

**JUVENILE COMMITMENT  
INDICATOR**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	78 ( 60)	115 ( 64)	445 ( 77)	32 ( 94)	197 ( 67)	87 ( 57)	157 ( 69)	15 ( 63)	20 ( 80)	47 ( 80)	42 ( 68)
One or More	44 ( 34)	38 ( 21)	26 ( 4)	2 ( 6)	69 ( 23)	46 ( 30)	46 ( 20)	3 ( 33)	3 ( 12)	9 ( 15)	17 ( 27)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>

**JUVENILE COMMITMENT  
INDICATOR**

JUVENILE COMMITMENT INDICATOR		None	One or More	Unknown	TOTAL
Longwood	354 ( 87 )	175 ( 75 )	94 ( 86 )	51 ( 80 )	85 ( 79 )
Shirley	175 ( 75 )	42 ( 18 )	12 ( 11 )	8 ( 13 )	17 ( 16 )
Lancaster	94 ( 86 )	12 ( 11 )	8 ( 13 )	17 ( 16 )	0 ( 0 )
Boston State	51 ( 80 )	8 ( 13 )	17 ( 16 )	0 ( 0 )	7 ( 11 )
S. Middlesex	85 ( 79 )	23 ( 92 )	56 ( 86 )	27 ( 93 )	32 ( 82 )
Park Drive	23 ( 92 )	56 ( 86 )	27 ( 93 )	32 ( 82 )	212 ( 81 )
Norfolk PRC	56 ( 86 )	27 ( 93 )	32 ( 82 )	212 ( 81 )	2325 ( 75 )
Charlotte House	27 ( 93 )	32 ( 82 )	212 ( 81 )	2325 ( 75 )	
Hillside PRC	32 ( 82 )	212 ( 81 )	2325 ( 75 )		
MHHI	212 ( 81 )	2325 ( 75 )			
Total	2325 ( 75 )				

**NUMBER OF PRIOR HOUSE  
OF CORRECTION  
INCARCERATIONS**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Frammingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	58 ( 45)	94 ( 53)	339 ( 58)	23 ( 68)	127 ( 43)	61 ( 40)	110 ( 48)	15 ( 63)	17 ( 68)	31 ( 53)	24 ( 39)
One	24 ( 18)	29 ( 16)	61 ( 11)	4 ( 12)	68 ( 23)	25 ( 16)	40 ( 18)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 16)	10 ( 17)	11 ( 18)
Two	14 ( 11)	14 ( 8)	43 ( 7)	2 ( 6)	31 ( 11)	23 ( 15)	19 ( 8)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 15)	10 ( 16)
Three	13 ( 10)	8 ( 4)	17 ( 3)	4 ( 12)	17 ( 6)	13 ( 8)	19 ( 8)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 7)	5 ( 8)
Four	6 ( 5)	4 ( 2)	4 ( 1)	1 ( 3)	10 ( 3)	2 ( 1)	9 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	2 ( 3)
Five	2 ( 2)	1 ( 1)	2 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	3 ( 1)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
Six or More	5 ( 4)	3 ( 2)	5 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 3)	7 ( 5)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)	6 ( 10)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**NUMBER OF PRIOR HOUSE  
OF CORRECTION  
INCARCERATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	247 ( 65)	120 ( 52)	67 ( 61)	40 ( 63)	56 ( 52)	16 ( 64)	47 ( 72)	20 ( 69)	25 ( 64)	136 ( 52)	1674 ( 54)
One	70 ( 18)	50 ( 22)	21 ( 19)	13 ( 20)	12 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	8 ( 12)	4 ( 14)	6 ( 15)	48 ( 18)	511 ( 17)
Two	19 ( 5)	21 ( 9)	8 ( 7)	3 ( 5)	15 ( 14)	3 ( 12)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 10)	3 ( 8)	24 ( 9)	268 ( 9)
Three	8 ( 2)	8 ( 3)	3 ( 3)	1 ( 2)	8 ( 7)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	2 ( 5)	14 ( 5)	152 ( 5)
Four	2 ( 1)	6 ( 3)	4 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	10 ( 4)	67 ( 2)
Five	0 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 2)	2 ( 2)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	31 ( 1)
Six or More	3 ( 1)	7 ( 3)	2 ( 2)	1 ( 2)	5 ( 5)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 5)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 5)	9 ( 3)	74 ( 2)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	15 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

**NUMBER OF PRIOR  
STATE OR FEDERAL  
INCARCERATIONS**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	77 ( 59)	126 ( 70)	406 ( 70)	24 ( 71)	208 ( 71)	103 ( 67)	165 ( 72)	18 ( 75)	22 ( 88)	49 ( 83)	48 ( 77)
One	26 ( 20)	14 ( 8)	28 ( 5)	6 ( 18)	25 ( 9)	18 ( 12)	21 ( 9)	3 ( 13)	1 ( 4)	5 ( 8)	7 ( 11)
Two	12 ( 9)	8 ( 4)	18 ( 3)	2 ( 6)	15 ( 5)	8 ( 5)	11 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	4 ( 6)
Three	3 ( 2)	4 ( 2)	9 ( 2)	1 ( 3)	5 ( 2)	2 ( 1)	5 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)
Four	2 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 3)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Five	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	5 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Six or More	2 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**NUMBER OF PRIOR  
STATE OR FEDERAL  
INCARCERATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	349 ( 92)	191 ( 82)	80 ( 73)	44 ( 69)	87 ( 81)	20 ( 80)	54 ( 83)	24 ( 83)	26 ( 67)	203 ( 78)	2327 ( 75)
One	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	10 ( 9)	10 ( 16)	8 ( 7)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	2 ( 7)	7 ( 18)	21 ( 8)	235 ( 8)
Two	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	10 ( 9)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 3)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	2 ( 7)	5 ( 13)	10 ( 4)	119 ( 4)
Three	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	3 ( 3)	1 ( 2)	3 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 6)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	9 ( 3)	53 ( 2)
Four	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	2 ( 2)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	23 ( 1)
Five	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	11 ( 0)
Six or More	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 0)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	15 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>3084</b>

NUMBER OF PRIOR  
ADULT INCARCERATIONS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	33 ( 25)	80 ( 45)	294 ( 51)	17 ( 50)	102 ( 35)	52 ( 34)	96 ( 42)	11 ( 46)	17 ( 68)	29 ( 49)	20 ( 32)
One	29 ( 22)	36 ( 20)	73 ( 13)	5 ( 15)	66 ( 22)	26 ( 17)	35 ( 15)	4 ( 17)	4 ( 16)	8 ( 14)	12 ( 19)
Two	26 ( 20)	12 ( 7)	47 ( 8)	3 ( 9)	30 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	30 ( 13)	3 ( 13)	0 ( 0)	11 ( 19)	13 ( 21)
Three	13 ( 10)	12 ( 7)	31 ( 5)	6 ( 18)	31 ( 11)	14 ( 9)	18 ( 8)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 8)
Four	9 ( 7)	4 ( 2)	11 ( 2)	2 ( 6)	11 ( 4)	8 ( 5)	13 ( 6)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 2)
Five	3 ( 2)	3 ( 2)	6 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 3)	4 ( 3)	6 ( 3)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Six or More	9 ( 7)	6 ( 3)	9 ( 2)	1 ( 3)	17 ( 6)	9 ( 6)	5 ( 2)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)	8 ( 13)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**NUMBER OF PRIOR  
ADULT INCARCERATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	447 ( 63 )	109 ( 47 )	51 ( 47 )	33 ( 52 )	54 ( 50 )	14 ( 56 )	43 ( 66 )	17 ( 59 )	21 ( 54 )	121 ( 46 )	1462 ( 47 )
One	70 ( 18 )	52 ( 22 )	23 ( 21 )	13 ( 20 )	8 ( 7 )	2 ( 8 )	6 ( 9 )	5 ( 17 )	3 ( 8 )	48 ( 18 )	529 ( 17 )
Two	19 ( 5 )	23 ( 10 )	14 ( 13 )	8 ( 13 )	13 ( 12 )	3 ( 12 )	5 ( 8 )	4 ( 14 )	6 ( 15 )	23 ( 9 )	313 ( 10 )
Three	8 ( 2 )	10 ( 4 )	4 ( 4 )	1 ( 2 )	10 ( 9 )	2 ( 8 )	4 ( 6 )	2 ( 7 )	3 ( 8 )	17 ( 7 )	198 ( 6 )
Four	2 ( 1 )	8 ( 3 )	8 ( 7 )	0 ( 0 )	7 ( 7 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 8 )	16 ( 6 )	108 ( 4 )
Five	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 2 )	3 ( 3 )	2 ( 3 )	3 ( 3 )	2 ( 8 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 3 )	8 ( 3 )	56 ( 2 )
Six or More	3 ( 1 )	11 ( 5 )	3 ( 3 )	2 ( 3 )	7 ( 7 )	6 ( 0 )	4 ( 6 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	11 ( 4 )	111 ( 4 )
Unknown	31 ( 8 )	15 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 5 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	17 ( 7 )	307 ( 10 )
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084



