases acknowledged failure in this regard. Unorganized teenagers and young adults were described as being particularly difficult to deal with. Although the officers in two of the community relations units stated that they had the full support of the chief and the cooperation of the rank and file, the others admitted to some feeling of isolation and impotence within their own departments. The latter were eager to learn what other police-community relations units were doing to educate their departments to the importance of increased support for the police on the part of minority groups.

All the police-community relations personnel interviewed thought that the conference participants should have ample opportunity to discuss their common problems with one another and urged the use of small workshops

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Reports on these visits are submitted to OLEA under separate cover.

for this purpose. Movies, tape recordings and talks by experts were also suggested as useful supplementary techniques.

The results of the site visits and the surveys were discussed with the staff of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance and consultants to URC skilled in police-community relations work. These discussions were helpful both in evaluating the validity and representativeness of the information which had been collected and in interpreting its application to the goals of the conference. They also led to suggestions for resource people to be used during the conference.

#### B. Composition of the Agenda.

The topics selected for the agenda conformed closely to those identified in the Agenda Questionnaire survey and site visits as being of major interest to the grantee departments. Subject matter areas covered in half-day sessions included relations between the police-community relations unit and other elements of the department; the organization and operation of police-community relations training; and the identification of, and effective contact with, key groups and individuals in the community.

The development and evaluation of programs for hard-to-reach troublesome youth also was assigned a half-day on the agenda. Although the grantees had not indicated any special interest in program planning and evaluation, it was felt that this was due more to their lack of familiarity than to indifference or unwillingness to have these topics discussed. Because of their relevance to

<sup>7&</sup>lt;sub>See Attachment C.</sub>

the objectives of the OLEA planning grant, it was decided to include them on the agenda. Youth programs, a subject of known concern for many of the grantees, was selected as the context for their examination. Other subjects were allocated less than full half-day sessions. These included the OLEA police-community relations program, goals and strategies of police-community relations programs, sources of federal funds available to police, and the art of "grantsmanship."

In addition to determining the agenda topics it was necessary to decide how the topics could be presented. The pre-conference surveys suggested that the grantee representatives favored small group discussions, talks and films. 8 A combination of two of these techniques, small group meetings and lectures, promised to permit a balance between the competing goals of exposing the conferees to the thinking of knowledgeable and thoughtful resource people on the one hand, and of enabling them to learn from one another while working on common problems and sharing their experiences on the other. It was decided, therefore, that the basic organizational format of the conference would have three components. One would be plenary sessions at which one or two resource persons would each speak for about five to ten minutes to introduce the topic and then lead the ensuing general discussion. Second, following each such plenary session the conferees would divide into workshops. The third element would consist of relatively brief sessions at which the workshops reported their findings and conclusions to the full conference.

Four workshop groups, each consisting of about twelve members, were established. Assigned to each workshop

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>A suitable film was sought but could not be obtained.

were eight to ten grantee representatives, one or two resource persons, and one URC or OLEA staff member. encourage familiarity and informatilty the members were requested to meet as a group throughout the conference. Although it was expected that the workshops would continue to explore the topic opened up during the preceeding plenary session, it was left to each group to determine the subject matter to be discussed. As will be reported below, several of the workshops occasionally returned to problems raised in their prior meetings instead of addressing issues developed in the immediately preceeding ple-In order to encourage the active participation of the most experienced officers present, the chiefs and other high-ranking officials were asked to chair the meetings of the workshops to which they were assigned. They also were responsible for selecting one of their workshop members to report the groups' conclusions to the full conference.

The format of introductory lectures and general discussions at plenary sessions followed by workshops and workshop reports to the conference was followed throughout most of the conference. However, during the first morning of introductory statements, and again during the third afternoon when federal funding programs and techniques for preparing grant applications were described, it was replaced by relatively formal presentations followed by questions and answers. The Attorney General also appeared and spoke briefly to the conference late in the afternoon of the second day. Other minor departures from the agenda occurred as the result of changes requested by the conferees.

A device used to promote informality, flexibility, and participant involvement was the scheduling of an open

forum during one evening. During this session the floor was open to all present to raise whatever subject they felt to be worthy of discussion. Drinks at half price were available. Similarly, in order to enable the grantee representatives, the staff of URC and OLEA, and the resource people to become acquainted under congenial circumstances a reception was held on the evening preceeding the first working session. The reception was given at the home of the Conference Chairman, Dr. Arnold Trebach.

#### C. Preparation of the Evaluation Design and Instruments.

An elaborate assessment of the results of the conference was not attempted. However, in order to obtain some systematic, if incomplete, understanding of the conference's accomplishments and shortcomings, two types of data were collected. One of these consisted of the responses of the grantee representatives to brief paper-and-pencil questionnaires administered at the beginning of the first working session and again at the close of the final session. 9 These questionnaires sought to determine the extent and direction of change in the participants' perceptions of the topics covered during the conference, whether and what they had learned during the conference, which sessions they felt were most productive, and what suggestions they had for improving the conference. Lack of time and funds did not permit either pre-testing of the instruments used or extensive analysis of the findings.

The second method used to assess the impact of the conference was to tap the opinions of the resource people.

A questionnaire was prepared as a guide to their responses,

<sup>9</sup>See Attchment D.

<sup>10</sup> See Attachment E.

but they were not required to confine their remarks to the topics listed. While the results of this poll are not susceptible to systematic analysis, they offer insights not available through the objective tests administered to the grantee representatives. They also provide a relatively impartial assessment through which to filter the impressions of URC staff.

#### D. Physical Accomodations.

The conference was held at a mid-town hotel in Washing-ton, D.C. The police officials and civilan employees representing the grantee departments together with the out-of-town resource people were housed at the same hotel. It was hoped that this arrangement not only would facilitate starting the sessions on time, but also would promote informal contacts among the conference participants.

The plenary sessions were conducted in a large room in which the conferees were seated at tables arranged in the shape of a rectangle. This space was separated by a moveable partition from a second large room which was used as a dining area and as a location for one of the four workshop groups. The other workshops met in smaller rooms nearby.

#### E. Participants.

Two of the departments which had received planning grants were unable to send representatives because of sudden emergencies. Seven departments sent two delegates, the expenses of the second representative being borne by his department. The Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., which does not have a police-community relations grant, sent an officer to several sessions of

the confernce. Representation from a police department and from two non-police agencies which had received action-project grants also were present.

Twenty-nine police officials and five civilians representing twenty-eight departments attended. These included two chiefs and one director of public safety, eleven with the rank of deputy chief, inspector, major or captain, eleven lieutenants and four sergeants or corporals. Thus, most of the departments were represented by middle to upper echelon officials. One of the twenty-eight departments sent both a police officer and a civilian, and five other departments were represented by civilian employees only. Five non-police agencies, such as human rights commissions, sent a total of seven representatives. Altogether, therefore, twenty-eight police forces and five non-police agencies were represented by twenty-nine police officers and twelve civilians. 11

Conference staff included five full-time and eight part-time resource people. Two of the consultants were police chiefs and a third was a lieutenant and one had retired from his department with the rank of captain. Three officials of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance attended the conference, one of whom was present at all times. Three URC staff were on hand throughout and two others were present for portions of the conference. Conference staff, therefore, totalled twenty-one as compared with forty-four persons representing grantee departments and agencies.

<sup>11</sup> See Attachment F for a list of participants.

#### INI. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

A. Morning Session - June 19th

#### Introduction and Welcome

Arnold S. Trebach, President University Research Corporation

The chairman opened the conference by welcoming the participants. He noted that the conference had been organized with the help and advice of the conferees and explained that the agenda topics had been selected as the result of a preconference survey and field visits to five departments. He emphasized that the conference was to be an informal, working meeting, and stated that the program could be modified if the participants so desired. A description of the procedures which would be followed during the plenary sessions, workshops and other portions of the conference concluded his remarks.

#### Welcome

Daniel Skoler, Associate Director Office of Law Enforcement Assistance U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Skoler asserted that problems of police-citizen relations are among the most critical facing law enforcement during this decade and indicated that they constituted an area of prime concern to the Department of Justice. The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance has awarded a number of grants to facilitate the development of better techniques for dealing with these problems. As the participants here are aware, these grants include those to support the planning of community relations programs in major cities throughout the country.

A responsible federal program, he noted, does not simply give out funds and then absolve itself of responsibility for the effective use of that money. Instead, it attempts to the maximum extent feasible to aid its grantees to achieve their projects' objectives. In keeping with its continuing obligation, OLEA sponsored this conference to give the recipients of police-community relations planning grants an opportunity to become familiar with each others' problems, to exchange ideas and to hear the suggestions of knowledgable persons in the field.

### Police-Community Relations Program of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Officer Office of Law Enforcement Assistance U.S. Department of Justice

Attempting to cope with police-community relations problems is not only challenging but frustrating, Mr. Estaver observed, because they must be dealt with largely on a pragmatice rather than theoretical basis. The field is so new that there are few successful precedents to follow. Another complicating factor is that police-community relations is a game without winners. Unlike baseball, on which most Americans were raised, no one wins and no one loses. Instead, the best one can achieve is greater mutual understanding and cooperation.

Despite obstacles such as these, police must develop the competence needed to deal with the difficult problems of community relations. Moreover, this competence must be generated internally within the department rather than by bringing in people from the outside to do the work. If this is done it will contribute to the professionalization of the police field. For this reason OLEA generally has awarded police-community relations grants to police departments rather than to human rights commissions and other such agencies.

The conference will provide an opportunity to acquire greater understanding of the issues in police-community relations and of various approaches to their resolution. Mr. Estaver closed by urging the conferees to participate actively in all its sessions.

<u>Plenary Session: Goals and Strategies of Police-</u> Community Relations Programs

Patrick V. Murphy, Assistant Director Office of Law Enforcement Assistance U.S. Department of Justice

Determining the goals and strategies for a police-community relations program, Mr. Murphy pointed out, requires the same basic approach as is needed to cope with most problems confronting the police. We must find out what we really want to know. Only if we raise the right questions will the answers come.

One publication which raises many of the right questions It is extremely is the National Crime Commission's Report. critical of our law enforcement system. But by identifying and scrutinizing the many basic problems in the police field, it does a great service to the police. It demonstrates that an individual police officer's daily decisions are as demanding in judgment and skill as those made by any professional. therefore supports the proposition that law enforcement should be a profession. The police officer, for example, should be educated at the college level and provided with proper training He should be able to move up by transferring to a higher position in another department instead of having to wait for openings in his own department. Also, there should be a constant flow of ideas between police forces in different cities and police should be able to visit other departments throughout the country.

But today these are not happening. The police world is a closed one with little communication within it. We are isolated and defensive. We constantly point out how the community fails to support us, fails to provide sufficient funds, and fails to cooperate in enforcing the law. All this must change. Just as the Crime Commission asked many of the right questions, so must we.

In dealing with the community, we also must learn to look at things differently, to ask the right questions. Although no city has an ideal police-community relations program, many cities are working on the problem. We must look at each one for ideas. In examining these programs, we should recognize that their goals are likely to differ depending on the problems within the particular city. Among the possible goals of a community relations program are: preventing riots; keeping the peace; helping the community police itself; improving communication with the community, particularly those members who are poor, unemployed or delinquent; converting the chief to the need for a strong police-community relations program; converting other officers within the department to this new way of thinking; and converting the mayor, the city council and other sources of power in the community.

In any event, we must learn to look at ourselves and our problems afresh, and to realize that the word today is change, change, change.

#### General Discussion: Goals and Strategies of Police-Community Relations Programs

Several of the issues which were raised in the ensuing discussion cropped up again during other sessions of the conference.

1. Do we know what the ideal police-community relations

program is? The conferees responded to this question in two different but related ways. One response was that we do not know what an ideal police-community relations operation is any more than we can say what an ideal law enforcement system is. It was suggested that policing a democratic society is too new for an ideal pattern to have emerged. However, in a democracy the police should help the community police itself. Police-community relations, therefore, are the essence of law enforcement in our society and the recent recognition of their significance constitutes an emerging awareness of what law enforcement should be. At present, of course, police are not only ineffective in helping people police themselves, but are frequently influenced by political and corrupt forces within the community.

Other conferees suggested that while we may not know what the ideal police-community relations program is, we do have some ideas of what it is not. The police-community relations unit, for example, should not operate in isolation from the rest of the department, nor should it attempt to build an empire for itself. One participant indicated that his unit attempted to avoid these dangers by functioning as program development staff instead of an operations staff. finds out what the problems on the street are, devises a program to deal with them and then plugs the new program into the department's operations. Other conferees pointed out, however, that to function in this manner it is necessary to have the full cooperation of the chief and other top officials. For them, the problem of isolation is the absence of support from the command levels in their department. It was asserted that only when they have succeeded in converting the brass to the idea of a police-community relations unit will they be able to influence the rest of the department.

2. What are the goals of police-community relations? Related to the question of whether the ideal police-community relations program is known is the issue of what such a program's goal or goals should be. The representative of one department with relatively extensive experience in policecommunity relations indicated that his unit's aim was to have people understand the problems of their police. It was objected that selling the police point of view is too limited an objective, and that police-community relations is a twoway street. Not only should the community better understand the difficulties police encounter, but the police should be more aware of citizens' problems and grievances. Another participant re-phrased the goal first asserted: we must get people to give their cooperation. The response again was that before people will give their cooperation, the police must learn what their problems are. If you are willing to sit and listen, you'll learn how to get their support. But if you start with the assumption that everyone must obey the law before being listened to, you'll tend to lecture rather than listen.

Tension reduction was suggested as a possible goal. Some objected that easing tensions is not enough, while another participant asserted that it may well be an essential short range goal of police-community relations efforts. For example, forestalling a possible riot is a legitimate aim of a police-community relations program even though other long range goals also may be appropriate. Police-community relations programs thus have multiple rather than single aims. In addition to variation over time, such program objectives are likely to vary with the needs and problems of the particular community, it also was pointed out.

While acknowledging the need for plural goals, a resource person suggested that an overall goal for law enforcement

should be greater integration into the affairs of the community. The police should be so much a part of their community that they become its weathervane, pointing to solutions to general community concerns. In particular, they should explain to the taxpayers that crime cannot be reduced significantly unless they are willing to reduce poverty, unemployment, bad housing and similar conditions causing crime. He acknowledged that this goal is not currently accepted by police. This qualification was emphasized by a police officer who then stated that the police goal is the reduction of crime.

3. What is "the community" -- how do you "reach" it -and why do you reach it? While there was general agreement that a police-community relations program should establish contact with the community, there was some disagreement as to which groups and individuals in the community were meant by "the community." One participant, describing his program, stated that members of the clergy, political leaders, shop keepers and other such persons were the ones sought to be involved in meetings with the police. Finding people sympathetic to the police is not a problem, it was added. conferee observed that involving traditional leadership of the type described was not enough, and that his program attempts to enlist the support of beauty culture associations, barbers' unions and similar groups which tend to exercise greater influence over people who are hostile toward the police. It was pointed out that the police often find themselves enforcing middle class mores rather than the law, and tend to be dominated by business interests at the expense of the poor, minority groups and other less influential segments of the community. Thus, although the police may be in contact with the sources of economic and political power in the community, it was suggested that

these contacts may tend to isolate them from the very groups and individuals where cooperation in law enforcement is most needed.

Assuming that contact has been made, however, and that the object is to help them police themselves, what does this mean? One answer given was that if police need witnesses, pressure can be applied through citizens' groups to bring the witnesses to the police. Another participant suggested, however, that attempting to generate pressure to inform is ultimately self-defeating, since it tends to undermine the leadership of those in sympathy with the police over those who are hostile toward the police.

#### B. Afternoon Session - June 19th

Plenary Session: Relations Between Police-Community Relations Unit and the Police Department

Resource Person: Chief William Smith
Police Department, Syracuse, New York
Resource Person: Professor Raymond T. Galvin
School of Police Administration
Michigan State University

Chief Smith opened the session with a brief statement. He pointed out that to be effective, the philosophy of police-community relations must pervade the entire department from top to bottom. The chief, command officers, detectives, patrolmen, all must be convinced of the importance of police-community relations objectives. Training and planning are two areas where it is crucial for the police-community relations unit to operate. Training may require convincing the chiefas well as instructing the men on the street, but there are no easy answers to how this can be done. With

respect to planning, it is essential to discover the community's needs. This will necessitate citizens' coming to you, or if that doesn't work, you must go out to them. In Syracuse, the police department made contact with the people by publicizing a procedure for registering complaints against its officers.

A participant described a program which his city, Chicago, had introduced to receive complaints from persons dissatisfied with police service. Another conferee suggested, however, that a police-community relations unit should be problem-oriented rather than complaint-oriented. That is, it should deal with general issues in police relations with the citizenry rather than the specific grievances concerning individual officers. The representative of another department was of the opinion that it was useful to have the police-community relations unit receive complaints, but not be responsible for investigating them since this would be likely to jeopardize the unit's standing with other members of the department.