NUMBER OF PRIOR  
JUVENILE PAROLES

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	113 ( 87)	136 ( 76)	468 ( 81)	34 (100)	243 ( 83)	115 ( 75)	195 ( 86)	19 ( 79)	22 ( 88)	52 ( 88)	56 ( 90)
One	3 ( 2)	7 ( 4)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	10 ( 3)	8 ( 5)	4 ( 2)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 7)	1 ( 2)
Two	5 ( 4)	6 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	4 ( 3)	3 ( 1)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Three	1 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**-NUMBER OF PRIOR  
JUVENILE PAROLES**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	347 ( 91)	202 ( 87)	100 ( 92)	55 ( 86)	97 ( 91)	23 ( 92)	60 ( 92)	28 ( 97)	36 ( 92)	230 ( 88)	2635 ( 85)
One	1 ( 0)	7 ( 3)	6 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	4 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	5 ( 2)	69 ( 2)
Two	0 ( 0)	6 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	5 ( 2)	38 ( 1)
Three	1 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	2 ( 1)	20 ( 1)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	15 ( 0)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	12 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

NUMBER OF PRIOR JUVENILE  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Paroled	113 ( 87)	136 ( 76)	468 ( 81)	34 (100)	243 ( 83)	115 ( 75)	195 ( 86)	19 ( 79)	22 ( 88)	52 ( 88)	56 ( 90)
None	3 ( 2)	10 ( 6)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 3)	9 ( 6)	4 ( 2)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 2)
One	5 ( 4)	3 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	7 ( 2)	5 ( 3)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	0 ( 0)
Two	1 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)
Three	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>

**NUMBER OF PRIOR JUVENILE  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
Never Paroled	147 ( 91)	222 ( 87)	100 ( 92)	55 ( 86)	47 ( 91)	23 ( 92)	60 ( 92)	26 ( 97)	36 ( 92)	230 ( 88)	2635 ( 85)
None	1 ( 0)	7 ( 3)	4 ( 4)	1 ( 2)	3 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 5)	5 ( 2)	66 ( 2)
One	1 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 2)	3 ( 5)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	6 ( 2)	43 ( 1)
Two	0 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	1 ( 0)	21 ( 1)
Three	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	7 ( 0)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	5 ( 0)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	15 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

NUMBER OF PRIOR  
ADULT PAROLES

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Frammingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	94 ( 72 )	132 ( 74 )	434 ( 75 )	30 ( 88 )	214 ( 73 )	112 ( 73 )	171 ( 75 )	18 ( 75 )	21 ( 84 )	51 ( 86 )	52 ( 84 )
One	15 ( 12 )	14 ( 8 )	26 ( 4 )	4 ( 12 )	35 ( 12 )	14 ( 9 )	26 ( 11 )	4 ( 17 )	1 ( 4 )	4 ( 7 )	6 ( 10 )
Two	11 ( 8 )	5 ( 3 )	8 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	9 ( 3 )	4 ( 3 )	4 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )
Three	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	2 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 2 )	2 ( 1 )	2 ( 1 )	1 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )
Four or More	2 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )
Unknown	8 ( 6 )	26 ( 15 )	109 ( 19 )	0 ( 0 )	28 ( 10 )	20 ( 13 )	25 ( 11 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	3 ( 5 )
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**NUMBER OF PRIOR  
ADULT PAROLES**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	348 ( 92 )	197 ( 35 )	70 ( 83 )	51 ( 80 )	89 ( 83 )	21 ( 84 )	56 ( 86 )	27 ( 93 )	31 ( 79 )	206 ( 79 )	2449 ( 79 )
One	1 ( 0 )	14 ( 6 )	12 ( 11 )	5 ( 8 )	10 ( 9 )	2 ( 8 )	5 ( 8 )	1 ( 3 )	6 ( 15 )	20 ( 8 )	225 ( 7 )
Two	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	2 ( 2 )	2 ( 3 )	2 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	11 ( 4 )	65 ( 2 )
Three	3 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	2 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	7 ( 3 )	26 ( 1 )
Four or More	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	12 ( 0 )
Unknown	31 ( 8 )	15 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 5 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	17 ( 7 )	307 ( 10 )
INITIAL	360	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

**NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Frammingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Paroled	94 ( 72)	132 ( 74)	434 ( 75)	30 ( 88)	214 ( 73)	112 ( 73)	171 ( 75)	18 ( 75)	21 ( 84)	51 ( 86)	52 ( 84)
None	7 ( 5)	9 ( 5)	12 ( 2)	4 ( 12)	14 ( 5)	4 ( 3)	13 ( 6)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	4 ( 6)
One	15 ( 12)	9 ( 5)	21 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	26 ( 9)	14 ( 9)	15 ( 7)	4 ( 17)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	2 ( 3)
Two	4 ( 3)	3 ( 2)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	9 ( 3)	1 ( 1)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 2)
Three	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Four or More	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>

**NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MMHI	Total
Never Paroled	348 ( 92)	197 ( 85)	90 ( 83)	51 ( 80)	89 ( 83)	21 ( 84)	56 ( 86)	27 ( 93)	31 ( 79)	206 ( 79)	2449 ( 79)
None	1 ( 0)	10 ( 4)	9 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 3)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 3)	4 ( 10)	11 ( 4)	113 ( 4)
One	0 ( 0)	6 ( 3)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 3)	7 ( 7)	1 ( 4)	5 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 8)	19 ( 7)	159 ( 5)
Two	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	2 ( 2)	3 ( 5)	2 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	7 ( 3)	42 ( 1)
Three	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	10 ( 0)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 0)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	15 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
TOTAL	360	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084



TOTAL NUMBER OF  
PRIOR PAROLES

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	91 ( 70)	124 ( 69)	432 ( 74)	30 ( 88)	201 ( 68)	103 ( 67)	167 ( 73)	18 ( 75)	21 ( 84)	47 ( 80)	11 ( 82)
One	15 ( 12)	12 ( 7)	28 ( 5)	4 ( 12)	37 ( 13)	15 ( 10)	26 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	8 ( 14)	6 ( 10)
Two •	9 ( 7)	8 ( 4)	8 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	11 ( 4)	3 ( 2)	5 ( 2)	2 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Three	2 ( 2)	5 ( 3)	2 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	7 ( 2)	5 ( 3)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)
Four or More	5 ( 4)	4 ( 2)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	10 ( 3)	7 ( 5)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**TOTAL NUMBER OF  
PRIOR PAROLES**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	340 ( 91)	184 ( 81)	88 ( 81)	49 ( 77)	87 ( 81)	21 ( 84)	54 ( 83)	27 ( 93)	30 ( 77)	202 ( 77)	2382 ( 77)
One	2 ( 1)	12 ( 5)	12 ( 11)	5 ( 8)	9 ( 8)	2 ( 8)	5 ( 8)	1 ( 3)	5 ( 13)	17 ( 7)	223 ( 7)
Two	0 ( 0)	8 ( 3)	3 ( 3)	2 ( 3)	4 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 5)	13 ( 5)	79 ( 3)
Three	1 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	2 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	4 ( 2)	39 ( 1)
Four or More	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	1 ( 1)	3 ( 5)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	8 ( 3)	54 ( 2)
Unknown	31 ( 8)	15 ( 6)	3 ( 3)	5 ( 8)	5 ( 5)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	17 ( 7)	307 ( 10)
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIOR  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Frammingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Paroled	91 ( 70)	124 ( 69)	432 ( 74)	30 ( 88)	201 ( 68)	103 ( 67)	167 ( 73)	18 ( 75)	21 ( 84)	47 ( 80)	51 ( 82)
None	6 ( 5)	12 ( 7)	14 ( 2)	4 ( 12)	18 ( 6)	8 ( 5)	13 ( 6)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 5)	4 ( 6)
One	18 ( 14)	10 ( 6)	21 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	13 ( 8)	18 ( 8)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	5 ( 8)	2 ( 3)
Two	4 ( 3)	3 ( 2)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	11 ( 4)	5 ( 3)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 13)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 2)
Three	1 ( 1)	4 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	1 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Four or More	2 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIOR  
PAROLE VIOLATIONS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
Never Paroled	340 ( 41 )	184 ( 81 )	88 ( 61 )	49 ( 77 )	87 ( 81 )	21 ( 64 )	54 ( 83 )	27 ( 93 )	30 ( 77 )	202 ( 77 )	2382 ( 77 )
None	4 ( 1 )	12 ( 5 )	9 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	3 ( 3 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	4 ( 10 )	12 ( 5 )	131 ( 4 )
One	1 ( 0 )	8 ( 3 )	7 ( 6 )	3 ( 5 )	8 ( 7 )	1 ( 4 )	4 ( 6 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 8 )	17 ( 7 )	170 ( 6 )
Two	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 2 )	2 ( 2 )	4 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	9 ( 3 )	59 ( 2 )
Three	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 5 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	19 ( 1 )
Four or More	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	16 ( 1 )
Unknown	31 ( 8 )	15 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 5 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	17 ( 7 )	307 ( 10 )
TOTAL	360	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

AGE AT FIRST  
COURT APPEARANCE

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
12 or Younger	16 ( 12 )	20 ( 11 )	18 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	37 ( 13 )	26 ( 17 )	19 ( 8 )	5 ( 21 )	0 ( 0 )	6 ( 10 )	7 ( 11 )
13	9 ( 7 )	14 ( 8 )	17 ( 3 )	2 ( 6 )	21 ( 7 )	8 ( 5 )	15 ( 7 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )	7 ( 11 )
14	15 ( 12 )	12 ( 7 )	18 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	26 ( 9 )	10 ( 7 )	26 ( 11 )	1 ( 4 )	1 ( 4 )	4 ( 7 )	4 ( 6 )
15	17 ( 13 )	14 ( 8 )	28 ( 5 )	3 ( 9 )	28 ( 10 )	14 ( 9 )	26 ( 11 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 12 )	8 ( 14 )	7 ( 11 )
16	18 ( 14 )	10 ( 6 )	35 ( 6 )	1 ( 3 )	29 ( 10 )	15 ( 10 )	19 ( 8 )	2 ( 8 )	4 ( 16 )	3 ( 5 )	8 ( 13 )
17	27 ( 21 )	25 ( 14 )	60 ( 10 )	5 ( 15 )	42 ( 14 )	22 ( 14 )	41 ( 18 )	6 ( 25 )	0 ( 0 )	11 ( 19 )	5 ( 8 )
18	8 ( 6 )	13 ( 7 )	35 ( 6 )	4 ( 12 )	25 ( 9 )	11 ( 7 )	22 ( 10 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 12 )	6 ( 10 )	5 ( 8 )
19	2 ( 2 )	9 ( 5 )	31 ( 5 )	4 ( 12 )	14 ( 5 )	3 ( 2 )	6 ( 3 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 8 )	4 ( 7 )	2 ( 3 )
20	3 ( 2 )	8 ( 4 )	27 ( 5 )	1 ( 3 )	14 ( 5 )	6 ( 4 )	5 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 12 )	5 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )
21	3 ( 2 )	3 ( 2 )	25 ( 4 )	1 ( 3 )	5 ( 2 )	5 ( 3 )	3 ( 1 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 8 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )
22	2 ( 2 )	3 ( 2 )	13 ( 2 )	3 ( 9 )	8 ( 3 )	2 ( 1 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	2 ( 3 )
23	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	19 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	2 ( 1 )	2 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 6 )
24	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	19 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	3 ( 1 )	1 ( 1 )	3 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )
25	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 3 )	22 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 5 )	1 ( 2 )
26-29	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 3 )	48 ( 8 )	5 ( 15 )	4 ( 1 )	5 ( 3 )	5 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )
30-39	2 ( 2 )	9 ( 5 )	40 ( 7 )	3 ( 9 )	6 ( 2 )	3 ( 2 )	4 ( 2 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	3 ( 5 )
40-64	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	15 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	1 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )
65 and Older	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )
Unknown	8 ( 6 )	26 ( 15 )	109 ( 19 )	0 ( 0 )	28 ( 10 )	20 ( 13 )	25 ( 11 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	3 ( 5 )
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**AGE AT FIRST  
COURT APPEARANCE**

AGE AT FIRST COURT APPEARANCE		Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
12 or Younger	1	1	1	4	4	9	0	2	0	5	12	213
13	11	11	1	3	3	3	0	5	1	1	10	149
14	21	21	6	5	5	3	0	8	3	3	4	513
15	40	40	5	5	5	9	1	4	3	3	23	200
16	19	19	6	6	6	10	0	6	0	8	9	613
17	23	23	9	9	9	10	0	9	0	13	10	239
18	18	18	7	7	7	11	6	5	0	2	21	242
19	17	17	9	9	3	8	1	8	0	3	19	165
20	11	11	10	10	1	3	2	3	2	2	15	139
21	3	3	6	6	4	4	3	1	1	4	7	99
22	11	11	6	6	6	4	12	2	3	10	3	78
23	6	6	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	33
24	11	11	2	2	1	4	1	2	1	2	2	57
25	2	2	5	5	1	1	0	3	2	0	6	64
26-29	4	4	7	7	1	6	1	4	2	0	10	141
30-39	15	15	8	8	4	7	0	5	3	3	16	176
40-64	8	8	3	3	1	3	3	4	3	1	4	71
65 and Older	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unknown	11	15	3	5	5	5	2	2	1	0	17	307
Total	260	432	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084	