Professor Galvin spoke next. He observed that the issue for discussion is not relations between the police-community relations unit and the department. A department may not have a police-community relations unit. It may only assign a man half-time to police-community relations work, for example. Instead, the issue is relations between police-community relations functions and other functions of the department. A police department, of course, has many functions in addition to developing and maintaining citizen support. Crime detection and suppression, for example, are functions which most police regard as their basic responsibilities, even though traffic control, licensing, inspection and other regulatory activities generally consume a far greater proportion of their time. All these other functions, however, are community

relations. A major goal of the police-community relations unit, therefore, must be to establish goals, identify problems, and devise procedures and policy to deal with them which will enable the department to foster public cooperation and understanding while at the same time implementing its other functions. In short, as Chief Smith also pointed out, planning must be one technique of the police-community relations unit.

In addition, the police-community relations unit must be involved in training. All department personnel must be trained to handle community relations problems and to recognize their importance. The staff of the police-community relations unit itself must be trained in the application of the science of human relations. Also, of course, the chief has to be sold on the value of police-community relations. Only if this can be accomplished will the unit be able to influence departmental policy and procedure. Field practices and personnel management such as recruitment criteria, promotional standards, and assignments should reflect considerations of police-community relations.

These inter-related functions of planning and training mean that the unit should operate in a staff rather than line capacity. Execution of plans developed by the unit should be the responsibility of the entire department.

In closing, Professor Galvin noted that police-community relations units can expect to experience difficulties in attaining their objectives. One of the most serious will be role conflict. Every unit visited in the course of conducting a study for the National Crime Commission was found to be troubled by the conflicting responsibilities of building trust on the one hand and enforcing the law on the other. In one case, for example, an officer confesses that when he attended meetings in the community he could not avoid looking for needle-scarred arms and dilated pupils. Should he as a police officer close

his eyes to evidence of law violation? This conflict in roles is not confined to police-community relations units but is a problem for all police. They also must develop trust and support within the community. The solution is not to give up the law enforcement role but to temper it with an awareness of the need to take a long-range point of view. Ignoring the needlemarks, for example, may lead to greater community confidence and cooperation and to a greater willingness on the part of people to report crimes, act as witnesses and otherwise aid law enforcement.

#### General Discussion: Relations Between the Police-Community Relations Unit and the Department

A number of suggestions for strengthening a community relations unit's relationship with its department were made during the general discussion. It was recommended, for example, that the officer in charge of the unit should be of relatively high rank, such as captain. This will enhance the chances of the unit's programs being carried out and increase the respect given the men in the unit by the other officers in the department. Another participant stated that he and the man in his unit spend a lot of time in the squad room in informal contact with the line officers. "In this way they come to know and respect us as individuals and this carries over into their attitudes toward our work," he pointed out. Several departments make a point of inviting patrolmen. sergeants and higher officials to attend meetings with citizens' groups. department this is official policy, actively endorsed by the chief.

Recruit and in-service training in police-community relations is practiced by several of the departments represented at the conference. One or two, for example, indicated that all ranks get this kind of training. Other departments implied

that their training program was more limited. One officer, for example, said that he and his men frequently attend roll calls to explain his program and alert the patrolmen to community problems.

The question of how training in community relations should be conducted was raised. One police officer stated that you can't train effectively in the academy but must move the classroom into the ghetto. "You've got to show the men how to talk to the people who are tough to reach -- not the ministers, but the kids with the marcelled hair." A conferee reported that a department, not represented at the conference, had attempted such a program but without success. Another conferee stated that you can't scuttle 100 percent of your training and go into the streets. Others expressed interest in the approach but questioned whether it could be made to work.

A resource person observed that there is little official inducement for police officers to practice good community relations. The failure to recognize such activity combined with the fact that the officer who has a record of good "pinches" or who hands out a lot of traffic citations is rewarded, tends to downgrade the duty to develop good relations with the public. It was urged that departments add community relations to the list of activities which are officially regarded as important, and to discourage the traditional distinction between crime prevention and building good relations with the community. Winston Salem and Chicago police departments are reported to be doing this.

One other technique for increasing support for the policecommunity relations unit was offered: a conferee stated that his unit plans to publish a newspaper to report on its activities, relevant policy developments in the department, problems in the community, and similar matters. Instead of distributing it to the men while on the job, it will be mailed to their homes so that their families also will become better informed. The effectiveness of this method was questioned.

The discussion of methods for improving the influence of the police-community relations unit within its department led to a re-examination of how to reach the community. representative from St. Louis described the assignment of police-community relations staff to multi-service centers located throughout the inner city. Police-community relations officers meet regularly with area residents at these centers. A resource person added that the opportunity to discuss one's problems with a sympathetic listener is helpful and that in his experience police can be effective in this role. Several participants disagreed. They argued that "just going to listen to people tell you their troubles doesn't do any good. You must be able to help them solve their problems. Although they may listen for awhile. if the department doesn't respond they find out and get disgusted." In New Haven the police department is a member of an inter-agency council which coordinates the city's social services. The police refer citizens with problems beyond the capacity of the police to the appropriate agency represented on the council.

A resource person criticized all the methods mentioned. He pointed out that the concern shown by police-community relations officers is seldom representative of the entire department, with the result that their efforts usually are rendered worthless. Only if the chief is committed to the idea of police-community relations and has the full support of his department will a community relations unit be able to operate effectively.

#### Workshop Reports: Relations Between the Police-Community Relations Unit and the Department

Workshop No. 1 reported that it had several recommendations to offer. First, police-community relations units should be given full divisional status. The formation of youth or juvenile divisions in many departments is a relevant precedent because the officers assigned to this kind of work experience many of the same problems within their departments as do community relations officers. Second, officers who reduce tension in the community should be rewarded. incentives are policeman-of-the-year awards, salary increases, and promotions. One difficulty, however, is the problem of how to measure tension reduction. One possible device with which Rice University is experimenting is periodic social surveys. The workshop also recommended that in-service and recruit training courses in community relations be given. It also suggested that the training units and the community relations units be combined so as to eliminate competition.

Workshop No. 2 reported that its members presented a wide spectrum of viewpoints and that it had focused more on identifying problems than in working out methods for reducing them. One difficulty police-community relations units have, for example, is demonstrating their effectiveness. "With departments as shorthanded as they are, how can you justify going out and shaking hands? On the other hand, how do you measure the cost of not trying to achieve better relations with the community?" Another problem is how to instruct patrolmen. "They think it's a lot of social work. How do you overcome this attitude?"

The third workshop reported that police departments tend to go through three developmental stages with regard to their dealings with the public. During stage one they tell the citizen to mind his own business and get out; in stage two they manipulate the truth; and in the third stage they try to do right and tell it openly. To get to stage three, police must bring in better educated people, must recruit minority group members and promote them, must get police-community relations training down to the officer on the beat, and must contact the youth who cause most of the trouble.

Workshop No. 4 had several suggestions for improving the effectiveness of a police-community relations program. It recommended hiring and training teenagers to conduct lock-your-car and similar public safety campaigns. It also reported a successful summer camp program for slum children in which the children were encouraged to make their own rules and run the camp so far as possible. The workshop recommended that police-community relations units accept and refer complaints, but indicated that its members were divided on the issues of whether the unit should process complaints against police officers. It noted, finally, that the wholehearted support of the command is needed before a community relations program can succeed.

#### C. Morning Session - June 20th

Plenary Session: Organization and Operation of Police-Community Relations Training

Resource Person: Drexel Sprecher
Leadership Resources, Inc.
Resource Person: Professor Frank Cizon
Director of Research, School of Social Work
Loyola University

Professor Cizon opened by pointing out that training may be directed to three major groups: the police-community relations personnel, the other officers in the department, or the community. What strategies you use in conducting the training, such as how often it is given, the direction of

each session, the length of the training, who the trainers are, and so forth, will vary depending on the group being trained.

Mr. Sprecher suggested another consideration to be kept in mind when conducting a training program. "People do not like being forced into something. They do not like having their noses rubbed in it. When you bring together members of two minority groups like the police and Negroes, for example, they generally feel coerced into the situation and tend to turn off their hearing." "This conference itself has some elements of manipulation despite its official overlay of democratic process," he observed. "People are more likely to listen and learn if they've had a hand in deciding what's to be taught." He illustrated the point by requesting the participants to form into groups of three members each. All of the groups were asked to answer two questions: What is the most difficult problem in police-community relations work; and what is the most successful experience you've had in this connection? groups were given 5-6 minutes to come up with their answers. Mr. Sprecher than called on every group in turn to tell him its answers. As each group gave its responses he wrote them down on a large sheet of paper, which he then hung on the wall. Both he and Professor Cizon provided brief clarifying commentary on the groups' replies. Most of the groups responded to the second question by suggesting conditions needed to insure success rather than by giving successful experiences.

Group No. 1. Problem: the belief of other officers in the department that police-community relations makes a social worker out of a cop. Success: an incident in which a group of Negroes had willingly and constructively discussed their grievances with the police.

Group No. 2. Problem: the image which police officers have of themselves as being apart from the community. Success: a high-ranking police officer who doesn't just delegate responsibility

for handling community relations problems but meets with community leaders himself.

Group No. 3. Problem: resistance to police-community relations training by most officers. Success: placing a recruit under the supervision of a good field officer.

Group No. 4. Problem: police-community relations program was forced on the department by outside pressure. Success: when a police-community relations unit takes a realistic view of the department's expectations.

Group No. 5. Problem: veteran officers are particularly resistant to change, and all of the officers are suspicious of non-police trainers. Success: when there is a core of men in the department who vigorously support the police-community relations program.

Other problems mentioned by the groups included the following:

- 1. Hostility of police academy trainers;
- 2. Lack of experience and absence of suitable training materials;
- 3. Negative attitude of the officer toward any kind of training which is required;
- 4. Difficulty in defining areas of responsibility of police and community representatives in police-community relations training;
- 5. Tendency of people in general as well as police officers to relate the significance of a problem to the funds budgeted for a program to deal with it.

Among the other suggestions for a successful program were the following:

- 1. Train recruits in psychology and sociology;
- 2. Use attitude scales to survey the public's attitudes on various matters;
- 3. Involve all officers in the department in police-\*\* community relations training;
- 4. Use group sessions to allow police officers to discuss problems within the department;
- 5. Have the police-community relations unit use good public relations techniques, such as are employed by the F.B.I., to improve the image of the policemen.

After the reports were completed, Professor Cizon led the discussion. He pointed out that a training program must take account of individual differences among the trainees, the particular needs of the department which the training program in intended to meet, and the level and areas of competence of the trainers. Thus, every training program should be unique to at least some degree, because what is effective in one situation may not be in another. "You cannot plug into your department a training program that was used elsewhere, no matter how successful it may have been. Every program must be geared to meet your needs."

With respect to the program's trainees, for example, it is important to determine which of the men have negative attitudes, the content of these attitudes, the reasons for them, how they may be changed, and so forth. In Professor Cizon's experience, the proportion of hostile trainees is usually about 15-25 percent of the group. However, they often seem

to be in greater strength because they tend to make a disproportionate amount of noise. Generally about the same proportion of the group is very interested in community relations, while the remaining 50-60 percent fall somewhere between these extremes. While it sometimes is possible to change the attitudes of the hostile, authoritarian members of the class, Professor Cizon has found that they generally are more authoritarian after the program than before. It may be better strategy, therefore, to concentrate on persuading the large, uncommitted group than struggling with the authoritarian types. Although the latter can be troublesome in the program, their destructive influence tends to dwindle as the group gradually becomes dissatisfied with them.

It is also important to take into account the training capacity of your department. The training unit may just be starting and lack experienced trainers; it may be under-financed or short of staff; it may be allowed too little time to do an effective training job. "In short, don't take a program which someone else has developed and apply it blindly in your department. The chances are that it will need modifying to fit your needs."

Also to be avoided is the "spotty" or "crash" training program developed in response to a crisis. While this type of program may help handle an immediate problem, it is an unsatisfactory approach for the long run. Training, and the development of training programs, should be on a routine, continuous footing. Moreover, it is useful to develop a comprehensive training plan which provides appropriate training for every rank in the department. This is the model developed by industry.

Professor Cizon noted that resistance to training is a common problem. No matter how excellent the training program may be, if the trainees are unwilling to accept it, it will fail. He requested suggestions for overcoming resistance. One conferee

suggested an attitude survey of the department to find out what the men had complaints about. Another recommended that training be entirely voluntary so that only those who requested it would be trained. Such a procedure, it was observed, would result in the training of those men who least need it. Moreover, it would tend to isolate the advocates of police-community relations from their peers and thus diminish support in the rank and file where it is weak to begin with. Payment as an incentive was suggested. One officer stated that his department not only pays its men to train but through an arrangement with a local university enables them to obtain college credit for certain courses.

It was suggested that resistance to police-community relations training would be reduced if the department was totally committed to strengthening its relations with the public. In this case, training merely becomes one expression of a policy which is implemented in various other areas of the department's activities. One would expect minimal resistance under these circumstances.

Another recommendation was to involve the officers who were to be trained in the planning of the training program. The tactic has been found to be effective in the District of Columbia police force where the training department selected two white officers known to be hostile and two officers from the police-community relations unit. The question was raised whether this would undermine the structure of authority.

Also suggested was that an officer with the highest possible rank be assigned to head up the police-community relations training. It was interjected, however, that it might be wiser to find an officer who could do the job most effectively. For example, he might be an officer who is highly respected as an individual apart from his rank, or someone who is not about to retire. (Not clear at this point was whether the head of the

community relations unit or of its training program was in issue.) It was added that his rank should be appropriate to his responsibilities and comparable to the rank of officers in charge of comparable units. Whatever his rank, one participant suggested, he should report directly to the chief.

The discussion returned to the question of how to overcome resistance among the men to police-community relations training. Four possible methods of getting them into such a program were The first is on-the-job training. That is, part of their regular duties the officers are assigned to attend training. They get paid their regular wages and work their usual hours. Because it takes men from their regular assignments, on-the-job training is often avoided by departments which are short of staff. The second is to train the men during overtime and compensate them with additional leave. This method may be unpopular if the officers have second jobs or are unable to use their compensatory leave when they want it. A varient of this is to pay them for the extra hours they are required to put into training. Fourth, ask for volunteers to attend training on their own time. The last is the least realistic. is most desirable, particularly if the department uses it as part of a comprehensive revamping of its community relations effort.

Professor Cizon ended the morning's session by briefly describing a number of training techniques.

- 1. Use visual aides to emphasize points of special importance.
- 2. Use small discussion groups. However, require the trainees to participate in the same group throughout the training program, because it takes a couple of sessions before they stop feeling one another out and begin to communicate. Moreover, the discussions should be structured and this requires well-trained discussion group leaders and overall coherence.

- 3. The program's sessions should follow one another in a logical sequence and have a continuity of content. Therefore don't use eight different speakers at eight different places in the program who talk about eight different and unrelated subjects.
- 4. Use follow-up sessions to reinforce points made during the training.
- 5. Evaluate the program. Use this feedback to refine and improve the program and as a basis for developing new programs.

#### D. Afternoon Session - June 20th

# Plenary Session: Reaching the Community

Resource Person: William Downs, President
Associate Services Incorporated
Resource Person: Professor William MacKenzie
School of Urban Studies
Loyola University

Mr. Downs opened the discussion by pointing out that while community relations programs must be concerned with the total community, it may be useful to distinguish subpopulations within the overall group and to develop specialized strategies to deal with them. Business leaders and others in positions of power, for example, may be used to effect changes helpful in coping with the problems of the disadvantaged whose cooperation is likely to be more difficult to obtain. It was suggested that "public relations" may better describe the approach to the white community, and "community relations" the methods for reaching the Negro community.

Professor MacKenzie described his experience in developing police-community workshops in the 18th precinct in Chicago. In this program the police worked with the Conference of Christians and Jews, with Negro groups and with the Puerto Rican community to establish workshops composed of natural community leaders. The Mayor, the Archbishop, heads of city departments and others in positions of power attend the workshops from time to time.

It is important, he pointed out, to give the minority group members the feeling that participation will lead to positive action by those in power and not merely promises. This has occurred in Chicago with the result that the people now help the police by supplying them with information. Such information has led to the recovery of weapons, the identification of a gang of thieves, and the prevention of gang fights.

## General Discussion: Reaching the Community

A number of participants indicated that they had had trouble reaching the grass roots community in their cities. In Newark, for example, it was found to be difficult to retain ongoing con-"Although people will meet with us after a child has been killed by an auto to demand that a stop light be put in, they go away after it has been installed." In Kansas City, Missouri, a conferee claimed that the grass roots leaders use the police as a scapegoat for all the city's social and economic problems and as a target for change around which to mobilize the community. They consistently criticize the police department, and encourage the people to refuse to cooperate with the police. The same problem arose in Rochester, its representative reported. However, in that city the police have managed to incorporate these leaders into the community council. The reasons for the different results in these two cities were not brought out.

A resource person stated that the discussion thus far failed to confront the basic problems which have alientated the police from the community. He argued that the only way to gain people's confidence and support is to eliminate police brutality, police corruption, racial discrimination in hiring, promotion and assignments, and other faults which in varying degrees exist in all police departments. He referred to the results of studies reported by the National Crime Commission to support his contention that these obstacles to public trust are a national problem and not confined to only a few depart-The validity of the Crime Commission's studies was vigorously challenged by another resource person. This participant agreed, however, that too often police departments are not fully committed to achieving sound community relations despite official policy to the contrary. In essence, "it is not what the chief says at the Kiwanis Club, but what the cop does in the alley that counts. The policy must be enforced and if brutality occurs, the offending officer must be fired. not just fined."

Mr. Downs and others suggested that militant grass roots leaders are strong because they build on the unfulfilled promises of the Establishment. Moreover, they benefit from the illusion that those in power are trying to silence them. "Therefore, you must take away their arguments by facing up to community relations problems, and by giving such people every opportunity to be heard. Police departments should open up and demonstrate that they have nothing to hide. Try to make everything you do visible. If someone wants to ride in a patrol car, for example, let him do it. If one of the criticisms of the police is brutality, then it should be dealt with." Departments should make sure that their men are well informed as to what police brutality is, what it means to the community, and how the department will deal with it if it should occur.

Upon resumption of the session, the chairman suggested that police departments employ subprofessionals as one means of strengthening their relations with the community. He noted that other agencies besides the police commonly experience difficulty in communicating with their constituents and that subprofessionals had been used effectively to bridge this gap. He briefly described the New Careers model and the programs which are supported under the Scheuer Amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act.

Several of the departments represented had experimented with subprofessional aides. The Dayton police, for example, are using the "White Hat" program, previously developed by the Tampa police force. Its application in Dayton resulted from the efforts of a state representative who had assembled a group of about fifty teenagers and young adults to discuss their grievances during a period of incipient riot. A disturbance occurred outside the meeting and the youths rushed out into the street. The state representative, however, succeeded in getting eighteen of the boys back into the meeting. from the ensuing discussion was the decision to permit the youths to assist in trying to cool off the situation in their neighborhoods. As a symbol of their new responsibility, and to enable the community as well as the police to distinguish them from other youth, they were given white helmet liners and cards identifying them as members of the Dayton Police Youth The boys patrolled in groups of four, and according to the Dayton representative at the conference, helped stabilize a dangerous situation.

The fact that the Youth Patrol was exposed to considerable danger of physical injury prompted the comment that careful consideration should be given to defining the role of the subprofessional and that he should not be expected to perform tasks beyond his competence. Moreover, several participants questioned whether it was sound to expose untrained youth to physical danger.

If subprofessionals are to be used in a role in which the risk of injury is high, it was urged that they be covered by medical and life insurance.

A Detroit representative reported that his department has used teenagers to find lost children, report damaged stoplights, missing signs, abandoned cars and other traffic hazards, help children register their bicycles, and so forth. At the present they aren't on the Department's payroll, but it is hoped that most will qualify for the Department's cadet program. Another city was reported to use gang leaders to control gangs, and in Chicago subprofessionals are used as housing aides. The St. Louis representative stated that the majority of calls for police assistance from ghetto neighborhoods are for reasons other than enforcement and could be handled by properly trained and supervised subprofessionals.

Despite these encouraging experiences in using subprofessionals, it was noted that police departments traditionally have resisted admitting outsiders. Police-community relations units should anticipate and attempt to neutralize this resistence when planning to use subprofessionals. Resistence from the department probably is more likely than from the community, although there may be problems of acceptability here also. It was reported that the boys at first were accused of being "Toms," but during the next summer there was competition to get into the program. That city's representative felt that if the youngsters feel they are being trusted with real responsibility and are not double crossed, and if they're given a stake in what they're doing, they'll do a good job and enjoy doing it.

The chairman identified the problem of employing persons with criminal records in police departments. This is an important consideration in developing subprofessional jobs in law enforcement, because most of the potential candidates will have been arrested one or more time. It appeared to be the consensus

that persons who have been convicted of a felony could not be hired. There also was considerable doubt concerning the likelihood of employing someone with a felony arrest record. However, the Kansas City, Missouri representative stated that such a person would be hired by his department if an investigation indicated his probable innocence. Misdemeanors and less serious juvenile offenses probably would not present a serious hurdle, at least in some departments.

Before bringing the session on reaching the community to a close, the chairman briefly listed the guidelines for establishing a New Careers program.

- 1. Develop a detailed job description of the proposed subprofessional role which meets the needs of your department, is within the capability of the persons expected to fill it, and is integrated with the roles of the officers with whom he will be working.
- 2. If the job description is approved, set up a system for recruiting and selecting the aides.
- 3. Develop a training program aimed at equipping the subprofessionals with the skills needed to perform the tasks outlined in the job description.
- 4. Develop a career line so that the subprofessionals will be able to move up to positions of better pay and greater responsibility within the department. This career line may lead into the regular police career structure, or it may require the development of a new, specialized and graduated set of jobs, such as within a community relations unit, which parallels the regular police career system.

## Address by the Attorney General

The plenary session then ended and the participants went to their workshops. However, the workshop sessions were cut short in order to meet with Attorney General Ramsay Clark. The Attorney General gave a brief talk in which he described various social, economic and demographic developments in our society which present special problems for law enforcement. He indicated that he regarded the problems of community relations to be among the most serious faced by the police today.

#### Open Forum

The Open Forum was attended by most of the conference staff and about half the departmental representatives. Some of each group left before the meeting concluded at 10:30 pm. As compared with the plenary sessions in which only a few are able or willing to speak, nearly everyone participated. The commends were outspoken and at times the discussion became heated. In keeping with the forum's spirit of friendly candor, notes were not taken.

### E. Morning Session - June 21st

# Plenary Session: Development and Evaluation of Programs for Youth

Resource Persons: Dr. Jacob R. Fishman, Director,
Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University;
Chief Consultant on New Careers, University Research Corp.
Dr. Hyman H. Frankel, Director,
Experiment in Higher Education,
Southern Illinois University;
Consultant, University Research Corporation.

Dr. Frankel opened the discussion by noting that the approach to developing youth programs has changed. Whereas

professionals used to treat problem youngsters as subjects for detached, objective study, they now join with them in establishing a dialogue in which the youth participate in identifying the conditions leading to their getting into trouble and help to devise programs to remedy them. Moreover, getting through to the youth has been found to be less difficult than is generally realized. "If you approach them in good faith, they will work with you and will provide insightful suggestions for coping with their problems." Successful youth programs generally are those which the youngsters have helped to develop and have a major responsibility for running.

Dr. Fishman outlined the principles for establishing youth programs.

- 1. Try to be as realistic and honest with the youth as possible. If you're mad, tell him.
- 2. Respect the youth's need for autonomy and independence. You must have the flexibility to deal with him on his own terms when necessary.
  - 3. Understand his need for status within his own group.

Identify the group's natural leader and use him as a vehicle for achieving your objectives.

- 5. Remember that your role is that of an advisor. The group must be doing the work, not you. One of the biggest problems you'll encounter will be giving the youth enough latitude to reject what you suggest.
- 6. Put the responsibility for themselves and their community in their hands.
  - 7. Orient the program so that it will prepare the youth to

move into a job leading to an employment career or other responsible community role.

Dr. Fishman indicated that these principles were developed through experimental projects undertaken at the Institute for Youth Studies and elsewhere, and that they are part of the New Careers concept. This concept, which is implemented nationally under the Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, aims at aiding unemployed, low-income persons to acquire the job skills and other capabilities needed to function effectively as aides to professionals in such fields as health, education, social service, child care, and law enforcement. The program differs from other employment programs for the disadvantaged by providing the training and job development needed to enable the trainee to move up from his entry level job into positions of higher pay and greater responsibility and eventually into a career line.

Although focused on helping the poor to help themselves through opening employment opportunities, the New Careers program also is intended to alleviate manpower shortages and enable the institutions in these fields to provide improved services. One of the major benefits found to date is that agencies using subprofessionals are able to communicate better with, and provide better services to, the people in the neighborhoods from which their subprofessionals are recruited. While experience in the law enforcement field is limited, it is consistent with this finding. Another advantage which agencies have discovered is that New Careerists tend to remain on the job. This contrasts with the costly and inconvenient high turnover rates associated with most dead-end, entry-level jobs.

Dr. Fishman concluded by summarizing the basic requirements of a successful youth program:

1. It must give the youth a meaningful role;

- 2. It must provide him with status; and
- 3. It should prepare him for movement into employment, or if that is not possible, into another type of responsible community role.

## General Discussion: Development of Youth Programs

It was pointed out that an important problem likely to be met in developing subprofessional roles for delinquent youth is restrictive civil service regulations, such as restrictions on employing persons with delinquency records, or the need to have a high school diploma or meet certain physical and health standards. These should be checked out before starting a youth program. Even if your department is unwilling to employ youth it is advisable to work with any agency which may have, or be developing, youth programs. In the District of Columbia, for example, the Metropolitan Police Department refused to become linked with a group called the Rebels with a Cause. While the Rebels were initially open to developing cooperative relations with the police, they are now actively anti-police.

## Evaluation of Youth Programs

Dr. Frankel briefly commented on the techniques of program evaluation. The reason for evaluating our programs, he pointed out, is to find out whether what we are doing works. To be able to do this, however, you have to know exactly what you are trying to accomplish. Sophisticated methodology is useless unless you have thought through and precisely defined the project's intended goals. You don't need an outside expert for this. You should be able to decide what you are trying to accomplish. Deciding the project's goals is the crucial phase of program evaluation. Before you can accurately define the project's objectives, however, you will have to define the problem

which the project is intended to correct. This usually means limiting the problem so that it can be dealt with realistically.

The third step in program evaluation is to develop and implement the means of measuring the project's accomplishments against the goals which it was intended to achieve. An expert should help you with this part of the evaluation process. once your project is running, conditions may arise which cause it to veer from the goals established for it, or the goals themselves may become redefined. These changes may be subtle, occurring gradually and before you are aware of them. Therefore, if you are to keep on top of these changes, to measure them or redirect the project back to its original design, you will need a continual feedback of information on what is happening to the project. Obtaining feedback is called monitoring, and you may need help in setting up and running a monitoring system. short, by following these four steps, identification of the problem, determination of what you plan to do about the problem, specification of the methods to be used, and monitoring, you will find that evaluation of the project is less formidable than it appears.

Lack of time prevented a general discussion of program evaluation.

# Workshop Reports: Development and Evaluation of Programs for Youth

Workshop No. 1 reported that it discussed projects which its members, police-community relations units, had tried and found to be helpful. One such project was to string a chain across a lovers' lane which had become a nuisance and source

of delinquency in the neighborhood. The unit had acted in response to citizens' complaints and having corrected the problem believed that it had strengthened the community's appreciation of the police. Another police-community relations unit succeeded in having the sanitation department remove trash from a lot with the same satisfactory results.

Workshop No. 2 stated that it had examined the problem of double standards in law enforcement, as issue which had been raised in the Open Forum the preceeding evening. While the principle that the law should be enforced impartially and without regard to race, social position or other consideration should be adhered to, there are occasions when exceptions may properly be made. Rather than run the risk of creating an inflammatory incident, for example, police should request a group of youth standing on the corner to move on instead of arresting them for loitering. Only if they appear to be deliberately blocking the sidewalk or annoying pedestrians or shop keepers should they be arrested. Similarly, an exception should be made to the enforcement of the curfew ordinance in the case of youngsters coming home from a dance or otherwise on the street for good reason.

The Workshop also had discussed riot prevention. In Trenton the police had established contact with community leaders. However, a riot nevertheless occurred, apparently because these leaders had little influence with the young adults and teenagers who caused the trouble. The report concluded by noting that the Workshop Chairman believed that the conference should have provided information on riot prevention.

Workshop No. 3 reported that it had considered the problems inherent in hiring delinquent youth and disadvantaged people by police departments. It pointed out that you cannot recruit many people with criminal records without losing recruits who have good backgrounds.

Workshop No. 4 also discussed the problem of employing ex-offenders. It is possible, for example, that the testimony of an officer with a criminal record could be impeached if he were to testify. The existence of this danger may mean that if subprofessionals are to be hired they should be used in roles other than law enforcement.

The Flint (Mich.) Police-School Liaison Program also was discussed. Prevention of delinquency and the greater respect for law enforcement are its major objectives. The program consists of assigning detectives to all junior and senior high schools in the city. They became well known to the students, faculty, parents and the people in the school neighborhood. They check out all complaints concerning the children in their school. This may involve conferences with the student or contacts with his parents. The School Liaison Officer also participates on a Regional Counseling Team whose other members are the principal, dean of students, dean of counseling, school community director and principals of the elementary schools that feed the junior high. The program is credited with having stopped vandalism and cut down on other forms of delinquency.

Workshop No. 5 reported that it discussed the problems created for police-community relations by programs aimed at upgrading law enforcement, such as higher educational requirements, replacing the foot patrolman with cruisers, and closing down precinct stations in order to achieve greater administrative efficiency.

F. Afternoon Session - June 21st

# Plenary Session: Federal Funds and the Art of "Grantsmanship"

Resource Person: Mr. Daniel Skoler, Associate Director
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
Resource Person: Mr. Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Offic
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance
Resource Person: Dr. Arnold S. Trebach, President
University Research Corporation
Resource Person: Mr. Richardson White, Jr.
Legal Staff Associate, University Research Corporation

The Chairman opened by explaining that the final session would consist of statements by several resource people. Although there would be an opportunity after each talk to ask questions, it would be necessary to limit them in order to cover all of the scheduled topics. Before introducing Mr. Estaver the chairman had distributed copies of two bills, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967 (H.R. 5037) and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967 (H.R. 6162), and a pamphlet entitled Federal Grants and Technical Assistance Programs Available to Police.

Mr. Estaver reviewed the role of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in the improvement of the administration of criminal justice. He characterized its activities as experimental jointly conducted by the federal government and local governments, in a field which is necessarily local. This relationship means that the grantor and the grantee have a common goal, the success of the project, and must work together to achieve it. OLEA's role is not that of doing favors, but of joining with local police departments and other agencies of the criminal justice system to bring about improvements in law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice.

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix G.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance attempts to encourage the development and testing of new ways of coping with crime and criminals. It therefore provides funds for projects which create, experiment with, test and domonstrate new knowledge and techniques. In addition, however, it also takes into consideration the need of a locality for improvements in its system of criminal justice. In the area of police-community relations, the factor of need is regarded as being as important as developing innovations.

Project evaluation is also an objective. Evaluation in this sense means as assessment, not of the problem the project is attempting to deal with, but of the project. The methods you propose to use in evaluating your project should be built into your application. When reporting on the effectiveness of your project, it is important that you be factual and candid. Progress in improving the administration of criminal justice can be achieved only if failures as well as successes are reported.

The next speaker was Dr. Trebach, who outlined the approach to follow in preparing grant applications. "It is most important that you state clearly and succinctly what you propose to do. You should assume that you are communicating with an agency which is unfamiliar with your situation and must have it described before it can understand what you are trying to do. On the other hand, do not try to describe in detail everything that you think that you might do. If approved, your application is a commitment by you to undertake every activity set forth in the proposal, so be sure you indicate only those things that you actually are prepared to undertake."

"The budget is very important. Be sure that it adequately reflects your needs. Ask for as much as you realistically think your costs will be, but be prepared to do some negotiating. You

may find that the grantor is unwilling or unable to allocate as much money as you have requested. In that case, do not try to do too much with too little. Instead, scale down your project so that the money available will cover what you need to do."

Mr. Skoler reported on the status and principal provisions of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. previously titled the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, only recently was reported out of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. The legislation would establish a grant-in-aid program to reduce crime and improve the administration of criminal justice, and is to be administered by the Department of Justice. Title I authorizes grants to States. units of local government, or combinations thereof for the purpose of preparing, developing or revising law enforcement and criminal justice programs. Title II authorizes grants to carry out the programs developed under Title I. Title III authorizes grants to, or contracts with public and private agencies to conduct research, demonstrations or training. It repeals and supercedes the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Title IV provides for the administration of the legislation. 13

Mr. White introduced the topic of federal assistance available to police by pointing out that the pamphlet Federal Grants and Technical Assistance Programs Available to Police had been prepared from material obtained directly from federal agencies and from information given in the Catalogue of Federal Assistance Programs. The Catalogue is recommended as an excellent source of information on federal programs, and

available at no cost from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Although the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act and

<sup>13</sup>Mr. Skoler's remarks will not be reported in greater detail owing to the substantial modifications made to the bill before being passed by the House. See H.R. 5037.

the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, when passed, will be most directly relevant to the law enforcement agencies, a number of other sources of federal grants and technical assistance already exist for which police may qualify. These include, for example, the Model Cities program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in that the reduction of crime and delinquency through comprehensive programs for rebuilding and restoring slum areas is an explicit objective.

The Community Service Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 is also available to police. The program supports university-based research and training projects which aid in the solution of community problems. Sixteen institutions have conducted seminars and workshops for police, including conferences on police-community relations.

Other federal programs of particular relevance to police which were briefly outlined were the Crime and Delinquency Program of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Work-Experience Program administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and three programs run by the Department of Labor: New Careers, Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Program.

The conferees agreed to dispense with the workshops, and during the coffee break completed the post-conference evaluation schedule. After concluding remarks by the chairman, the conference ended.