**AGE AT FIRST COURT  
APPEARANCE FOR  
ALCOHOL OFFENSE**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Not Applicable	93 ( 72)	121 ( 68)	392 ( 68)	29 ( 85)	214 ( 73)	97 ( 63)	157 ( 69)	20 ( 83)	17 ( 68)	44 ( 75)	40 ( 65)
14 or Younger	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	2 ( 1)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
15-17	8 ( 6)	6 ( 3)	7 ( 1)	2 ( 6)	9 ( 3)	14 ( 9)	11 ( 5)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 7)	2 ( 3)
18-19	11 ( 8)	10 ( 6)	15 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	13 ( 4)	5 ( 3)	18 ( 8)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)	5 ( 8)
20-21	5 ( 4)	2 ( 1)	11 ( 2)	2 ( 6)	13 ( 4)	7 ( 5)	6 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 8)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 5)
22-25	2 ( 2)	5 ( 3)	18 ( 3)	1 ( 3)	9 ( 3)	4 ( 3)	8 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	3 ( 5)	7 ( 11)
26-29	1 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	10 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
30-39	0 ( 0)	6 ( 3)	14 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 2)
40 and Older	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	4 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**AGE AT FIRST COURT  
APPEARANCE FOR  
ALCOHOL OFFENSE**

AGE AT FIRST COURT APPEARANCE FOR ALCOHOL OFFENSE											
Not Applicable	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
	( 0 ) 0	( 71 ) 164	( 74 ) 81	( 72 ) 46	( 66 ) 71	( 68 ) 17	( 68 ) 44	( 83 ) 24	( 62 ) 24	( 70 ) 184	( 61 ) 1882
14 or Younger	( 1 ) 2	( 0 ) 1	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 9
15-17	( 5 ) 19	( 6 ) 13	( 5 ) 5	( 5 ) 3	( 7 ) 7	( 0 ) 0	( 8 ) 5	( 0 ) 0	( 3 ) 1	( 4 ) 11	( 4 ) 129
18-19	( 18 ) 68	( 5 ) 12	( 4 ) 4	( 8 ) 5	( 6 ) 6	( 12 ) 3	( 6 ) 4	( 0 ) 0	( 8 ) 3	( 6 ) 15	( 6 ) 199
20-21	( 15 ) 56	( 3 ) 7	( 4 ) 4	( 6 ) 4	( 7 ) 7	( 0 ) 0	( 6 ) 4	( 3 ) 1	( 8 ) 3	( 2 ) 5	( 5 ) 144
22-25	( 20 ) 72	( 4 ) 9	( 6 ) 6	( 0 ) 0	( 7 ) 8	( 8 ) 2	( 5 ) 3	( 3 ) 1	( 13 ) 5	( 7 ) 18	( 6 ) 167
26-29	( 12 ) 42	( 1 ) 3	( 4 ) 4	( 0 ) 0	( 2 ) 2	( 4 ) 1	( 3 ) 2	( 0 ) 0	( 8 ) 3	( 0 ) 1	( 3 ) 82
30-39	( 15 ) 56	( 2 ) 5	( 2 ) 2	( 2 ) 1	( 1 ) 1	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 3 ) 9	( 3 ) 103
40 and Older	( 7 ) 28	( 1 ) 3	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 0	( 2 ) 1	( 7 ) 2	( 0 ) 0	( 0 ) 1	( 1 ) 42
Unknown	( 8 ) 31	( 6 ) 15	( 3 ) 3	( 8 ) 5	( 5 ) 5	( 8 ) 2	( 3 ) 2	( 3 ) 1	( 0 ) 0	( 7 ) 17	( 10 ) 307
TOTAL	360	234	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084



**AGE AT FIRST COURT  
APPEARANCE FOR  
DRUG OFFENSE**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Not Applicable	52 ( 40)	63 ( 35)	241 ( 42)	8 ( 24)	120 ( 41)	53 ( 35)	99 ( 43)	15 ( 63)	13 ( 52)	27 ( 46)	27 ( 44)
14 or Younger	7 ( 5)	4 ( 2)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	6 ( 3)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)
15-17	23 ( 18)	20 ( 11)	25 ( 4)	3 ( 9)	33 ( 11)	22 ( 14)	31 ( 14)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 7)	8 ( 13)
18-19	16 ( 12)	17 ( 9)	33 ( 6)	4 ( 12)	26 ( 9)	20 ( 13)	26 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	1 ( 4)	7 ( 12)	4 ( 6)
20-21	8 ( 6)	14 ( 8)	43 ( 7)	5 ( 15)	33 ( 11)	14 ( 9)	16 ( 7)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 12)	6 ( 10)	7 ( 11)
22-25	12 ( 9)	13 ( 7)	55 ( 9)	4 ( 12)	29 ( 10)	12 ( 8)	14 ( 6)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 12)	8 ( 14)	6 ( 10)
26-29	1 ( 1)	7 ( 4)	33 ( 6)	4 ( 12)	6 ( 2)	6 ( 4)	3 ( 1)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 5)
30-39	3 ( 2)	14 ( 8)	32 ( 6)	5 ( 15)	14 ( 5)	3 ( 2)	5 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	1 ( 2)
40 and Older	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	8 ( 1)	1 ( 3)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)
Unknown	8 ( 6)	26 ( 15)	109 ( 19)	0 ( 0)	28 ( 10)	20 ( 13)	25 ( 11)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 5)	3 ( 5)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

**AGE AT FIRST COURT  
APPEARANCE FOR  
DRUG OFFENSE**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middle	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
Not Applicable	248 ( 65 )	43 ( 40 )	40 ( 37 )	23 ( 36 )	44 ( 41 )	13 ( 52 )	39 ( 60 )	11 ( 38 )	23 ( 59 )	100 ( 38 )	1352 ( 44 )
14 or Younger	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	34 ( 1 )
15-17	17 ( 4 )	22 ( 9 )	7 ( 6 )	8 ( 13 )	9 ( 8 )	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 6 )	1 ( 3 )	2 ( 5 )	13 ( 5 )	257 ( 8 )
18-19	22 ( 6 )	20 ( 9 )	8 ( 7 )	10 ( 16 )	11 ( 10 )	2 ( 8 )	6 ( 9 )	4 ( 14 )	1 ( 3 )	24 ( 9 )	263 ( 9 )
20-21	16 ( 4 )	22 ( 9 )	10 ( 9 )	6 ( 9 )	6 ( 6 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 3 )	3 ( 10 )	2 ( 5 )	20 ( 8 )	236 ( 8 )
22-25	24 ( 6 )	26 ( 11 )	23 ( 21 )	4 ( 6 )	12 ( 11 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	4 ( 14 )	4 ( 10 )	44 ( 17 )	305 ( 10 )
26-29	10 ( 3 )	13 ( 6 )	8 ( 7 )	5 ( 8 )	13 ( 12 )	5 ( 20 )	2 ( 3 )	2 ( 7 )	2 ( 5 )	12 ( 5 )	141 ( 5 )
30-39	11 ( 3 )	13 ( 6 )	7 ( 6 )	3 ( 5 )	2 ( 2 )	1 ( 4 )	2 ( 3 )	2 ( 7 )	4 ( 10 )	24 ( 9 )	149 ( 5 )
40 and Older	1 ( 0 )	6 ( 3 )	2 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 4 )	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 6 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 3 )	6 ( 2 )	40 ( 1 )
Unknown	31 ( 6 )	15 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 5 )	2 ( 8 )	2 ( 3 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	17 ( 7 )	307 ( 10 )
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

**Furlough Program Participation**

TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
None	121 ( 93)	162 ( 91)	573 ( 99)	26 ( 76)	255 ( 87)	127 ( 83)	195 ( 86)	22 ( 92)	18 ( 72)	43 ( 73)	39 ( 63)
One	5 ( 4)	5 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	11 ( 4)	6 ( 4)	13 ( 6)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 5)
2-5	2 ( 2)	7 ( 4)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 9)	17 ( 6)	11 ( 7)	14 ( 6)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 16)	2 ( 3)	6 ( 10)
6-10	2 ( 2)	4 ( 2)	2 ( 0)	2 ( 6)	9 ( 3)	5 ( 3)	4 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	6 ( 10)	7 ( 11)
11-15	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 2)	4 ( 6)
16-20	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	2 ( 3)
21-30	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	6 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 2)
31-50	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	0 ( 0)
51-100	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
101 or More	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS</u>	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
None	283 ( 74 )	188 ( 81 )	78 ( 72 )	27 ( 42 )	55 ( 51 )	14 ( 56 )	45 ( 69 )	20 ( 69 )	8 ( 21 )	106 ( 41 )	2410 ( 78 )
One	51 ( 13 )	9 ( 4 )	5 ( 5 )	4 ( 6 )	5 ( 5 )	1 ( 4 )	4 ( 6 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	20 ( 8 )	147 ( 5 )
2-5	45 ( 12 )	15 ( 6 )	5 ( 5 )	4 ( 6 )	19 ( 18 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 3 )	2 ( 7 )	0 ( 0 )	44 ( 17 )	206 ( 7 )
6-10	1 ( 0 )	12 ( 5 )	11 ( 10 )	5 ( 8 )	15 ( 14 )	3 ( 12 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 17 )	5 ( 13 )	44 ( 17 )	147 ( 5 )
11-15	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	3 ( 3 )	8 ( 13 )	5 ( 5 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	1 ( 3 )	3 ( 8 )	17 ( 7 )	55 ( 2 )
16-20	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 2 )	3 ( 3 )	4 ( 6 )	4 ( 4 )	3 ( 12 )	2 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	11 ( 28 )	13 ( 5 )	54 ( 2 )
21-30	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 3 )	8 ( 13 )	3 ( 3 )	1 ( 4 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	6 ( 15 )	9 ( 3 )	34 ( 1 )
31-50	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 4 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	2 ( 1 )	13 ( 0 )
51-100	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	6 ( 2 )	13 ( 0 )
101 or More	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 0 )
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL  
FURLOUGHS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Furloughed	121 ( 93)	162 ( 91)	573 ( 99)	26 ( 76)	255 ( 87)	127 ( 83)	195 ( 86)	22 ( 92)	18 ( 72)	43 ( 73)	39 ( 63)
None	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
One	5 ( 4)	4 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	8 ( 3)	6 ( 4)	14 ( 6)	1 ( 4)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	3 ( 5)
2-5	2 ( 2)	7 ( 4)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 9)	17 ( 6)	11 ( 7)	13 ( 6)	1 ( 4)	4 ( 16)	2 ( 3)	6 ( 10)
6-10	2 ( 2)	4 ( 2)	2 ( 0)	2 ( 6)	9 ( 3)	5 ( 3)	5 ( 2)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	6 ( 10)	7 ( 11)
11-15	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 8)	1 ( 2)	4 ( 6)
16-20	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	1 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	2 ( 3)	2 ( 3)
21-30	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	1 ( 2)
31-50	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 3)	0 ( 0)
51-100	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
101 or More	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
TOTAL	130	179	580	34	294	153	228	24	25	59	62

# NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL FURLONGHS

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PR	MHHI	Total
Never Furloughed	283 ( 74 )	188 ( 61 )	78 ( 72 )	27 ( 42 )	55 ( 51 )	14 ( 56 )	45 ( 69 )	20 ( 69 )	8 ( 21 )	106 ( 41 )	2410 ( 78 )
None	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	4 ( 0 )
One	52 ( 14 )	10 ( 4 )	6 ( 6 )	4 ( 6 )	5 ( 5 )	1 ( 4 )	4 ( 6 )	1 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	22 ( 8 )	149 ( 5 )
2-5	44 ( 12 )	15 ( 6 )	4 ( 4 )	4 ( 6 )	19 ( 18 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 3 )	2 ( 7 )	0 ( 0 )	42 ( 16 )	201 ( 7 )
6-10	1 ( 0 )	11 ( 5 )	11 ( 10 )	5 ( 8 )	15 ( 14 )	3 ( 12 )	5 ( 8 )	5 ( 17 )	5 ( 13 )	44 ( 17 )	147 ( 5 )
11-15	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	3 ( 3 )	8 ( 13 )	6 ( 6 )	2 ( 8 )	3 ( 5 )	1 ( 3 )	5 ( 13 )	17 ( 7 )	57 ( 2 )
16-20	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 2 )	3 ( 3 )	4 ( 6 )	3 ( 3 )	3 ( 12 )	2 ( 3 )	0 ( 0 )	10 ( 26 )	14 ( 5 )	53 ( 2 )
21-30	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	3 ( 3 )	9 ( 14 )	3 ( 3 )	1 ( 4 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 13 )	8 ( 3 )	33 ( 1 )
31-50	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 4 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	2 ( 1 )	13 ( 0 )
51-100	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	6 ( 2 )	12 ( 0 )
101 or More	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	0 ( 0 )	5 ( 0 )
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

**NUMBER OF LATE  
UNDER FURLOUGHS**

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Furloughed	121 ( 93)	162 ( 91)	573 ( 99)	26 ( 76)	255 ( 87)	127 ( 83)	195 ( 86)	22 ( 92)	18 ( 72)	43 ( 73)	39 ( 63)
None	9 ( 7)	15 ( 8)	6 ( 1)	7 ( 21)	36 ( 12)	22 ( 14)	31 ( 14)	2 ( 8)	7 ( 28)	15 ( 25)	23 ( 37)
One	0 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 3)	3 ( 1)	3 ( 2)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	0 ( 0)
2-5	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
6-10	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>



**NUMBER OF LATE  
UNDER FURLONGHS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
Never Furloughed	263 ( 74 )	186 ( 81 )	78 ( 72 )	27 ( 42 )	55 ( 51 )	14 ( 56 )	45 ( 69 )	20 ( 69 )	8 ( 21 )	106 ( 41 )	2410 ( 79 )
None	90 ( 22 )	40 ( 17 )	24 ( 22 )	32 ( 50 )	45 ( 42 )	6 ( 32 )	19 ( 29 )	7 ( 24 )	25 ( 64 )	134 ( 51 )	603 ( 20 )
One	1 ( 0 )	3 ( 1 )	6 ( 6 )	5 ( 8 )	6 ( 6 )	3 ( 12 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 7 )	5 ( 13 )	17 ( 7 )	60 ( 2 )
2-5	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 1 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 2 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 3 )	3 ( 1 )	9 ( 0 )
6-10	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	1 ( 0 )	2 ( 0 )
TOTAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

NUMBER OF LATE  
OVER FURLONGHS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Framingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Furloughed	121 ( 93)	162 ( 91)	573 ( 99)	26 ( 76)	255 ( 87)	127 ( 83)	195 ( 86)	22 ( 92)	18 ( 72)	43 ( 73)	39 ( 63)
None	9 ( 7)	17 ( 9)	7 ( 1)	8 ( 24)	39 ( 13)	25 ( 16)	33 ( 14)	2 ( 8)	7 ( 28)	16 ( 27)	23 ( 37)
One	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>

**NUMBER OF LATE  
OVER FURLONGHS**

Never Furloughed	283 ( 74 )	188 ( 81 )	78 ( 72 )	27 ( 42 )	55 ( 51 )	14 ( 56 )	45 ( 69 )	20 ( 69 )	8 ( 21 )	106 ( 41 )	2410 ( 78 )	Total
None	97 ( 26 )	44 ( 19 )	31 ( 28 )	37 ( 58 )	52 ( 49 )	11 ( 44 )	20 ( 31 )	9 ( 31 )	29 ( 74 )	154 ( 59 )	670 ( 22 )	
One	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 5 )	1 ( 0 )	4 ( 0 )	
INITIAL	380	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084	