#### IV. EVALUATION

## A. <u>Introduction</u>.

The substantive content of the conference has just been summarized. Earlier the preparations leading to the conference were described: recognition of the need to assist urban police in the planning of police-community relations programs; the decision to call a training conference for this purpose; specification of the conferees' objectives; development of the various methods for achieving these aims, including involvement of the grantees in planning the conference, selection of the conference topics and the various methods to be used in their presentation; recruitment and orientation of the resource personnel; and the handling of a variety of essential, if mundane, administrative details. Remaining to be examined is the meaning of the conference, the relevance of its preparation to its outcome and its implications for the future. Were the goals which the conference sought to achieve appropriate when measured against the needs of the grantee-participants? Assuming the validity of the conference's objectives, was the subject matter selected for presentation consistent with them? Were the methods employed to present these topics effective? What did the conferees learn and was it consistent with the conferees' aims? What kind of follow up, if any, should be attempted? to these questions will provide an estimate of the return on the investment of skills, time and money required to put on the conference.

Conclusive answers, of course, cannot be given. Indeed, elaborate and expensive techniques for the collection, tabulation and interpretation of conference data would have been needed if an assessment with even a reasonably high order of probability was to be made. As previously indicated, an evaluation of this nature was not attempted. Instead, some limited information was

collected from the grantee-representatives, the resource people and URC staff. These data permit an instructive, though necessarily preliminary, appraisal of the conference. In this section these data will be reviewed and tentative conclusions regarding various aspects of the conference offered.

## B. Topics Covered During the Conference

A basic question is whether the subject matter selected for consideration during the conference contributed to the aims of the conference. Three objectives of the conference are relevant in this regard: to familiarize the participants with the basic information in the field of police-community relations; to provide them with insights into human nature and social change; and to provide suggestions for possible ways of setting up a police-community relations program.

The principal method for selecting the conference topics, it will be recalled, was to poll the departments and agencies prior to the conference regarding the subject matter areas in police-community relations which they deemed important and deserving of consideration. In addition to this method, site visits were made to five police-community relations units, and OLEA staff and other experts were consulted. However, the principal criterion against which conference topics were selected was the express concerns of the invited grantees.

Available evidence indicates that the topics which were covered during the conference were those which the conferees regarded as important. One source of data is the observations of the conference consultants. All but one of the resource people 14 who considered the question believed the conference topics generally covered the basic concerns and interests of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Eight resource people, including all those who attended the entire conference, were asked to submit written evaluations of the conference. Seven complied.

the participants. The exception consisted of an individual who attended only one day of the conference and therefore disqualified himself on this point. Second, the conferees themselves provided evidence that they were satisfied with topics selected.

Before the conference began, the police officials and other grantee representatives were asked to indicate how much emphasis they would like to see placed on each of fourteen topics during the conference. The fourteen included all the major agenda items, as well as four which could more accurately be described as basic goals of the conference. 15 All fourteen items were rated by more than half of the representatives (23 of 37) as deserving either "some emphasis" or "much emphasis," and seven of the topics were so scored by 30, or better than three-fourths, of the participants. In contrast to approval of all fourteen topics by more than a majority, only one topic, "to learn how to develop a training program," was rated by as many as 13 participants as requiring "little emphasis" or "no emphasis." The same overall approval of the fourteen topics is indicated by the fact that the average number of participants who believed that some or much emphasis should be given them (29.6) is six times the average number who voted to give them little or no emphasis (5.1). 16

Although these findings suggest that the conferees regarded the fourteen topics as generally deserving emphasis during the conference, they do not indicate that these preselected topics included all subject matter areas considered important by the conferees. It is possible, in other words, that the roster of identified topics omitted one or more subjects

<sup>15</sup> These included, for example, items such as "to get new ideas for projects," and "to exchange information, solutions, (and) new approaches to problems." See Table I-A, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Appendix H.

<sup>16</sup> Figures in this paragraph based on "Preliminary Analysis."

which they considered to be important. Because the fourteen included all the major subject areas to which all or parts of sessions were scheduled, an omission from this list in turn would raise serious doubts as to whether the omitted topic or topics actually were covered during the conference.

This danger, however, appears to have been remote. In addition to indicating the relative amount of emphasis or deemphasis to be given each of fourteen listed subject areas, the participants also were asked to describe a fifteenth topic of their own choosing. The fact that only five 17 of the participants bothered to select additional topics, and that only two of these selected similar subject areas suggests that no matter of general concern was omitted from the list of fourteen. Further confirmation is given by the ratings which the five participants gave to the topics which they themselves chose -- two of the five indicated that their topics should be given little of no emphasis.

Another possible difficulty was that even though the topics identified for specific attention during the conference met the approval of the conferees, they nevertheless constituted the "wrong" topics. In particular, it might be argued that coverage of the basic issues, problems and techniques in police-community relations required the inclusion of matters which the participants regarded as unimportant or antithetical to their concerns. The basic method by which the topics were originally selected -- by polling the grantees -- could be expected to produce a problem of this nature.

One of the resource persons challenged the selection of topics on this score. Although he concurred in the opinion of the other resource people that the agenda items accurately

<sup>17</sup> This number might well be reduced to three, since two of the added topics closely resemble those already contained in the list of fourteen.

reflected the interests of the grantee-representatives, he nevertheless regarded it to be an error to equate police perceptions of salient issues in police-community relations with what in fact are the basic problems in this area. Not only are the grantees inexperienced in police-community relations, but more important, their perspective is that of the police, not of the community. What is important to discuss, as well as what is important not to discuss, from the police standpoint is at odds with the judgments which the community would make. He suggested, therefore, that civil rights leaders and human rights officials should have been consulted in selecting the agenda topics. They also should have been invited to the conference.

While this contention has merit, two points should be noted. First, the criticism either misconstrues or rejects the objectives of the conference; and second, although not as well represented as some might prefer, the community perspective on police-community relations issues was included in the preparation and conduct of the conference.

Contrary to the inference drawn by the resource person, the purpose of the conference was not only to provide the participants with an overview of the major elements of police-community relations. Other goals were to provide a forum in which police officials could learn from each other and from resource people, and to create an awareness among the conferees of the advantages of working together on common problems. The technique of involving the grantees in the development of the conference program, including the selection of agenda topics, was employed primarily to achieve these goals, rather than to discover all the major issues in police-community relations.

Had civil rights and human rights officials been given a hand in preparing the conference, a more complete identification of salient issues probably would have been obtained.

But such material would have to have been handled in light of the objectives of the conference, and the objectives encompassed training and did not provide for citizen-police confrontation. This is not to say that such confrontations are useless. is to say that this technique was not planned for in this conference. It is probable, therefore, that the principal consequence of a confrontation would have been to provoke rather than to instruct most of the conferees. Assuming the resource people, conference staff, and some of the grantees to be sympathetic with the community perspective, it is possible that they would have been drawn into repeated conflict with the police representatives. Had this occurred, it might also have polarized the conferees for the remainder of the conference, and thus increased the belief that little rather than much is to be gained by trying to work with persons with an opposing persuasion.

While there is no way of knowing what the outcome would have been had confrontations been planned, two occurrences during the conference suggest that the risk of jeopardizing its objectives was substantial. One was the heated wrangle over the National Crime Commission's statistics which sidetracked an effort to examine the relationship between police malpractice and police-community relations. The other was the separation into two camps of resource persons and nonpolice agency representatives on one side, and police officials on the other, during the Open Forum when various controversial matters were considered. Although both sides exhibited great candor, the police representatives plainly were uncomfortable and on the defensive. As one resource person later reported:

The low point of the entire conference was the evening open forum . . . Police conferees . . . felt that /it/was completely dominated by resource people who were not very sympathetic to their problems or at the very least were not willing to accept them as problems. There was considerable hard feeling created and many policemen expressed this feeling the following day.

This finding is consistent with the conferees' rating of the Open Forum as the "least productive" session, in the post-conference survey.

The limited benefits of confining consideration only to those matters which police regard as legitimate and necessary also was recognized. Three steps short of formally scheduling controversial topics were taken. First, the items which were placed on the agenda were defined with sufficient generality to permit a variety of issues and viewpoints to be expressed. Second, resource persons with community-oriented views were recruited. Third, an Open Forum was scheduled at which time the conference chairman and other URC staff planned to raise controversial matters if no one else did. As noted, this proved to be unnecessary. In addition to these preparations, it was considered likely that the representatives of the non-police grantees, two of whom were from human rights commissions, would not permit the police view to go unchallenged.

The appropriateness of the topics selected for coverage is one important measure of the success of the conference. Also significant are the relative amounts of emphasis given to the conference topics. This aspect of the conference is taken up next.

## C. Emphasis Given Conference Topics

A greater proportion of the three-day period was formally allocated to some topics than to others. A half-day each was spent in discussing reaching the community, relations between the police-community relations unit and the police department, and on police-community relations training, for example, while a half-hour or so was given to reviewing such subjects as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967 and sources of federal funds and technical assistance. In addition to formal allocations of time, some subjects cropped up from time to time throughout the conference, while others were mentioned once or twice only. The question arises, then, as to whether these formal and informal allocations of time and attention were consistent with the aims of the conference.

A likely conclusion one can draw from the findings of the pre-and post-conference questionnaires is that the conferees were generally satisfied with the amount of emphasis given to the various conference topics. It will be recalled that before the conference they were asked to indicate how much emphasis they wanted placed on each of fourteen topics. After the conference they were asked how much emphasis they thought had been given to these same topics during the conference. order to find out if the participants were satisfied with the amount of emphasis given to each topic, their rank orders were compared. 18 Eleven of the fourteen topics ranked in terms of "perceived emphasis" were within three places of the position they occupied in the "desired emphasis" listing. Three others varied five places. Thus, the conferees appeared to feel that most of the topics had been given about the same amount of emmasis during the conference which before the conference they

<sup>18</sup> That is, each topic was given a score consisting of the number of participants who voted to give it "much emphasis," and on the basis of that score, was placed in order relative to the other thirteen topics.

thought should have been given them.

One topic, however, they apparently felt had not been given enough emphasis. Before the conference, "learning how to evaluate programs" ranked second in importance among the subjects to be covered. It fell to tenth in terms of emphasis perceived to have been given during the conference. conceivable, however, that this shift simply reflected a new perception of the relative unimportance of program evaluation which the representatives developed during the conference. there is no evidence to support this view, while there are several grounds for believing that the participants were displeased by the treatment of program evaluation. First. in another portion of the pre-conference questionnaire they were asked to rate the difficulty of eleven problems with which they had had to cope in applying for and administering their OLEA grant. By far the most difficult problem was "evaluating effectiveness of your program or projects." Second, in the post-conference questionnaire, they were asked to rate the helpfulness and productivity of the sessions they attended. "Development and evaluation of programs for youth" was among the least productive. Third, Mr. Paul Estaver, the OLEA official responsible for administering the police-community relations planning projects, emphasized the need for candor in reporting on projects. This stress is unlikely to have encouraged the representatives to devalue the importance of program evaluation. Finally, it is plain that program evaluation was not covered thoroughly from the conferee's standpoint. Only about twenty minutes of one session was spent on the topic.

In addition to the suitability of the selection and emphasis given to the conference topics, there is also the complicated problem of how well the various techniques for communicating ideas about these topics worked. Despite the highly impressionistic quality of the information germane to this problem it deserves brief discussion.

# D. Effectiveness of Training Methods

Information regarding the effectiveness of the conference, and its component methods, as a training instrument is confined to two types of data. One of these is the results of the pre- and post-conference questionnaire which attempted to discover whether the participants had learned and accepted the approach to various issues endorsed by the resource persons and other authorities at the conference. The other information consists of the opinions of the conferees, resource persons and URC staff regarding the effectiveness of the total conference experience and of various aspects of the conference.

Turning to the latter data first, it will be recalled that one of the objectives of the conference was to create a forum in which the representatives would have the opportunity to exchange experiences and learn from each other. A number of tactics were used which were expected to contribute to this end, such as the holding of a reception, the allotment of nearly two hours out of a tight agenda to lunch periods, and the avoidance of mealtime speakers, housing the conferees together in the same hotel, and by making it financially advantageous to share rooms and eat together. The Open Forum, workshops and general discussions during the plenary sessions also were intended to facilitate interchange among the conferees.

This aspect of the conference appears to have been generally successful. Evidence includes the observations of several of

the resource people, who felt that the conferees benefitted greatly from the chance to make acquaintances and to share experiences with others who were struggling with similar problems of developing and running police-community relations programs. It not only gave them a chance to exchange suggestions and learn from one another, but also to come to realize that they were not alone in trying to do a job which is diffcult, unorthodox and generally unappreciated within their departments.

Although it seems likely that this aspect of the conference was successful, evidence suggests that the methods used to attain it were uneven in their effects. The confereess. for example, rated as most productive the "informal, unscheduled meetings," but at the same time scored as least productive the Open Forum and the workshops. Although the information is somewhat conflicting, the workshops appear to have suffered from several defects. First, they were not led by skilled, small group discussion leaders, but by police chiefs. appropriate training, several of the chiefs tended to dominate the discussion rather than to encourage general participation. Their rank may have deterred full participation by other members. Moreover, the lack of direction from the conference staff as to what should be discussed may have complicated the chiefs' role. Finally, two-thirds of the conferees thought the workshops were too short.

In addition to learning from one another, the conference also sought to enable the conferees to work with, and learn from, selected authorities in various aspects of police-community relations. To achieve this objective, most of the plenary sessions were conducted by two resource people, and generally several others also were present and participated actively in the general discussion; resource persons attended each of the workshops; and all out-of-town resource people

roomed and ate with the grantee-representatives throughout the conference. In addition, the resource persons, particularly those assigned to lead a plenary session, were informed of how the conference had been put together, its aims, and the general subject matter areas they should cover. Beyond this, however, they were largely on their own.

Exposed in a variety of ways to a resource staff of generally excellent quality and pertinent experience in various aspects of police-community relations, it is highly likely that most of the conferees acquired useful information. It is also clear, however, that this experience was not as comfortable as the conferees would have desired, and possibly not as profitable for them as the conference staff had hoped. One difficulty which arose was the tendency of the resource people to talk over the heads of the conferees. to have occurred because the conferees lacked experience in police-community relations, and also because they were less accustomed than the resource persons to formulating and discussing ideas in somewhat abstract terms. The suggestions for improving the conference made by the conferees are illustra-"More nuts and bolts and less philosophy;" "more input on the part of the conference attendees, more focus on day-to-day problems;" "more definite answers to questions;" and "by staying with one idea or question until fully answered." 19

Although some of the input from resource people was intended to come as a result of brief lectures and talks, much time was given to sessions in which the consultants and police officials were expected to participate jointly in the discussion. This training method suffered not only from the difficulties mentioned above but from several others as well. One was the sheer number of resource persons present. This factor combined with their intense interest in the topic resulted on occasion

<sup>19</sup> See Appendix H, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Attachment C.

in the conversation's being dominated, if not monopolized, by the resource persons. This difficulty was greatest during the Monday sessions and in the Open Forum, where the ratio of resource people to police officers was nearly one to one.

Another difficulty encountered derives from the selection of consultants with non-police backgrounds to act as trainers of police officers. To an extent which is impossible to ascertain, the resource people never were wholly accepted by the conferees. One resource person, himself a police officer, reported that the participants resented the aloofness of the resource people. The fact that several of the conferees suggested that the conference could have been improved by using more police officials as trainers also indicates some resistance to the resource staff. Similarly, there is the low mark given the Open Forum, in which the conferees were nearly matched in numbers by the resource people, and in which they were over-matched in the discussion of police practices presumed to be deleterious to police-community relations.

What effect the conferees' resentment toward their trainers had on what they learned about police-community relations during the conference is impossible to determine from the data available. Since this antipathy did not appear to be either widespread nor intense, it may not have seriously contaminated the acceptability of the ideas the resource people sought to communicate.

The second source of information regarding the effectiveness of the training methods used at the conference is the
results of the pre- and post-conference survey. One section
of this survey sought to discover if the conferees learned
what was expected to be taught in five areas of police-community
relations. On two questions, more of the participants chose
the "right" answer after the conference than before the

conference, thus suggesting that some of the group "learned." The other questions either indicated very slight improvement or increased preference for a "wrong" answer. All three of these items, however, assumed that the resource persons would emphasize points which, in fact, they failed to do. example, the conferees were asked to indicate whether they agreed with the statement "since statisticians do not deal directly with delinquents, their help in evaluating a police youth program is pretty limited." It was expected that the resource person would stress the need to obtain expert assistance in evaluating youth programs, and that the "right" answer would be to "disagree." In fact, however, he emphasized the responsibility of police officials conducting such programs of playing a major part in devising evaluation designs. as a result, the percentage of those giving the "right" answer declined from 74 percent before the conference to 55 percent after it.

Another section of the survey asked the conferees to indicate the importance or unimportance to police-community relations of 12 factors both before and after the conference. On most items the ratings changed only slightly. The two items to which responses shifted the most, however, changed in a direction consistent with the emphasis given during the conference. These results suggest that learning in a least a few areas took place in the desired direction, by some participants.