NUMBER OF ESCAPE  
FURLOUGHS

	Cedar Junction	Concord	Frammingham	Hodder House	Norfolk	NCCI	SECC	Bay State	NCC	Plymouth	Warwick
Never Furloughed	121 ( 93)	162 ( 91)	573 ( 99)	26 ( 76)	255 ( 87)	127 ( 83)	195 ( 86)	22 ( 92)	18 ( 72)	43 ( 73)	39 ( 63)
None	9 ( 7)	17 ( 9)	6 ( 1)	8 ( 24)	34 ( 12)	25 ( 16)	33 ( 14)	2 ( 8)	7 ( 28)	16 ( 27)	23 ( 37)
One.	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	5 ( 2)	1 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>

**NUMBER OF ESCAPE  
FURLONGHS**

	Longwood	Shirley	Lancaster	Boston State	S. Middlesex	Park Drive	Norfolk PRC	Charlotte House	Hillside PRC	MHHI	Total
Never Furloughed	483 ( 74 )	188 ( 81 )	78 ( 72 )	27 ( 42 )	55 ( 51 )	14 ( 56 )	45 ( 69 )	20 ( 69 )	8 ( 21 )	106 ( 41 )	2410 ( 78 )
None	47 ( 26 )	44 ( 19 )	31 ( 26 )	37 ( 58 )	52 ( 49 )	11 ( 44 )	20 ( 31 )	9 ( 31 )	31 ( 79 )	153 ( 59 )	665 ( 22 )
One	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	0 ( 0 )	2 ( 1 )	9 ( 0 )
TOTAL	580	232	109	64	107	25	65	29	39	261	3084

## Glossary

### Age at First Drug and Alcohol Court Appearances

Not applicable means never charged with such offenses.

### Complex Sentence (Time Served)

Forthwith sentences, split sentences, from & after sentences or fines are categorized as complex sentences and are not included in the calculation of time served.

### Contract (Security Level Released From)

The contract pre-release facilities are: Brooke House, Coolidge House II, Coolidge House, McGrath House, Temporary Housing Program, Hillside Pre-Release Center, Charlotte House, and Drug Houses.

### Court From Which Committed

Municipal Courts are lower courts of Suffolk County.

District Courts are lower courts of all other counties.

### Drug Offenses

Class A includes heroin and morphine

Class B includes cocaine, opium, amphetamines and barbiturates.

Class C includes hallucinogens.

Class D includes marijuana.

Class E includes other prescription drugs.

### Furlough Outcomes

Successful: returned to DOC facility within the designated number of hours.

Late Under: returned to DOC facility within two hours after designated time of return.

Furlough Outcomes (Cont.)

Institution

Known Drug Use

Minimum Sentence

MSA

Number of Charges for Various Offenses

Late Over: declared escape, returned to DOC facility voluntarily within 24 hours of the designated time of return.

Escape: declared escape, did not return voluntarily within 24 hours of designated time of return.

SECC is Southeastern Correctional Center.

NCC is Northeastern Correctional Center.

MHHI refers to Massachusetts Halfway Houses, Inc. facilities. This includes Brooke House, Coolidge House, Coolidge II, McGrath House and the Temporary Housing Program.

Drug Rehabilitation refers to pre-release facilities with a substance abuse program component. This includes Spectrum House.

This information is obtained from the Probation Department report prepared on each individual. Persons are described as drug users if they: (a) describe themselves as one or, (b) have a history of court appearances for narcotics offenses.

Cases with no minimum term are county or reformatory sentences; parole eligibility is determined by the Parole Board Regulations.

Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The variables listed as "Charges for Person, Sex, Property, Escape, Alcohol and Drug offenses" includes the present charges as well as all prior charges.

**Number of Prior House of Correction Incarcerations**

**Present Offense**

**Person Offenses**

**Sex Offenses**

**Property Offenses**

County incarcerations have a maximum sentence length of 2½ years.

The most serious charge is listed if an individual is committed for more than one offense.

**Manslaughter** includes vehicular homicide;

**Armed assault** includes armed assaults in dwelling houses, assault and battery with dangerous weapon, and attempted murder;

**Unarmed assault** includes assault and assault and battery, and other assaults;

**Other Person** includes confining or putting in fear a person for the purpose of stealing, and mayhem;

**Assault w/int. to rape** includes indecent assault and battery on a person over 14;

**Rape of Minor** includes rape of child, and rape of female under sixteen;

**Assault w/int. rape minor** includes indecent assault and battery on child under 14, and assault on female under 16 with intent to commit rape;

**Crimes Against Chastity, Morality** includes unnatural and lascivious acts, open and gross lewdness, child pornography, and other sex offenses;

**Stealing** includes common and notorious thief;

**Vehicle Theft** includes use without authority;



## Drug Offenses

**Controlled Substance** includes the manufacturing, distribution, dispensing or possession with intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense a controlled substance, and mandatory drug offenses for possession: -

- **Class A** consists of heroin and morphine;
- **Class B** consists of cocaine; opium, amphetamines and barbiturates,
- **Class C** consists of hallucinogens;
- **Class D** consists of marijuana;
- **Class E** consists of prescription drugs;
- **No Class Specified** means that the type of drug is not indicated by the sentence;

**Other Drug** includes being present where narcotic drugs illegally kept, sale of heroin, and possession of narcotic drugs with intent to sell;

## Other Offenses

**Weapons Offenses** includes Bartley-Fox Gun Law violations;

**Prostitution** includes common night walker;

**Vehicle Offense** includes leaving the scene;

**Contempt of Court** includes violation of a court order or violation of a restraining order;

**Other** includes jumping bail, contributing to the delinquency of a minor, tax evasion, violation of a civil ordinance, attempting to commit a crime, gaming, minor in possession of alcohol, and unlawful possession of alcohol.

### Type of Release

**Discharge:** A release from a sentence where statutory or earned good time has been applied to the release date.

**Expiration:** A release from a sentence where no statutory or earned good time has been applied to the release date.

**Parole:** A conditional release from prison where the inmate serves the remaining portion of his/her sentence supervised on parole.

### Type of Sentence

**One Sentence Only:** simple sentence for one offense.

**Concurrent:** Sentences for multiple offenses are served at the same time.

**Aggregate:** Sentences for multiple offenses are served consecutively.

**Fine:** Offender was given a fine, but because of being unwilling or unable to pay, served time in prison.

**Forthwith:** Offender was previously incarcerated for another offense; present sentence superseded previous sentence.

**From and After:** Offender was previously incarcerated for another offense, present sentence began after termination of previous sentence.

**Split:** Sentence was divided into a term of incarceration followed by community supervision by the court.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

HIGH PERFORMANCE POLICE MANAGEMENT

Executive Training Series

POLICE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

NIJ Grant Award #86-IJ-CX-0003 (S-3)

125239

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been  
granted by  
Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

JANUARY 22, 1990

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I.	OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION.....	4
Section II.	PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	6
	A. Police Management Association.....	6
	B. Project History.....	7
Section III.	SCOPE OF WORK.....	10
	A. Site Selection.....	10
	B. Curriculum Development.....	12
	C. Participant/Trainer Selection.....	20
	D. Pre-Seminar Activities.....	20
	E. Evaluation Design.....	21
Section IV.	HIGH PERFORMANCE POLICE MANAGEMENT TRAINING.....	24
	A. Key Events and Evaluation Results.....	24
	1. Boulder, Colorado.....	24
	2. Phoenix, Arizona .....	36
	3. Fayetteville, North Carolina.....	48
	4. Forsyth, Georgia.....	58
	5. Providence, Rhode Island.....	68
	6. San Bernardino, California.....	80
	7. Newport News, Virginia.....	87
	B. Workshop Flow and Activities.....	94
	Table A: Flow and Activities by Site.....	94
	Table B: Workshop Impact.....	94
	Table C: Followup.....	95
	Table D: Participation and Rank.....	95
	Table E: Evaluation Response Rate.....	96
Section V.	RECOMMENDATIONS AND CLOSING.....	97

APPENDICES:

- A. High Performance Police Management Workbook
- B. High Performance Police Management Sourcebook
- C. Self-administered examination
- D. Evaluation
- E. Certificate of Course Completion - Sample
- F. Lists of Participants

## SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

The Police Management Association (PMA) received a continuation grant award from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct seven (7) sixteen-hour management training seminars over a period of twelve (12) months. This award and subsequent report follow four previous NIJ grant awards to conduct a series of training for law enforcement management executives.

Pre-seminar activities included convening the Planning/Site Selection Committee during the first quarter reporting period. Planning activities focused on recommendations from the 1988 site evaluations, with updates to topical research and the logistical and on-site delivery of same. Planning coordinators identified additional research resources and supplemented the 1989 program by increasing the use of visual aides and developing avenues for participant interaction. Site selection activities consisted of the solicitation and selection of seven (7) primary and two (2) alternate training sites.

This specialized training was targeted to middle and upper-level law enforcement managers. Participant selection was left to the discretion of the host department(s), with guidance from PMA as previous experience has warranted.

Survey measurements were replicated from previous grant projects but modified in accordance with the defined 1989 seminar program. The results are expounded herein, as well as other

succinct information deemed important to the overall project history.

## SECTION II. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### A. The Police Management Association

Incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1980, the Police Management Association (PMA) is an international, nonprofit, educational and professional membership organization for law enforcement personnel. Membership supports a forum of experts in all facets of police operations and administration, with current enrollment reaching law enforcement personnel in forty-five States and several countries abroad. PMA's membership consists of middle managers ranking from sergeant through executive heads of police agencies, as well as civilian law enforcement personnel, police officers and criminal justice students.

The PMA mission is grounded in a belief that through continual research, training, experimentation and networking of ideas, a body of knowledge on police standards continuously develops and is expanded throughout the entire police community. The organization's objective is driven towards professionalizing police managers, for it is this caliber of police personnel which will be prepared to meet tomorrow's future, today.

Of the many diverse services provided by this membership organization, the delivery of proven research and information to the middle manager via training and dissemination fulfills PMA's primary goal. While undergoing topical revisions and structural transformation, the NIJ sponsored "High Performance Police Management" has objectively worked towards achieving this goal for five years.



## B. Project History

Originally entitled "Improving Police Management" (IPM), this NIJ-supported workshop series spawned out of the Research Utilization Program (RUP). Prior to 1981, RUP -- a three-day program -- was attended by top criminal justice policymakers and administrators in a multi-state area. NIJ then began to look at less costly ways to conduct training and disseminate research findings to the law enforcement management community. The objectives of PMA and its unique membership qualified as a logical alternative for NIJ's intended target group.

In late 1984, the staff of PMA developed and drafted a proposal to present six (6) one-day training workshops targeting law enforcement managers across the country. At the time, the organization was unable to apply directly for this grant because its' staff did not have a Certified Public Accountant (CPA), a requirement for the allocation of federal funding. The Police Foundation, a private, nonprofit research organization, requested and received funding from NIJ, and the grant was sub-contracted to the PMA in its entirety.

Offering police departments a shopping list of several NIJ-approved training programs, the PMA sponsored four IPM seminars and two Differential Police Response (DPR) workshops in ten months during 1985. Pleased with the overall success of these one-day seminars and having secured the services of a CPA, the PMA applied for, and received direct funding from NIJ to present eight, two-day training programs in 1986. Extending the course

for at least one additional day was a major recommendation stemming from PMA's 1985 training evaluation report. PMA strongly urged interested police agencies to select the "Improving Police Management" training from among the course offerings, because of the comprehensive updates and revisions planned for the course materials, which was to include DPR training. Moreover, the program's trainers had exhaustive knowledge about each training topic as well as each other's training methods. Thus, the historical familiarity with the program enabled PMA and the trainers to plan and conduct the specialized training in an efficient, effective and flexible manner, satisfying NIJ's program plans as well.

Having received a number of invitations during the 1986 series, PMA again applied and received continuation funding to conduct four additional seminars in 1987. With the permission of PMA's Grant Monitor, these seminars were extended to three days in length, beginning noon on the first day and ending at noon on the third day to accommodate drivable distance departments. The program substance, however, remained at the required sixteen training hours.

The program again underwent extensive substantive revisions during the 1988 training series, inspired by the 1987 evaluation results. The pool of trainers was enlarged to include both academic and tactical practitioners. The topical contents and logistical delivery were extensively reviewed in order to develop a program which addressed the contemporary needs and problems

facing law enforcement managers today. Having taken on an entirely new dimension, the NIJ-sponsored program adopted a new name -- "High Performance Police Management (HPPM)" -- to reflect the futuristic direction which the training sought to establish.

Student evaluations and response to this entirely new program yielded highly favorable findings, as evidenced in the report submitted to the Department of Justice (see U.S. Department of Justice, PMA Final Report # 86-IJ-CX-0003 (S-2)). Students were responsive to the new delivery techniques, which included on-site telephone conferences with leading police managers; videotapes of departmentally-implemented programs such as Neighborhood Oriented Policing, Problem Oriented Policing and Career Criminal Units; self-assessment exercises; and, forums for audience participation and interaction. The success by which this program was met resulted in another NIJ continuation grant award to include seven delivery sites in 1989. Section III,B, Curriculum Development, describes the overall program in some detail.

### SECTION III. SCOPE OF WORK

#### A. Site Selection

PMA staff and trainers convened in February, 1989 to identify the project's seven primary training sites. Prevailing criteria continued to decide site selection, i.e., seasonal considerations, geographic locale, verbal and/or written invitations from interested police agencies and the identification of need based on available training provided to the middle managers.

At the time of the Planning/Site Selection meeting, PMA had already scheduled the first of seven sites in Boulder, Colorado, on March 8-10, 1989. Six additional sites were tentatively determined at this meeting. Several of the sites selected were substituted (with documented reasons) as the first quarter reporting period closed. The remaining primary sites were then identified and reported to NIJ as follows: Fayetteville, North Carolina; Phoenix, Arizona; Forsyth, Georgia; Providence, Rhode Island; Alexandria, Virginia and Long Beach, California. Experience required the scheduling of secondary sites to serve as back-ups in the event of cancellations or unforeseeable scheduling problems with the primary site(s). Secondary sites identified by the Committee were San Bernardino, California and Newport News, Virginia. Both secondary sites chosen hosted the HPPM training program. Long Beach, California declined, citing a difficulty in securing a training facility. The Alexandria, VA Police Department was also unable to accept an invitation,

declining in late September, 1989, noting an inability to obtain interested participants from surrounding departments.

PMA's milestone chart called for conducting the seven (7) seminars within a seven (7) month period. The extension of the final site - Newport News, VA - into December required PMA to file a time extension without cost with NIJ.