It would be encouraging to conclude, as one resource person reports, "that after the conference was over, everyone realized that there is a problem of police-community relations, and that there are ways of improving police-community relations, and those with responsibility for developing programs attending

These were Item 7, "Community relations ability as a factor in police promotions," and Item 12, "Preventing race riots." Eight more persons regarded Item 7 as "very important" after the conference than did before, while ten fewer persons thought that Item 12 was very important after the conference. See Appendix H, "Preliminary Analysis of Questionnaires," Table III-A.

the conference went home with many useful ideas and techniques." The results of the conference questionnaire, of course, are too inconclusive to support any such sweeping affirmation. While one hopes that the resource person's interpretation is correct, the better evidence is that the conference provided a good learning opportunity from which at least some of the participants appear to have profited.

### E. Facilities

Before considering the implications of the conference for the future, two remaining aspects of the program -- food and space -- require brief mention. While not ordinarily significant, over a period of three consecutive days both can acquire great importance. This clearly occurred in the case of the meals, which during the first two days of the conference were felt to be inferior by many participants. Judging from the complaints registered at the time, and from the suggestions made for improving the conference, this was a source of real grievance. Meals during the third day were substantially improved. Space was less of a problem. However, the room in which the plenary sessions were held was crowded and required some of the conferees to sit with their backs to one another. A larger room would have been preferable.

### V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES

The fearful cost in blood and dollars of the summer riots is one index of the price we pay for permitting police-community relations to deteriorate to the flash point of violence. While the causes of these riots run deeper than citizen apathy for the police, this factor is extremely important and must be dealt with together with the other institutional breakdowns in our society.

Events since the conference reported herein have shown that many responsible officials, at all levels of government, are fully aware of this situation and are devoting their best efforts to deal with it. Inevitably, conferences have been called, and more will be, to discuss new strategies for dealing with civil unrest and mass outbreaks. All too often, many officials who style themselves men-of-action view conferences as a simple waste of time, at worst, or the chance to see old friends, at best. Our experience at this conference suggests that this does not always have to be the case. Conferences may be wearing to some, but they can serve vital functions.

In order to provide some guides to those preparing for future police-community relations conferences of this type, we present the following recommendations, which result from our evaluation of this one.

### A. <u>Pre-Selected Topics</u>.

Conferences should be sharply focused on a limited number of key topics. One such subject should be the police role in the recent riots. Component areas might include the following: police actions which appear to have been effective

in preventing riots from occurring and the reasons therefore; the kind of incidents either directly or indirectly involving police which seem to have triggered riots and the circumstances surrounding them; the strategies which law enforcement agencies used or attempted to use to control riots during their various stages, and their outcome; the kinds of follow-up actions which police have taken and their effects on relations with the citizenry; and the implications of all of the foregoing for the community relations unit within the department. A second major topic for discussion should be program evaluation and planning. Basic principles and their practical application by laymen should be emphasized. Concrete examples within the experience of the conferees should be used. In addition to these two major topics one or two others selected by the conferees should be given attention in depth.

The conference should not only be more narrowly focused than this conference, but it also should attempt to avoid too much "theorizing." To achieve this objective, discussion of the two pre-selected topics -- police role in riots and program evaluation and planning -- should be centered on the experiences of two or three of the departments present. These departments should be selected because their actions to prevent or control riots. or potential riots during the summer appear to have been both relatively progressive and effective. In addition, so far as possible, departments should be chosen in which the police-community relations unit played an active role in their departments' actions. Dayton's use of the Youth Patrol, for example, might be reason for selecting its department's activities for intensive review. Another city might have avoided a riot altogether. Where this appeared to be attributable, at least in substantial part, to specific policies developed by its police department to head off the danger, that department might be chosen. Another department might have been particularly imaginative in its response to the

community after a riot had occurred.

The principal criteria for selection, progressive and effective action to prevent or control riots relative to that taken by most departments, should be sufficient to permit two or three of the departments to be singled out.

The information needed to make the selection will be obtained from a variety of sources: newspapers and popular magazines; professional journals; technical reports; resource persons; and field visits to several of the more promising departments.

### B. Presentation of Pre-Selected Topics.

The relevant activities of the selected departments should constitute the core material for discussion both of police action in preventing and controlling riots and program evaluation and planning. The examination of several departments' actions should serve as concrete illustrations of particular sets of problems and solutions with which the conferees would be encouraged to compare their own experiences. Similarly, the resource people should be urged to present issues and principles in terms of the departments' activities covered at the conference. Later sessions focusing on program evaluation and planning should use the analyses previously used to explain the departments' actions as illustrations of the principles used in evaluating programs. Thus, for example, a previous discussion of why a department undertook a particular action might be used as a concrete example of how one goes about identifying a problem and determining the effectiveness of methods developed to deal with it.

In order to give the conferees a common factual base on which to develop interpretive analysis and in order to sharpen

the focus of the discussion, a substantial portion of the time allocated to each topic in the plenary sessions should be spent in descriptive and analytic input from the resource people. Moreover, the resource people should prepare detailed outlines of what they intend to cover both in their remarks and during the general discussion. The outlines of the issues and facts to be presented during the general discussion, however, should serve merely as guides for the resource people who should be free to pursue other topics if the drift of the discussion indicates such would be profitable.

Great time and effort is required by the resource people in planning for the conference. Each consultant responsible for reporting on the activities of a selected department should spend some time in site visits to that department. He should rely heavily on the staff of the police-community relations unit to aid him in collecting the necessary information. In addition, so far as possible the unit director should participate with the resource person in the preparation and presentation of the materials given at the conference.

The resource persons responsible for the sessions on evaluation and planning should confer with the consultants heading the discussion of police handling of riots. This will insure that the review of the principles of evaluation and planning will be in the context of specific activities with which the conferees already have been acquainted.

### C. Topics Selected by the Conferees.

In addition to the pre-selected topics, one or two other subjects may also be given specific attention. Compre-hensiveness is not sought. The object instead is to avoid omitting those few subjects which may be of grave concern to most of the conferees.

Those topics should be selected by canvassing the invitees in a manner similar to the methods used to identify the topics for the URC conference. However, in order to increase the specificity of these topics, more than one polling of the grantee representatives might be required. The first questionnaire, for example, might simply request identification of special areas of concern. A follow-up survey should request clarification of the one or two topics which a majority of the grantee representatives had selected as being of great interest.

Each questionnaire should be kept brief, and should be sent out sufficiently in advance of the conference to allow ample time for responses. The respondants should be notified of the importance of their assistance to the success of the conference. The information obtained should be used in several ways. Selection of agenda items, of course, should be based upon it. In addition, it will be employed to orient the resource persons to the kinds of information they should be prepared to present. Conferee interest in the conference also will be encouraged.

### D. Organization of the Conference.

The basic organization of the URC conference appears to have been generally sound and may be adopted for future meetings of this type. That is, the conference should be approximately three days long, and the materials should be presented through a combination of opening brief talks and general discussions in plenary sessions, workshops and workshop reports.

As previously indicated, the plenary sessions should be more structured in an effort to avoid problems which developed during the URC conference. In addition, the workshop sessions should be changed in several ways. The chairman should not be

a police chief but instead a resource person. If necessary, the chairman should be instructed in the fundamentals of conducting a workshop, but it is expected that they already will have the necessary experience. While the workshops should be loosely structured to encourage free discussion, the chairman should be expected to have thought through a tentative agenda for each session. He should be free, however, to use as much or as little of it as he deems most profitable to the group. The workshop participants should be asked to focus on the preceeding plenary session discussion, but again would be expected to exercise discretion.

Informal interaction among the conferees, resource people and conference staff should be encouraged as in the URC conference. Rather than schedule an Open Forum, however, the conferees should be asked if they wished such a session to be conducted. Possibly such a session could be held in conjunction with a film or other attractive inducement. Eating together, sharing rooms, lengthy breaks at meals, a reception and other such devices should be used to foster informal sharing of ideas and experiences.

### E. Conference Goals.

The conference should have the following objectives:

- 1. To provide an opportunity for a relatively intensive exploration of the facts, and their implications, pertaining to a limited number of issues in police-community relations which are of major concern to the conferees;
- 2. To enable police officers assigned to a task which is both difficult and frequently unappreciated by their fellow officers to learn that police-community relations officers in other departments have similar problems and to

discover how they deal with them;

3. To create an opportunity in which police can work together with resource persons to solve common problems.



VI. ATTACHMENTS

University Research Corporation 1425 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

### AGENDA QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are designed to give us some basic understanding of what you would like to see covered at the Police-Community Relations Conference. In order not to burden you with a lengthy and therefore time-consuming questionnaire, we've asked you to respond to only seven questions. Please answer them with as much detail as you feel appropriate to the planning of an effective conference. Use the space at the end for comments which cannot be fitted onto the space following each question. In addition, other topics you believe should be included, or other aspects of the conference you feel to be important should be mentioned in this space.

1. In your opinion, what problems in police-community relations are of special importance and should receive priority consideration at the conference? Please describe in enough detail so that the problems you have in mind will be clear. Examples from your own experiences will be helpful.

2. Are there other problems in police-community relations which you think deserve discussion, if time allows? Please answer as in Question 1.

### Agenda Questionnaire - 2

3. In recent years a wide variety of programs to improve police-community relations have been tried throughout the country. These include the establishment of community relations units and citizen advisory groups, and modification of recruiting, selection and promotion practices to encourage Negroes and other minority group members to make a career of police work, and the explicit consideration of minority group feelings in determining departmental policy regarding field practices, such as the use of tactical forces. Which programs have you found to be most successful? Please describe clearly using examples from your own experience.

- 4. Many persons attending the conference represent departments which have received funds from the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance to plan either the establishment of a community relations unit or the strengthening of an existing unit.
  - a. What problems has your department had in this connection which you think the other conference participants would benefit from learning about?

b. What progress in setting up or improving your department's community relations unit has there been which would be useful to present at the conference?

### Agenda Questionnaire - 3

- 5. Proposal development and funding for police department programs.
  - a. Would it be useful to review Federal grant programs from which funds may be requested for police-community relations?
  - b. Would a discussion of the procedures to be followed in applying for a grant (the art of "grantsmanship") be helpful?
- 6. The subject matter of the conference may be presented through lectures, small group discussions, films, visual demonstrations, role playing and various other devices.
  - a. Which methods of presentation do you think might best be used at the conference and for which subjects?

b. Which methods of presentation do you think should be avoided? Please explain.

### Agenda Questionnaire - 4

7. Please use the remaining space to complete your replies to the preceding questions, to suggest other topics for inclusion in the conference agenda, and to make any other comments.

Name and rank	
Name and address of department	
	Phone:
AgeYear	s of police service
Education (Indicate diplomas an	d degrees received, dates received,
	received)
Special training, date received	and duration
time, and give date begun)	cribe, state whether full or part-
	briefly describe, state whether full
	gnments (answer only if not covered be, state whether full or part-time,

This form is designed for police officers. In the event you are not in a police force, please supply equivalent information in the appropriate spaces.

### CONFERENCE ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

June 18-21, 1967

. Sponsored by UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION

Under Contract With
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Executive House
North Panel Room
1515 Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

## AGENDA

Sunday,	June	18
5:00		Registration
7:00		Dinner: South Panel Room
8:30		Reception: Residence of Arnold S. Trebach 1736 Shepherd Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
Monday,	June	19
9:00		Introduction and Welcome Arnold S. Trebach, President University Research Corporation
9:15		Welcome Daniel Skoler, Associate Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, United States Department of Justice
9:30		Police-Community Relations Program of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Officer, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, United States Department of Justice
9:45		Evaluation Interviews
10:00		Coffee
10:15		Plenary Session: Goals and Strategies of Police-Community Relations Programs
12:00		Lunch: South Panel Room
1:45		Plenary Session: Relations Between the Police- Community Relations Unit and the Police Department
3:00		Coffee
3:15		Workshops
5:00		Plenary Session: Workshop Reports
5:30		End of Session
6:30		Dinner: South Panel Room

## Tuesday, June 20

9:00	Plenary Session: Organization and Operation of Police-Community Relations Training
10:00	Coffee
10:15	Continuation of Plenary Session: Organization and Operation of Police-Community Relations Training
12:00	Lunch: South Panel Room
1:45	Plenary Session: Reaching the Community
3:00	Coffee
3:15	Workshops
5:00	Plenary Session: Workshop Reports
5:30	End of Afternoon Session
7:00	Dinner: South Panel Room
8:30	Open Forum
10:30	End of Evening Session
Wednesday, Ju	me 21
9:00	Plenary Session: Development and Evaluation of Programs for Youth
10:00	Coffee
10:15	Workshops
11:30	Plenary Session: Workshop Reports
12:00	Lunch: South Panel Rcom
1:45	Plenary Session: Federal Funds and the Art of "Grantsmanship"
3:30	Post-Evaluation Interviews
3:45	Summary and Concluding Remarks Arnold S. Trebach
4:00	End of Conference

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., administers the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. It provides funds for projects which may create, test or demonstrate new knowledge or techniques in crime precention, crime detection, law enforcement, the administration of criminal justice and corrections.

University Research Corporation is a private organization based in Washington, D.C. It develops research, demonstration and training programs in a variety of fields, including law enforcement, corrections and the administration of criminal justice.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION 1425 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. (202) 332-1628 URC/OLEA Evaluation PCQ-A June 67 J.K.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION
Research Department
Suite 208 - 1425 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005
(202) 332-1628

Code Number

# POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE SURVEY\*

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL NOT BE ANALYZED ON AN 'INDIVIDUAL' BASIS. A STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF THE ANSWERS OF EVERYONE AT THE CONFERENCE WILL BE GIVEN TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO HELP THEM IMPROVE THE OLEA PROGRAM.

Please circle one:

I am a (policeman, civilian) If policeman, give rank

I am a (conferee, observer)

I (did, did not) return the biographical questionnaire I was sent before this conference.

<sup>\*</sup>For use by the University Research Corporation only. Any reproduction in whole or in part without written consent is prohibited.

### Section I

OW MUCH EMPHASIS WOULD YOU LIKE PLACED ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POSSIBLE CONFERENCE TOPICS? (Circle only one response for each item, but answer all items.)

•		MUCH EMPHASIS	SOME EMPHASIS	UNDECIDED	LITTLE EMPHASIS	NO EMPHASIS
1,	To learn about other sources of financial aid	1	2	3	4	5
<ul><li>2.</li></ul>	To learn the art of "grantsmanship"	1	2	. 3	4	5
3.	To learn how to evaluate programs	1	2	3	4	5
4.	To exchange information, solutions, new approaches to problems	1	2	3	4	5
5.	To find out resources and consultants available	1	2	3	4	5
6.	To get new ideas for projects	1	2	3	4	5
٥	To learn how to develop programs	1	2	3	4	5
	To learn how to deal with minorities and the poor	1	/ <b>2</b>	3	4	5
9.	To learn how to influence others in the department	1 .	2	3	4	5
10.	To learn how to develop a training program	1	2	3	4	<b>S</b>
• 11.	To learn how to solve problems around recruiting minority policemen	1	2	3	4	5
12.	To understand human behavior and social change	1 .	2	3	4	5
13.	To learn how to increase the power and prestige of the community relations unit	1	2	3	4	5
•	To learn how to reach youths who are potential trouble-makers	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Other (Write in)	1	2	3	4	5

Code	Number	

### Section II

Various government agencies provide grants for programs in police-community relations. Match the following Pederal agencies with the programs they sponsor. If you think an agency has no program, put a zero in front of the agency.

		Agency		FIOGRAMS
	Α	Department of Housing and Urban Development	0.	Does not have any funds available related to police-community relations
,	В	Office of Economic Opportunity	1.	Crime and Delinquency Program
	c	Health, Eduction, and Welfare Office of Education	2.	Demonstration Cities Act
			3.	Neighborhood Youth Corps
	D	Health, Education, and Welfare National Institute of Mental Health	4.	Programs for the Disadvantaged
	Е	Department of Commerce		
2.	Since sta	tisticians do not deal directly with buth program is pretty limited.	deli	nquents, their help in evaluating a
	(check or	ne)		
		strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree	•	
3.	In order given to:	to change the attitudes of alienated	yout	h, the highest priority should be
	(Put a ch	eck by the appropriate letter. Only	chec	k one.)
	Α	Speaking to teenagers in the classro	om	
	в	Distributing pamphlets on educations	1 op	portunities
	c	Making parents legally responsible f	or t	heir children's delinquent behavior
	D	Recruiting hardcore delinquents to t	each	ball games to poor children

Code	Number	
------	--------	--

### Section III

RATE THE FOLLOWING IN TERMS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO GOOD POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS. (Circle only one response for each item, but answer all items.)

		·	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	UNDECIDED	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT
)	1.	Public relations programs	1	2	. 3	4	5
	2.	Citizen involvement in keeping down crime rate	1 .	2	3	4	5
)	3.	Citizen review of controversial police actions	1	2	3	4	5
	4.	Better understanding between police and community .	1	2	3	4	5
	5.	Attending social functions	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>)</b> .	Community relations unit to investigate civilian complaints	1	2	3	4	5
١	7.	Community relations ability as a factor in police promotions	1	2	3	4	<b>5</b>
	8.	Coordinating activities of minority groups and city authorities	1	2	3	4	5
,	9.	Holding ball games, teaching boxing etc. to the poor	1	2	3	4	5
	10.	Showing that police are humans too	1	2	3	. 4	5
	11.	Opening lines of communication between police and community	1	2	3	4	5
•	12.	Preventing race riots	1	.2	3	4	5
	13.	Other(Write in)	1	2	3	4	5

Section (V.

Coue Namee

SOLVE IN GETTING AND AMAINISTERING items.) HOW DIFFICULT HAVE THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS BEEN FOR FOR DEPARTMENT TO OLEA GRANTS? (Circle only one response for each item, but answer all

GE	GETTING GRANTS	VERY	SOMEWHAT	UNDECIDED	SOMEWHAT	VERY EASY
ij	Determining the type of program the Federal government requires	<b>+</b> 4	7	ю	4	S
2.	Defining the job of community relations personnel within the department		2	m	*	Ŋ
ю.	Getting matching funds or resources in kind	<b>r-1</b>	2	ю	<b>'4</b>	w
4.	Lack of local (city or state) expert assistance in designing your projects			·		
'n.	-	<del></del> 4	7	ы	4	Ŋ
	(Write in)					
\$1	ADMINISTERING GRANTS					
6	Establishing and maintaining communication with poor people	e 1	7	m	4	S
7.	Lack of clear Federal guidelines on expenditures	-	7	м	4	S
<b>∞</b>	Having to deal with city comptroller or treasurer rather	,	(		•	1
	than police getting money directly	<b>-</b> -1	2	۲۰	4	<b>د</b> م
9.	Evaluating effectiveness of your program or projects	<b>-</b> -1	7	83	4	ĸ
10.		r-1	2	ы	4	Ŋ
11.	Cooperation of public agencies	<b>-</b> i	7	80	4	S
12.		,,,	r	۲	•	U
_	statt the community retactions unit	-1	1	•	۲	,
13.	Other	<b>,</b> 1	7	м	4	Ŋ
14.	(Write in) What suggestions do you have for solving any one of these	problems	problems mentioned	above?		

Name one way in which it might be changed. Thank you for your cooperation. Please check each 15. How would you change the grant application procedure?

page to see that you have answered all questions.

TO:

Resource Personnel Attending Conference on

Police-Community Relations

FROM:

Arnold S. Trebach

SUBJECT:

Evaluation of Conference

URC is responsible under the terms of its contract with the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance for the preparation of a report describing and evaluating the Police-Community Relations Conference. Observations by URC staff as well as preand post conference interviews with the participating police officials will provide much of the information upon which the Report will be based. In addition, however, I hope that URC will be able to draw on your appraisal of the Conference as a supplement to the other sources of information.

The following items indicate some of the areas which we are considering for inclusion in the report to OLEA. However, these are listed below only to suggest areas for your comment. Please feel free to focus your remarks in any way you feel will be most helpful.

### I. The Structure and Orientation of the Conference as a Whole.

- 1. In your view, were the major topics selected for discussion during the Conference of primary importance for the police officer participants? Should some have been omitted? What other areas should have been included?
  - 2. Was the organization and operation of the Conference effective? For example, should more or less time have been given to workshops? Should movies, role playing or other training techniques have been used? What other kind of changes would you suggest?

### II. The Workshops

- 1. What issues were covered in the workshops you attended? What positions on these issues were taken by the workshop participants? What programs, administrative changes or other proposals for handling police-community relations problems were made?
- 2. Which topics generated the greatest interest? Did any of the participants become angry, defensive or anxious and if so why? Was the level of interest generally high?

- 3. Was there general participation in the workshops or did one or two persons tend to dominate? Was it helpful to have the workshops chaired by police chiefs?
- 4. What problems did the workshop sessions which you attended encounter? How were they handled? What recommendations do you have?

### III. The Plenary Sessions

- 1. Was the technique of assigning 2 or 3 resource persons to lead the discussion in the plenary sessions effective? How could this method have been improved?
- 2. What suggestions for chairing the plenary sessions do you have?
- 3. Was it useful to have the workshops report to the plenary sessions?

### IV. The Participants

- 1. What reactions regarding the Conference did the police officials have?
- 2. What changes in their attitudes or understanding of police-community relations appeared to occur during the Conference?

### V. Resource Personnel

- 1. In what ways were you as a resource person most effective in achieving the goals of the Conference?
- 2. How could your effectiveness have been increased?

# UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION..... SUITE 208 - 1425 N STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 332-1628

### POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE June 18 - 21, 1967

### Participants

Tot. Herbert Adams (see Williams) Police Department Flint, Michigan

Lt. James Ahern Police Department New Haven, Connecticut

Deputy Inspector Carl Bare Police Department Cleveland, Ohio

Robert J. Barton, Director Police-Community Relations Division Board of Police Commissioners St. Louis, Missouri

Sgt. Lee Brown Police Department San Jose, California

Lt. Cois Byrd Police Department Riverside, California

Lt. Malvin Caldwell Police Department Richmond, Virginia

Professor Frank Cizon Director of Research School of Social Work Loyola University Chicago, Illinois

William Downs, President Associate Services, Inc. Silver Spring, Maryland Professor Gus Economos Director of Training Police Academy Police Department Chicago, Illinois

Inspector George A. Edwards Police Department Flint, Michigan

Paul E. Estaver Dissemination Officer Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Jacques Feuillan Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law Washington, D.C.

Jacob R. Fishman, M.D.
Director, Institute for Youth Studies
Howard University
Director, New Careers Development
Program
University Research Corporation
Washington, D.C.

Joseph S. Ford, Jr. Project Director Police Department Paterson, New Jersey

Dr. Hyman H. Frankel, Director Experiment in Higher Education Southern Illinois University East St. Louis, Illinois

### Participants - 2

Deputy Chief R. J. Freischel Police Department St. Paul, Minnesota

Asst. Professor Raymond T. Galvin School of Police Administration Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan

William Gawlas Community Organization Worker Human Relations Commission Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Capt. Frank Gucciardo Police Department Gary, Indiana

Chief William Hanger
Police Department
Pontiac, Michigan

Det. John Harris Police Department Richmond, Virginia

Lt. Bruce Hartford Police Department Omaha, Nebraska

Capt. Herbert W. Hartz Police Department Tulsa, Oklahoma

Lt. Thomas Hastings Police Department Rochester, New York

Mrs. Lucia S. Hatch Conference Coordinator University Research Corporation

Harry Heller Former Captain, Police Department New York, N. Y.

Sgt. Charles J. Hick Police Department Kansas City, Missouri

Lt. F. M. Hicks Police Department Kansas City, Kansas Mr. Lonnie D. Johnson
Police Recruitment Project of
Michigan, Inc.
Detroit, Michigan

Mr. James A. Kelly Administrative Assistant Police Department Charlotte, North Carolina

Chief Joseph P. Kimble
Police Department
San Carlos, California
Internation Association of
Chiefs of Police
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Julie Kisielewski Research Associate University Research Corporation

Lt. Basil Leach Police Department Elizabeth, New Jersey

Mr. Kenneth Lenihan Research Director Vera Institute of Justice New York, N.Y.

Glenford S. Leonard, Director Department of Public Safety Oak Park, Michigan

Lt. Don Lowe Police Department Tucson, Arizona

Lt. Col. Clair W. Martz Police Department Dayton, Ohio

Professor William MacKenzie Graduate Division, School of Urban Studies Loyola University Chicago, Illinois

Inspector Joseph McAlpine Police Department New Haven, Connecticut

### Participants - 3

Lt. Wendell McLaughlin Police Department Des Moines, Iowa

Errol Miller
Lawyer's Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
Washington, D.C.

Chief Conway Mullins Police Department Gary, Indiana

Patrick V. Murphy
Assistant Director
Law Enforcement
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Lt. Edwin Nagorski. Police Department Cleveland, Ohio

Maj. Kenneth Nash Police Department Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Ronald Natalie
Lawyer's Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
Washington, D.C.

Robert Nelson
Lawyer's Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
Washington, D.C.

Capt. Wendell Nichols Police Department Des Moines, Iowa

Insp. A. P. Pattavina, Jr. Police Department Omaha, Nebraska

Richard L. Penelton Project Director Police Department Peoria, Illinois

Sgt. Harold Peterson Police Department Wichita, Kansas Charles Ryan
Lawyer's Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
Washington, D.C.

Deputy Chief Inspector Lloyd Sealy Police Department New York, N.Y.

Daniel Skoler Associate Director Office of Law Enforcement Assistance

Chief William Smith Police Department Syracuse, New York

Drexel Sprecher Leadership Resources, Inc. Washington, D.C.

Capt. Jeremiah Sullivan Police Department Boston, Massachusetts

Lt. Herbert S. Taylor Police Department Washington, D.C.

Bruce J. Terris
Assistant for the District of
Columbia to the President's
Council on Youth Opportunities

James Threatt Executive Director Human Rights Commission Newark, New Jersey

Dr. Arnold S. Trebach President University Research Corporation

Capt. Sam D. Watson Police Department Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Miss Harriet White Project Director Police Department Oak Park, Illinois

### Participants - 4

Lawrence M. White Director of Training Programs University Research Corporation

Richardson White, Jr. Legal Staff Associate University Research Corporation

Inspector Bernard Winckoski Police Department Detroit, Michigan

D. David McDonald Department of Community Affairs Trenton, New Jersey

Sgt. Charles Williams Police Department Flint, Michigan

# FEDERAL GRANT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO POLICE

Prepared by: University Research Corporation Washington, D.C.

June, 1967

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Program

Model Neighborhoods in Demonstration Cities

Nature and Purpose of Program This

Program

This program provides grants to plan and carry out comprehensive programs for rebuilding and restoring slum areas through coordinated use of all available Federal programs and private and local resources. Grants include:
(1) 80% of the cost of planning of model cities program; (2) 80% of the cost of administering an approved program; and (3) supplements up to 80% of the total non-Federal contribution required under Federally assisted projects or activities carried out as part of a model cities program. The supplemental grants may be used, without further local matching, for any project or activity included within an approved model cities program.

Demonstration cities programs deal with problems pertaining to housing, health, education, employment and with poverty and crime. Grants are made to a "city demonstration agency" which may be a city, county or single or jointly acting local public agency designated by local government to administer the program.

Relevance to Police

The reduction of crime and delinquency in slum areas is an explicit goal of this program.

Illustrative

Projects The establishment of citizens advisory councils to a police department in cooperation with the local community action center funded by OEO; the development of youth service centers, as recommended by the National Crime Commission, to which police could refer youngsters in minor trouble with the law in lieu of referral to the juvenile court.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Community Service Program- Higher Education

Nature and
Purpose of
Program The program assists institutions of higher education to strengthen their programs, activities or services for the purpose of aiding in the solution of community problems.

Relevance to
Police Enables police to benefit from university-based
research and training in law enforcement and
related matters. A total of 16 institutions have conducted
seminars, workshops and other programs for police under this
program.

Illustrative
Programs
Texas A & M conducted a training program on juvenile
delinquency and police handling of delinquent youth;
Wayne State University ran workshops and conferences in police administration; Central Missouri State University operated seminars
on police-community relations.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Air Pollution Control

Nature and Purpose of Program

Program provides grants for research and training and techincal assistance in dealing with problems of air pollution.

Relevance to .

Assistance may be obtained by police departments Police in those jurisdictions in which police are charged with enforcing air pollution statuates and ordinances.

Illustrative Training course for police officials in the identifi-Project cation of air pollution, in the construction and op-eration of devices to control air pollution, in the laws and regulations governing air pollution control, and in techniques for encouraging compliance by citizens and business concerns.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Low Interest Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education

Nature and
Purpose of
Program The program makes loans for education expenses
available to undergraduates and gradute students
enrolled in elegible institutions of higher education. It also
provides Federal funds to pay interest charges on student loans
for students from families with adjusted annual income of less
than \$15,000. These funds will cover 6% interest charges during
the students' school years and 3% interest charges during the
repayment period.

Relevance to
Police Police departments, interested in raising the academic standards of their staff may encourage their personnel or potential personnel to further their education using funds available under this program to meet the cost of additional schooling.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

National Institute of Mental Health Crime and Delinquency Program

Nature and
Purpose of
Program Supports research, training and demonstration
projects for the prevention and control of juvenile
delinquency and crime. Projects must be innovative and lead to
the development of new knowledge or skills relevant to the causes,
treatment and control of deviant behavior.

Relevance to
Police

A number of grants to police departments have been made under this program. These grants usually have been to support demonstration and training projects. Research grants generally are awarded to universities rather than to police agencies, however. In addition, police departments interested in applying for demonstration or training grants may benefit from outside technical assistance in designing and evaluating such projects.

Illustrative
Projects

Development of curricular material for police training in police-community relations by police officers working together with slum residents; a recreation project for Mexican-American adolescents run by a police department using other youth recruited from delinquent gangs as recreation aides.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Work Experience Program

Nature and
Purpose of
Program Object of program is to increase the employability
of needy adults with emphasis upon unemployed adults
of dependent children. Participants receive maintenance grants,
adult basic education, vocational instruction, high school equivalency, work experience and supportive services such as child day
care, and medical care. On-the-job training may be provided in
private and public agencies.

Federal funds pay up to 100% of the cost of a project. Grants are made to State welfare agencies for use by local welfare agencies in administering work experience projects. Work experience projects must be coordinated with existing community action projects in the locality.

Relevance to

Police Facilitates the recruitment and training of persons
from poverty areas for work in law enforcement and
related activities thereby tending to improve the department's understanding of and communication with the community. More than a dozen
police departments have participated successfully in the Work-Experience Program.

Illustrative
Projects The police in New Bedford, Mass. are training Work
Experience trainees as crossing guards. In seven
counties in Colorado they are being trained as driver license
examiners, sheriffs aides and deputies, cross walk guards and
police chief aides. In Pushmataha County, Okla., trainees are
being trained by the police department to be deputy sheriffs and
police dispatchers.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Supplementary Educational Centers

Nature and Purpose of

Grants are made to local educational agencies or Program combinations of such agencies to enable a community to raise the quality of educational services being offered, to provide educational services not presently available to the children, and to assist in the development of exemplary elementary and secondary school programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Projects are run through or in coordination with local school boards.

Relevance to Police

May provide support for educational services which contribute to law abiding behavior by youth.

Illustrative

Driver education courses for high school students Programs may be offered with local police acting as con-Courses on the relation of law, law enforcement and sultants. political action to the civil rights movement for high school students in ghetto areas may also be established in which police officers participate as instructors.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Program

Vocational Education Program

Nature and Purpose of Program

Program

Funds are available to maintain, attend and improve vocational education programs, to develop programs in new occupations and for experimental and innovative programs. Eligible students include persons attending high school, persons who have completed or dropped out of high school but can study full time, persons in the labor market who need training or retraining and persons with academic or socio-economic handicaps.

Relevance to
Police May provide support for police science and related courses in high school, technical institutes, colleges and universities.

Illustrative

Program

Police department may encourage a local community college to establish a police science program in which the students spend part-time assigned to the department and aides to officers performing different types of law enforcement duties and with command as well as line officers.

Department of Labor

Program

Employment Service-Industrial Services

Nature and Purpose of Program

Program

Technical assistance is given to employers by occupational or job market analysts of the State Employment Service to assist employers: (1) in improving use of skills and other potentialities of workers, particularly beginners; (2) in reducing excessive turn over and absenteeism of the employer's workforce; (3) in reducing problems of worker recruitment, selection and assignment; and (4) in developing manpower resources needed for technological advancement. Any employer is eligible to receive assistance.

Relevance to
Police Police departments suffer from many of the same
management problems as other industries. Techniques
developed to alleviate such problems in other areas may be applicable to similar problems confronting law enforcement agencies.

Illustrative
Project Police departments may request assistance under the
Employment Service-Industrial Service program to
help cope with such problems as recruitment, analysis of job functions and deployment of personnel, and staff turn over.

Department of Labor

Program

New Careers Program

Nature and
Purpose of
Program This is an adult work training employment program involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural conditions of the community. It encourages the creation and development of new career jobs as support personnel in public service in such areas as health, education, welfare and public safety.

Federal funds may be used to defray up to 90% of the cost of New Careers projects. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in-kind. Adults 22 years of age or older who are unemployed or who are impoverished may be enrolled. Enrollees must not displace employed workers.

Relevance to
Police Public agencies, including police, may sponsor New
Careers programs. Because recruits under this program are drawn from poverty stricken areas and frequently are
members of minority groups their involvement in police work as a
career can constitute a significant step toward alleviating the
misunderstanding and hostility with which the community often
views the police.

Labor Department

Program Neighborhood Youth Corps

Nature and
Purpose of
Program The program has three major components; an in-school,
an out-of-school program, and a summer program. The
in-school program provides part-time work and on-the-job training
for students of high school age from low income families. The
summer program provides these students with jobs during the summer.
The out-of-school program provides financially deprived school dropouts with work experience and on-the-job training. It encourages
them to return to school or if this is not possible to acquire work
habits and attitudes which will improve their employability.

Federal funds will cover up to 90% of the cost of NYC projects. The employer's share (if a public agency) may be in cash or in-kind (facilities, equipment, services etc.).

Relevance to
Police Public agencies, including police departments may sponsor NYC programs thereby involving potentially delinquent youth in constructive and income-producing activities. Increased interest in and understanding by youth of the objectives of law enforcement may result.

Illustrative
Project Employ youth as clerical aides, motor pool aides,
aides to cross-walk guards, or aides to juvenile
officers in maintaining contact with gangs, in referring children
arrested for minor offenses to social agencies and in assisting
in recreation programs for younger children.

Department of Labor

Program

Manpower Development and Training

Nature and Purpose of Program

Program . Provides occupational training for unemployed and underemployed persons who cannot reasonably obtain appropriate full-time employment without training. Basic education may be provided. MDTA programs are conducted either in vocational schools, or on the job, or in combination. Experimental and demonstration programs provide new approaches and innovative techniques in recruiting, counseling, training and placement. Training allowances may be paid for up to 104 weeks of eligible trainees. Transportation and subsistence allowances also are paid.

Persons having priority for selection for training are: (1) unemployed workers, (2) persons working below their skill capacity or substantially less than full-time, (3) persons unemployed because their skills have become obsolete, (disadvantaged youth between 16 and 22 who are out of school and in need of job training.

Relevance to
Police Supports training of underpriviledged persons who otherwise could not qualify for police cadet or police recruit programs but who with special assistance can be enabled to meet departmental entrance requirements. It thereby facilitates recruitment into police departments of persons whose backgrounds enable them to enlist the cooperation and confidence of the community.

Project In New York City an MDTA financed project focused on recruiting Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Most were high school dropouts who received 6 months of general education to enable them to pass the high school equivalency examination. Thereafter they go on to 6 months of special training in law enforcement. They were given counseling and had a police officer as a "Dutch Uncle". Students below 21 at end of the program enter the regular cadet program or take civilian positions in the department until they can qualify to become officers. The regular entrance standards of the department are applied.

Administering

Agency

Department of Transportation

Program

National Highway Safety Program

Nature and Purpose of

Program

The National Highway and Safety Agency administers a wide range of highway safety programs. The Agency's research and development program provides (1) grants to State and local agencies, institutions and individuals for training or educating highway safety personnel, (2) development of improved accident investigation procedures, (4) emergency service plans and (3) demonstration projects. The Agency also provides a matching grants-inaid to State safety programs in which political subdivisions may participate.

Relevance to

Program supplements in-service training in highway safety provided by police departments. It also provides funds to assist police departments to develop new and improved techniques for increasing highway safety and for understanding the causes of highway accidents.

Illustrative Project

Develop teams of squad car and air craft patrols to detect and apprehend speeders.

## PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES EVALUATING THE POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE

Julie Kisielewski, M.A.
Research Associate
University Research Corporation
September 1967

From the 19th through the 21st of June, University Research Corporation held a Police-Community Relations Conference for representatives of police departments that had either received a grant, or had a grant pending, for developing police-community relations programs from the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance of the Justice Department. The Research Department of URC was asked to measure the effectiveness of this Conference. The most important considerations were:

- 1. Participants' expectations of the Conference and the relative fulfillment of those expectations.
- 2. Effect of the Conference on participants' knowledge about police-community relations programs, including the best approaches, target groups, and Federal support.
- 3. Effect of the Conference on participants' attitudes toward police-community relations, especially the relative importance of various factors in police-community relations.
- 4. Problems of respondents' police departments in getting and administering OLEA grants.
- 5. Respondents' evaluations of the Conference and suggestions for improvements.

To measure these variables, questionnaires were administered before and after the Conference. Although representatives of various agencies attended the Conference, evaluation questionnaires were distributed only to representatives of police departments which had an OLEA grant for police-community relations, or had a grant pending. See the end of this report for copies of the questionnaires.

Respondents were assured that their individual responses would be known only to the Research Department, as indicated by the code number on their questionnaire. However, they signed their names on a sheet with code numbers so they could receive the right form on the post-test. As an indication of their lack of concern about anonymity, several respondents signed their names on their questionnaires.

I I am grateful to the professional and secretarial staff of University Research Corporation for assistance in preparing the questionnaires and this analysis.

Miss Felice Peres, Miss Claudia Kontrovich and Miss Patricia Ellis were particularly helpful.

Thirty-five persons took both the pre- and post-tests; two others took only the pre-test, one only the post-test.

Although most respondents filled out the pre-test before any substantive material was presented, and the post-test after all substantive material was presented, eleven persons were unable to attend the 'grantsmanship' session before filling out the final questionnaires; their results were tabulated separately for material in that session.

The body of this report is divided into five sections, based on the sections of the questionnaires. The pre-test contained four sections, the post-test five, three of which were comparable to the pre-test. Each section was designed to measure one of the five variables listed on page one.

SECTION I: EMPHASIS ON CONFERENCE TOPICS (PRE- AND POST-TESTS)

Before the Conference, respondents were asked how much emphasis they <u>would like</u> <u>placed</u> on 14 possible Conference topics. Table I-A shows the frequencies of responses to five possible ratings, from "much emphasis" to "no emphasis," for each topic. They would have liked <u>most</u> emphasis on:

To exchange information, solutions, new approaches to problems (item 4--ranked #1)

To learn how to evaluate programs (item 3--ranked #2)

To get new ideas for projects (item 6--ranked #3).

### They wanted least emphasis on:

To learn how to develop a training program (item 10--ranked #14)

To learn how to increase the power and prestige of the community relations unit (item 13--ranked #13)

To understand human behavior and social change (item 12 -- ranked #12).

After the Conference, respondents were asked how much emphasis they felt was placed on each of the 14 possible Conference topics. The frequencies are shown on Table I-B. They perceived that these items had received most emphasis:

To exchange information, solutions, new approaches to problems (item 4--ranked #1)

To get new ideas for projects (item 6--ranked #2)

To learn how to deal with minorities and the poor (item 8 --ranked #3).

## They felt the <u>least</u> emphasis was on:

To learn how to solve problems around recruiting minority policemen (item 11--ranked #14)

To find out resources and consultants available (item 5 -- ranked #13)

To learn how to evaluate programs (item 3--ranked #12).

- Those respondents who took form B of the pre-test and D of the post-test were offered only a four-point scale, with the neutral category, "undecided," omitted. The points on the scale were numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5. See the questionnaires at the end of this report. In accordance with our hypothesis, the omission of the neutral category for this section did not increase the number of items left unanswered. Those taking form B were comparable to those taking form A, as Section II will explain. Therefore, the use of alternate forms probably did not affect the answers to this question.
- 3 The average responses for all items were ranked from 1 to 14, most emphasis to least emphasis.

Although item 3 was rated in <u>second</u> place in emphasis desired, it received <u>twelfth</u> place in emphasis placed on topics. Table I-C presents the ranks before and after the Conference, with discrepancies between emphasis desired and emphasis perceived. Since the discrepancies are not great, except for item 5, the respondents probably were satisfied with the emphasis on Conference topics. The dissatisfaction with evaluation also was indicated on the ratings of productivity (Section IV).

For those respondents who requested "much emphasis" on a given item on the pretests, their post-test ratings on "emphasis placed" on that item were noted. The ratings were generally in the direction of more emphasis than the average, possibly indicating that they were more alert to the topics during the Conference. The exceptions were items 10, 11, and 12 (develop a training program, recruit minority policemen, understand behavior), which they rated with less emphasis placed than the average respondent. Since these items were de-emphasized at the Conference, those persons desiring coverage of them probably also noticed the de-emphasis more than the average.

Other topics respondents suggested for coverage before the Conference were:

Learning methods of establishing contact with hard-to-contact groups and individuals

Reaching the man on the street

Learning mistakes of other police departments so we may avoid them

Recruiting police officers

Reporting to OLEA.

Other topics respondents mentioned as having been covered during the Conference were:

Devising plans to improve image of juvenile and adult (sic)

- Reaching our own officers

Preventing riots.

Most of these items were indeed covered at the Conference.

4 The rank-difference correlation was significant at the .05 level.

# SECTION II: CONTENT OF THE SESSIONS (PRE- AND POST-TESTS)

How much did the conferees "learn" of the information or approaches that were presented in the sessions?

Since time for preparing the questionnaires was greatly limited, an attempt was made to measure one important point from each of the five plenary sessions. Although the items were not validated against other criteria, content validity was suggested by minutes of the sessions.

Exposure to the questions before the Conference might have alerted the respondents to the information in the sessions, spuriously increasing their knowledge after the Conference. To control this factor, two questions were given to half the respondents before the Conference (form A) and to the other half afterward (form D); two other questions were given to the remaining halves of the respondents before the Conference (form B) and afterward (form C). [That is, those who took form A were later given form C; those who took B were later assigned alternate form D.] See the end of this report for all four forms of the questionnaires. It was assumed that the two groups would respond similarly, given their random selection and similar education, rank and length of service, and number of civilian representatives. To test this assumption, one additional question was given to the total group before and after; there was no noticeable difference in their response patterns.

A preliminary analysis would indicate that respondents probably did learn the approaches suggested at two sessions. Respondents were asked:

"In order to change the attitudes of alienated youth, the highest priority should be given to:

(Put a check by the appropriate letter. Only check one.)

- A. \_\_\_ Speaking to teenagers in the classroom
- B. \_\_\_ Distributing pamphlets on educational opportunities
- C. \_\_\_ Making parents legally responsible for their children's delinquent behavior
- D. \_\_\_ Recruiting hardcore delinquents to teach ball games to poor children."

<sup>5</sup> Before the Conference the two forms (A and B) were handed out alternately to respondents seated randomly. In both groups the average respondent had some college, with the range from high school graduate to graduate work. In both groups, the ranks ranged from sergeant to deputy chief or chief, with comparable numbers in each rank. The median number of years service was 17 for both groups, with the range from less than one year to more than thirty years. The numbers of civilian representatives were comparable: 3 and 4.

Thirty-eight persons answered this question (19 before and 19 others after the Conference). Only half as many participants chose option A or C after as before the Conference? Moreover, almost three times as many chose D, the "right" answer, after the Conference? (Option B did not appeal to anyone.) Since the target populations for youth programs, such as hardcore delinquents in option D, were discussed in the sessions, this significant change was probably the result of learning at the Conference.

A similar significant change was seen in responses to the following question:

"Police interested in community relations should establish contact with influential persons in the community. Which one of the following do you think would be most influential in a poor neighborhood:

(Put a check by the appropriate letter. Only check one.)

- A. \_\_\_ The Parent Teachers' Association
- B. \_\_\_ A businessmen's group.
- C. A member of the clergy
- D. Leader of the neighborhood gang."

Eighteen persons received this question before the Conference, 17 others after the Conference. All but one person chose the "right" answer, D, on the post-test while only two-thirds selected it on the pre-test. (The remaining six persons were distributed among the other options.) Since the relative importance of these options was specifically discussed in the first session, we may conclude that some conferees learned what was presented as the "right" target group.

However, results of the other questions were less striking. Respondents were asked the following question about evaluation:

"Since statisticians do not deal directly with delinquents, their help in evaluating a police youth program is pretty limited.

(Check one.)

strongly agree

\_\_\_agree

undecided

\_\_\_\_ disagree

\_\_\_ strongly disagree."

6 Because two persons took only the pre-test (form A) and one person only the posttest (form D), there is a difference of one or two persons answering the questions. However, the numbers are not large enough to affect the comparisons.

7 Eight chose A before the Conference, four afterward. Six chose C before, three

afterward.

8 Four persons chose D before the Conference, eleven afterward. The chi square comparing right and wrong answers before and after the Conference was 5.40, which is significant at the .05 level and barely missed the .02 level, where the critical value is 5.41.

a machi square, as above, is significant at the .05 level, with a value of 4.11.

Of the 19 persons responding before the Conference, only 10 percent agreed with this statement. But, of the 19 responding after the Conference, 37 percent agreed. This may have been due to the fact that in the "evaluation session," the role of professionals was played down, i.e., the major burden for identifying the problem, etc., was on the police department. On the other hand, five of the ten persons who disagreed after the Conference--one-half--checked "strongly disagree," while only two of the 14 persons who disagreed before the Conference checked "strongly disagree"--only one-seventh of those who disagreed.

Respondents were also asked:

"The best strategy to improve the position and influence of the community relations unit would be:

(Put a check by the appropriate letter. Only check one.)

- A. \_\_\_ Secure expert assistance in public relations
- B. \_\_\_ Convince the police department that community relations can help them catch criminals
- C. Require each policeman to spend part of each month with the community relations unit
- D. \_\_\_\_ Distribute literature on activities of the community relations unit
- E. Put Federal pressure on officials that do not cooperate."

The "right" answer, B, was based on the approach that the community relations unit should demonstrate that they could do some substantive good for the rest of the department; however, the meaning may have been obscure since it was chosen by only about one-third of the participants on both the pre- and post-tests. More popular with both groups was option C, which was discussed more frequently in the sessions. Of the 35 respondents (18 before and 17 others after), only three chose option D-distributing literature--and no one option E. The most interesting finding was the decrease in choice of option A--public relations--from five persons to one; perhaps they learned that this was a misinterpretation of "community relations."

Finally, all of the respondents were asked to match five government agencies with four police-community relations programs that the agencies might sponsor, or indicate if any of the five agencies had no program related to PCR. This was considered basic information for a department interested in a government grant.

The issue of prior exposure to information was considered less important for this topic because the conferees would be alerted for this information, even without a questionnaire.

Of the 35 persons who took both the pre- and post-tests, the 24 who attended the "grantsmanship" session improved only slightly, but more than the group of 11 who were unable to attend--9.1 percent net increase in correct responses compared to 3.6 percent. Table II-A shows the number of persons attending or not attending the "grantsmanship" session who correctly identified the government agencies programs before and after the Conference.

<sup>10</sup> Five out of 18 chose B before while six out of 17 chose it after. The increase is not significant. See footnote 6 about the discrepancy in total numbers.

11 Six chose C before the Conference, eight afterward.

The small gains in information were probably due to the de-emphasis of this area in the session. However, most of the items were covered in the booklet distributed at the beginning of the session. Because of the small numbers, percentages would be misleading and tests of statistical significance meaningless.

We cannot make any definite statement about what the policemen "learned" from only five questions given immediately after the Conference sessions. However, some gains in knowledge did appear to result from the content of the sessions.

# SECTION III--IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS IN POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS (PRE- AND POST-TESTS)

Before and after the Conference, respondents were asked to rate on a five-point  $scale^{12}$  the importance of twelve factors in terms of their contribution to good police-community relations. Table III-A presents the frequencies of responses.

The two most important factors both before and after were related:

Opening lines of communication between police and community (item 11 --ranked #1 before, tied for first place after)
Better understanding between police and community (item 4--ranked #2 before, tied for first place after).

The least important factors before the Conference were:

Citizen review of controversial police actions (item 3--ranked #12 before)

Holding ball games, teaching boxing, etc. to the poor (item 9-ranked #11 before).

The <u>least</u> important factors after the Conference were:

Holding ball games, teaching boxing, etc. to the poor (item 9-ranked #12 after)

Community relations unit to investigate civilian complaints (item 6
--ranked #11 after).

Item 3 had risen in importance to ninth place. The effects of these policies were discussed in the sessions, item 3 being seen as beneficial to community relations and item 6 as detrimental.

Item 8 (Coordinating activities of minority groups and city authorities) rose in importance, while items 10 (Showing that police are humans too) and 12 (Preventing race riots) dropped somewhat.

Unfortunately, many respondents retained their belief that 'Public relations programs' (item 1) was a very important factor. This contrasts with the finding in Section II of a lessened belief in 'public relations.'

<sup>12</sup> Respondents answering form B before and form D after the Conference were given a four-point scale. See footnote 2.

Additional factors respondents suggested before the Conference were:

Recruiting qualified policemen

Greater citizen involvement

Recruit- and in-service training

More and better jobs as well as adequate housing for the poor

Developing one-to-one contacts between patrol officers and members of minority communities

A separate unit should investigate civilian complaints.

Additional factors respondents suggested after the Conference were:

Police contact with community

Educate against negative actions with positive and real values

Total commitment to program by chief

A well-disciplined police department in the area of human treatment.

# SECTION IV--PROBLEMS IN GETTING AND ADMINISTERING OLEA GRANTS (PRE-TEST ONLY)

Before the Conference, the police department representatives were asked to rate how difficult eleven problems had been for their department to solve in getting and administering OLEA grants. The frequencies of responses to the five-point scale 15 are presented in Table IV-A. By far, the most difficult problem to solve was "Evaluating effectiveness of your program or projects" (item 9). This problem was also reflected in their desire for information on evaluation at this Conference. (See Section I.)

Other problems that were difficult to solve were: "Lack of clear Federal guidelines on expenditures," "Determining the type of program the Federal government requires," and "Establishing and maintaining communication with poor people."

The problem that was easiest to solve was "Cooperation of public agencies." Also relatively easy were: "Lack of local (city or state) expert assistance in designing your projects," "Lack of expert advice on administering projects," and "Getting matching funds or resources in kind." However, all of these problems proved difficult for some of the departments.

The respondents were asked about suggestions for solving any one of these problems. Their comments are reported in Attachment A. The most frequent solution for several of the difficult problems was clarification and communication of OLEA and other federal policy and goals.

They were also asked how they would change the grant application procedure. Their suggestions are in Attachment B. Again they requested clarification and simplification.

As in Sections I and III, those who took form B were only offered a four-point scale with the neutral category omitted. In this case, however, the lack of a neutral category caused many crissions, particularly in cases where the item was not applicable. There were only two omissions for those who had a neutral category, but they used the neutral category twice as many times as the other group omitted items. That is, those taking form A circled 'undecided' fifty-eight times and omitted two items, while those taking form B omitted items thirty times, for items 1 through 4 and 6 through 12. Items 5 and 13 ("other" problems) were rarely used.

## SECTIONS IV AND V--EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE (POST-TEST ONLY)

Respondents were asked to indicate the helpfulness and productivity of the sessions they had attended. Rated <u>most</u> productive were the "informal, unscheduled meetings" and the session on "Relations between the police-community relations unit and the police department."

Rated <u>least</u> productive were the open forum, the workshops, and the session on "Development and evaluation of programs for youth."

Ten representatives did not attend the open forum. Some of the objections of those who did attend were the lack of structure and the expression of opposing points of view. Comments by some participants indicated they possibly could not tolerate the ambiguity and questioning of values in this session. (One later suggested: "Come up with one best answer to controversial questions.")

Participants objected to the interruptions of the workshops and lack of time to present workshop reports. As one respondent noted, "To comment on the workshops is impossible--one was interrupted, one was cancelled, one was cut in half."

The objection to the "Development and evaluation..." session was the lack of substantive information on evaluation, particularly appropriate resource persons to utilize. From observation and the minutes of the session, it appeared that the speakers were not well prepared and did not attend to the announced subject of the session.

Of the 36 respondents, half thought the length of the plenary sessions was acceptable or were undecided. Two-thirds of the rest found them too short and one-third too long. However, two-thirds of the 36 thought the workshops were too short, three-tenths about right or undecided, and a small minority thought them too long.

Respondents were also asked two ways in which the Conference could have been improved. Their comments, in Attachment C, indicate the Conference was generally well received. One representative summed it up: "I was extremely impressed by the great amount of planning, obvious efforts, and sincerity of the individuals responsible for this Conference. I am also delighted to find that by eating all of my meals at the hotel, I was able to lose ten pounds. This in itself should aid our police public relations, image-wise. Thank you for my invitation."

#### CONCLUSIONS

A preliminary analysis was performed on questionnaires answered before and after the Police-Community Relations Conference. The police department representatives were generally receptive to the Conference, particularly the informal meetings and the session on 'Relations between the police-community relations unit and the police department. That some of the Conference goals were achieved is supported by changes in attitudes about the relative importance of several factors in community relations in the direction of relevant discussions at the Conference. Knowledge about community relations programs also appeared to increase as a result of Conference discussions.

A desire for help with evaluating projects was recurrently expressed. It was one of the topics on which they desired the most emphasis when tested before the Conference. It was the most difficult problem to solve in getting and administering OLEA grants. And it was brought up informally by several participants as a problem in funding--how to get evaluation of projects budgeted in a grant. However, the respondents rated the subject of evaluation as getting relatively little emphasis at the Conference (together with the related topic of finding out resources and consultants available). They rated "Development and evaluation of programs for youth" as one of the least productive and helpful sessions, primarily because evaluation was not discussed. And they failed to improve in their perception of statisticians as "pretty limited" in helping to evaluate programs. Therefore, the area of evaluation should probably be one of high priority in future programs.

Although the findings in this report confirm our impressions of the Conference, they should be viewed as tentative because of the limited nature of this analysis.



HOW MUCH EMPHASIS WOULD YOU LIKE PLACED ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POSSIBLE CONFERENCE TOPICS? (Circle only one response for each item, but answer all items.)

15.	14.	13	12.	11.	10.	۰	, ,	7.	6	5	4	د	. 2	<u> </u>	1
Other (Write in)	To learn how to reach youths who are potential trouble-makers	To learn how to increase the power and prestige of the community relations unit	To understand human behavior and social change	To learn how to solve problems around recruiting minority policemen	To learn how to develop a training program	To learn how to influence others in the department	To learn how to deal with minorities and the poor	To learn how to develop programs	To	To find out resources and consultants available	To exchange information, solutions, new approaches to problems	To	•	To learn about other sources of financial aid	
2	13	∞	9	12	7	12	16	13	19	10	31	28	9	7	MUCH
<b>J1</b>	16	15	16	15	16	17	. 18	17	15	18	<b>ن</b> ر	6	22	.25	SONE
0	<b></b>	ы	2	0	Þ	L	0	<b></b>	<b>J1</b>	2	0	. 0	0	0	UNDECIDED
H	<b>4</b>	7	7	9	10	6	2	6	2	6	· <b></b>	2	5	5	LITTLE
<b>Jud</b>	<b>.</b>	4	3	<b></b>	, ω	0	۳	.0	0	, <b>j</b>	0	ш	<u>u</u>	0	NO EMPHASIS
32	2	0	0	0	0	ш	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 .	0 .	OMITTED
.37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	TOTAL

ONSES TO SECTION I OF POST-TEST--E S PLACED ON 14 TOPICS

CIES OF K

HASIS WAS PLACED ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POSSIBLE CONFERENCE TOPICS? (Circle only one response for each item,

	MUCH	SOME	UNDECIDED	EMPHASIS	NO EMPHASIS	OMITIED	TOTAL
about other sources of financial aid	<b>6</b>	18	0	<b>∞</b>	<b></b>	<b></b>	36
the art of "grantsmanship"	<b>∞</b> .	19	1	6	0	2	36
how to evaluate programs	6	13	2	• 11	4	φ.	36
nge information, solutions, new nes to problems	26	• 9		; •	<b>0</b>	0	36
out resources and consultants avail-	<b>.</b> .	15	0	11	v	0	36
new ideas for projects	16	15	ننر	2	1	<b></b> -	36
n how to develop programs	9	20	1	6	0	0	36
n how to deal with minorities and the	15	12	<del>-</del>	œ	0	0	36
n how to influence others in the de	12	16	0	6	2	0	36
n how to develop a training program	9	15	ш	<b>∞</b>	ω 	0	36
n how to solve problems around recruiting y policemen	4	œ	4	. 16	4	0	36
erstand human behavior and social change	S	18	2	<b>∞</b>	W	0	36
n how to increase the power and prestige community relations unit	∞ .	12	. టా	11	2	0	36
n how to reach youths who are potential e-makers	ζī	23	0	6	0	2	36
	4	0	0	<b>—</b>	0	31 .	36

(Write in)

TABLE I-C

## DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EMPHASIS RESPONDENTS DESIRED AND EMPHASIS THEY FELT WAS PLACED ON 14 ITEMS DURING THE POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE

		Rank Order Emphasis Desired Before Conference	Rank Order Emphasis Perceived After Conference	Discrepancy
1.	To learn about other sources of financial aid	8	8	
2.	To learn the art of "grantsmanship"	9 .	5	4
3.	To learn how to evaluate programs	2	12	-10
4.	To exchange information, solutions, new approaches to problems.	1 *	1 *	0
5.	To find out resources and consultants available	10	13	-3
● 6.	To get new ideas for projects	<b>. 3</b>	2	1
7.	To learn how to develop programs	6	4	2
8.	To learn how to deal with minorities and the poor	4	3	1
	To learn how to influence others in the department	7	6	1
10.	To learn how to develop a training program	14	. 9 .	5
11.	To learn how to solve problems around recruiting minority policemen	. 11	' 14	-3
12.	To understand human behavior and social change	12	10	2
13.	To learn how to increase the power and prestige of the community relations unit	13	11	; <b>2</b>
<b>9</b> 4.	To learn how to reach youths who are potential trouble-makers	5	7	<b>-</b> 2

<sup>\* &</sup>quot;1" was the item with most emphasis, based on the average rating of the respondents. "14" was the item with the least emphasis.

#### TABLE II-A

MUNDER OF PERSONS ATTENDING OR NOT ATTENDING THE "GRANTSMANSHIP" SESSION WIO CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED THE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES' PROGRAMS

BEFORE AND AFTER THE CONFERENCE

•		ATTENDING SESSION N=24	NOT ATTENDING SESSION N=24	TOTAL NUMBER N=35
Α.	Department of Housing	and Urban	DevelopmentDemonstration	Cities Act
	number correct before Conference	14	7	21
	number correct after Conference	16	<b>.</b> 5	21
B:	Office of Economic Opp	ortunity*		
	number correct . before Conference	12	6	18
	number correct after Conference	10	7	17
C.	Health, Education, and	l Welfare,	Office of EducationProgra	ms for the Disadvantaged
	number correct before Conference	5	1	6
	number correct after Conference	7	. 4	11
D.	Health, Education, and Delinquency Program	l Welfare,	National Institute of Menta	11 HealthCrime and
	number correct before Conference	8	1	9
	number correct after Conference	13	. 4	17
E.	Department of Commerce	no funds	available for PCR programs	;
-	number correct before Conference	14	· 6	20
-	number correct after Conference	18	3	21

<sup>\*</sup> Since OEO originally sponsored Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), this was accepted as a "correct" answer. Some persons left OEO blank, possibly indicating they knew OEO had a program that was not listed. This was also "correct" since Labor now sponsors NYC.

TAP 11-A
FREQUENCIES OF REST AND POST-TEST IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS IN POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

RATE THE FOLLOWING IN TERMS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO GOOD POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS. (Circle only one response for each item, but answer all items.)

13.	12.	<u></u>	10.	9.	&	7.	6.	5.	4.	3.	2.	jund 0	
Other (Krite in)	Preventing race riots	Opening lines of communication between police and community	Showing that police are humans too	Holding ball games, teaching boxing, etc. to the poor	Coordinating activities of minority groups and city authorities	Community relations ability as a factor in police promotions	Community relations unit to investigate civilian complaints	Attending social functions	Better understanding between police and community .	Citizen review of controversial police actions	Citizen involvement in keeping down crime rate	Public relations programs	
Pre Post	Pro Post	Pro Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Pre Post	Þ
4 0	28 18	35 34	20 ° 16	10	17 21	14	. 96	42	33 34	' 73	28 27	21 19	VERY
01	13	21	10 11	110	12 12	13 12	· 12	12 14	N.M	10	<b>%</b> 7	. 12	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
00	0 4	00	1	<b>ω</b> 55	0	23	14	W W '	o o	<b>24</b>	00	00	UNDECIDED
00	0 4	0	83	15 15	2 2	47	<b>4</b> 6	12	01	9	2	44	SOMEHWAT
00	نسز نسز	00	2	<b>66</b>	1 3	<b>3</b> 8 °	, 9 , 13	4 &	00	12	00	1 3	VERY UNIMPORTANT
32 31	00	00	00	10	00	10	00	00	00	20	00	00	OM Tred
3 <b>7</b> 36	3 <i>7</i> 36	3 <i>7</i> 36	37 36	37 36	<b>37</b>	3 <i>7</i> 36	3 <i>7</i> 3 <i>6</i>	37 36	37 36	37	<b>37</b>	37 36	TOTA



# PROBLEMS WITH OLEA GRANTS

HOW DIFFICULT HAVE THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS BEEN FOR YOUR DEPARTMENT TO SOLVE IN GETTING AND ADMINISTERING OLEA GRANTS? (Circle only one response for leach item, but answer all items.)

12.	jend jend ·	10.	9.		7.	6.	MOV	4	3.	2.	· •	GET
Lack of qualified personnel within the department to staff the community relations unit	Cooperation of public agencies ·	Lack of expert advice on administering projects	Evaluating effectiveness of your program or projects	Having to deal with city comptroller or treasurer rather than police getting money directly	Lack of clear Federal guidelines on expenditures	Establishing and maintaining communication with poor people	AIMINISTERING GRANTS	Lack of local (city or state) expert assistance in designing your projects	Getting matching funds or resources in kind	Defining the job of community relations personnel within the department	Determining the type of program the Federal government requires	GETTING GRANTS
4	2	0	9	2	4	<b>ω</b> ·		4 ,	4	W	<b>H</b>	VERY DIFFICULT
12	7	12	15	11	13	10		9	10	∞	. 17	SOMEWHAT
2	ω	7	6	7	6	œ		4	4	4	7	UNDECIDED
12	17	11	4	9	10	œ		17	9	16	Q	SOMEWIAT
ω	4	3	0	4	0	3		ы	7	2	⊷	VERY
4	4	مثله	<sub>.</sub> ω	4	4	W		0	3	.2	. 2	OMITTED
3	. 33	37	37	37	37	3,		37	37	37	37	13

#### ATTACHMENT A

## SUGGESTIONS RESPONDENTS OFFERED FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS IN GETTING AND ADMINISTERING OLEA GRANTS

"WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR SOLVING ANY ONE OF THESE PROBLEMS MENTIONED ABOVE?"

Crants or funds to pay for a separate Community Relations Program

Have the OLEA clarify its goals.

An immediate evaluation would not give a true picture of the effectiveness of Police Community Relations.

Specific training in specific areas. Too much time is spent going over and over the same type of information only to be stopped at a point, then not having the money or personnel to carry out programs.

Making cuts without checking [in reference to item 7--lack of clear Federal guidelines on expenditures]

Far more training in the various aspects, greater contact with parties that are familiar with projects

More frequent literature on available grants for police departments

Maintaining good communications with public and department

It is my sincere belief that programs such as this Conference are very helpful to police agencies.

Simpler, more direct lines of communication with OLEA and specific guidelines on request when contemplating initiation of New Programs which may qualify

Annual meeting of Police-Community Relations personnel who meet to discuss and analyze programs

At this time a comparative approach (Conference) to gauge programs

Citizens advisory group

#### ATTACHMENT B

SUGGESTIONS RESPONDENTS OFFERED ON CHANGING THE OLEA GRANT APPLICATION PROCEDURE
WOULD YOU CHANGE THE GRANT APPLICATION PROCEDURE? NAME ONE WAY IN WHICH IT MIGHT BE CHANGED."

Closer relationship with various specific problems and problem areas could be established and maintained.

In a general simplification of application form

Make it more simple

Have project directors attend conference or school before start of program.

Closer contact with requesting agency

More information

Make available funds for police department to visit the office of OLEA for consultation on available grants.

More specific methodology in "grantsmanship"

Possible preliminary submission of idea to OLEA to see if merit, before project is completely written

It might be useful to police department to require only that a description be provided and OLEA would then provide expert help in making the formal application.

Definite guidelines published and kept current, together with listing of a specific individual to be contacted and not overextend that individual's capacity

Allow the police to get the money directly.

More simple grant application requirements--judgment of idea merit only--not so much detail

No change

It seems fine to me.

See no positive need for change in this area

I would not change it.

## SOME SUGGESTIONS BY RESPONDENTS FOR IMPROVING THE CONFERENCE

"LIST ANY TWO WAYS IN WHICH THE CONFERENCE COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED."

ussion of recognition of tension which is to erupt into disorder--how do you control this situation

More definite answers to questions

 Not enough emphasis that CR Bureau is as much a part of a Police Department as the Detective Bureau

Excellent program--no suggestions

 Orient group more quickly at plenary session and then release to workshop. Then discuss specific findings at greater length.

The observation of the Conference techniques was excellent instruction in itself.

Better facilities

Confine discussion to total issues rather than deviating to other topics.

sure that subjects are fully answered for particular topic--have far more information relative a positive application of subject matter.

More time given to development and evaluation of programs for youth

Better control of acknowledging speakers

Cover problems that are occurring within cities rather than how to get a grant and how to write up a grant.

By staying with one idea or question until fully answered

Define goals and objectives of conference.

Less defense of activities and more orderly lanation of progress

Meals set-up to be charged to flat allowance and selection left to individual

etter food [two respondents]

and de more explanation speakers, with a destion-answer participation from conferees.

More specific methodology on how to establish various programs

Workshops reports should be given a more important status.

More table space

Very good Conference. Only comment is that we need a stand-up break more often.

Less monopolizing of discussion periods by resource personnel

More nuts and bolts and less philosophy

Prior information of what participating cities' programs really consist of

Very well controlled Conference-have received many ideas for starting our PCR program. I am very greatful for the opportunity of meeting with other officers and units with common problems.

More representative participation

A more definite line of direction from the start More exchange of ideas

Place more emphasis on schedule.

Use of police as instructors—we do have some that could have helped us in PCR matters.

Better direction--more preparation of "experts"

More actual program discussion, less theory

More content orientation, more attention to real process

More emphasis on training

Eliminate evening sessions. [two respondents]

Use visual material.

Add at least one additional day to pick up loose ends.

More input on part of Conference attendees, more focus on day-to-day problems

Better control of speakers from the floor

Draw on less non-police (thinking) resource people for a variety of reasons.