## B. Curriculum Development

At the February, 1989 meeting, the Planning/Site Selection Committee also reviewed the evaluation findings of the previous year, addressing topical and delivery areas which were recommended be improved upon. Committee members included: Dr. Phyllis McDonald, formerly with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); Lt. Albert J. Sweeney, Boston, MA Police Department; Dr. Craig Fraser, Metropolitan Police Department, Boston, MA; H. Jerome Miron, The Miron Group, Largo, Florida; and, PMA staff. NIJ Program Monitor, Jonathan Budd, was also in attendance. The work produced by this Committee focused on the expansion of the substantive areas researched by NIJ and elaborating on the techniques needed to implement many of the current methods now available to police managers.

Trainer McDonald agreed to compile and organize supplemental reading materials with the original Coursebook and revise the Prospectus and outline to reflect content changes. PMA project staff elected to provide students with two separate training books, one which would serve as an on-site workbook and the second, as a supplemental sourcebook of selected readings. Copies of both are provided as Appendix A and Appendix B.

Updated articles for inclusion in the 1989 edition include George Kelling and Mark Moore's, "The Evolving Strategy of Policing"; Myron Magnet, "America's Underclass: What to Do"; Mark Moore, et.al., "Crime and Policing" and "Policing and the Fear of

Crime;" Malcolm Sparrow, "Implementing Community Policing"; and George Wilson's "Making Neighborhoods Safe."

Time schedules for the program delivery changed slightly, beginning and ending sessions 1/2 hour earlier than the previous years' schedule so that the program would end before rush hour traffic, accommodating drivable distance students. Program substance again remained at the required sixteen hours.

Session Fifteen of the 1988 manual, "Will the Real COP Stand Up" was deleted from the program. Time restrictions prohibited this session from occurring in all but one site last year.

The 1989 edition of "High Performance Police Management: Strategies for Mid-Level Managers" focuses on four areas identified as high priority issues for contemporary law enforcement:

1. Good Management and High Performance Leadership;
2. Drug Enforcement and the War on Drugs;
3. Drug Enforcement and Community Oriented Policing;  
and,
4. Community Oriented Policing and Resource Allocation

Management techniques emphasized are the following:

1. Problem Analysis;
2. Planning, implementation and adaptation of programs; and
3. Managing and evaluation of new programs.

The course is designed to take the students through a highly detailed sequence of exercises focusing on each of the above three management skill areas. A four (4) session outline was developed, accompanied by time schedules for each session (See Appendix A). Following completion of the updated materials by

project staff and principal course trainers, the HPPM Source - and Workbooks were prepared, edited and printed in late April. The following delineates the three-day course outline.

#### HIGH PERFORMANCE POLICE MANAGEMENT

After appropriate introductions and general objectives of the program are announced, the seminar begins with the students introducing themselves; stating which department they represent and identifying prevalent issues or problems that department currently faces. Experience, perspectives and expected program outcomes are also solicited through a self-assessment exercise. This further extends the knowledge the trainer receives about the composition of students and the diversity of problems existing in and around the host site.

Trainers proceed by taking participants through a management matrix; what it means to be a manager, the obstacles to good management and the necessary ingredients to become a high performing manager. High performance concepts are introduced and discussed. Students are instructed to complete a high performance self-assessment instrument which evaluates the individual, his/her unit or command and the department on dimensions and in relation to four frames of reference: reactive, responsive, proactive and high performing. Students complete the first day by viewing a videotape of the Career Criminal Program of the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington, D.C, reviewing that units' management style against the high performing program design and implementation efforts.



This prepares the student for the second day of training, which begins with a focus on drug enforcement. Reading assignments in preparation for the following day are distributed.

After a review of the critical points delineated on the first day of the seminar, students begin the second day of training watching a field enforcement video tape of the Boston Police Department's Drug Control Unit, a public broadcast which exposes reactionary management techniques. This is followed by a group discussion questioning the management techniques used by the unit, the probable impact of these strategies on drug control efforts and the impact of the media on the public's perception of the Boston Police Department's effectiveness. Students are asked to note their reactions on a worksheet and to rank the Boston police unit according to the criteria used in the High Performance Police Management session. Comparisons are made between the Boston and Washington, D.C. Units.

Management issues which surround the selection of drug enforcement programs are briefly identified, followed by participant discussion of experiences and perceptions, both of the middle manager and of the chief of police. This evolves into a discussion of the primary issues and obstacles in planning and implementing effective drug enforcement programs. Participants are provided with an inventory of current and active drug enforcement programs and those strategies which have been successfully implemented across the country. The inventory includes Operation Pressure Point, Operation Clean Sweep, the

aforementioned Career Criminal Program, Asset Forfeiture Program, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), Drug Use Forecasting program (DUF) and Tactical Narcotic Teams. For each program, a history and impact in each (all) test sites is provided, and attendees perspective, issues, and problems are sought. Current efforts by the United States Congress to combat drugs and their trafficking are discussed in reference to the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. Students are referred to the manuals as a reference tool for those programs not covered in their entirety.

The drug enforcement session concludes with the first of two conference telephone calls with three (3) selected mid-and upper-level executives who are experts in the field, discussing their department's drug enforcement program efforts. This provides participants with the opportunity to ask questions of the experts via a live telephone hook-up.

The afternoon session -- Drug Enforcement and Community Oriented Policing -- engages the students in a problem solving exercise as a means towards thinking about strategy options for drug enforcement efforts. The group is divided into teams, the size dependent upon the number of students and time limitations. The objective is to develop a consensus for action, the action being a recommendation about how to best deal with a typical, urban policing problem. The group session provides both a review of the issues involved and the development of a drug enforcement policy and program for a police agency. The issues include

management, community and media relations, inter-agency coordination, an audit and control mechanisms.

The first half of the training program is purposely designed first, as theoretical and second, as operational, in such a way as to make the necessary transition into practical applications. In the second half of training, practical applications are emphasized, and high performance concepts addressed in light of current developments in community-oriented, neighborhood-oriented and problem-oriented policing. An overview of programs; program elements; examples in selected cities, i.e., Newark, NJ; Minneapolis, MN and Houston, TX; and, lessons learned from these programs are presented. Differences between these styles of policing are described and key elements of each orientation identified. Visual aids include a videotape of the Houston Police Department's "Neighborhood Oriented Policing."

An applied Fear Reduction Program is presented by the use of the Houston Police Department's Fear Reduction videotape, which reviews the program undertaken during 1984-85 with NIJ assistance. Following this tape, participants are asked to address several concerns arising from fear reduction experiments, including program development strategy, involvement of line personnel, empowerment of employees and integration into normal department procedures. The Houston Fear Reduction Program is ranked by the students according to the HPPM criteria.

On Day III, practical applications continue as students are briefed on the cognitive changes which managers must make in the

application and implementation of COP on resource allocation, beat designs, measuring impact and managing calls for service. The initial perspective is from patrol work demands, providing a review of current patrol workload analysis methods. A computerized workload analysis and scheduling methodology used by the Houston Police Department and others is then presented as a more accurate and reliable alternative method for workload analysis. The program is distributed to the students on diskette, either on-site or as seminar completion materials are mailed. A larger perspective of application and implementation is gained by an individual exercise which asks students to think through the changes their department(s) will need to re-orient its approach to the community and to review calls for service to determine if changes are needed.

A second teleconference call is established with experts in the COP area. Project staff moderate the discussion, providing the opportunity for participants to ask questions or invoke discussion. Each of the participating experts have either managed a successful community- or neighborhood-oriented policing program or have been deeply involved in program development and conceptualization activities.

Finally, participants will be asked to engage in a sample examination that tests their understanding of the material covered. (See Appendix C). The format of the test will be that of a promotional examination. Following discussion of the correct answers, participants are then asked to complete the

evaluation of the seminar, the results of which are detailed in this report.

#### Participation To Date

Approximately 1,883 participants from 565 departments have participated in the NIJ training series from May, 1985 to December, 1989. The following report reflects the results of the 1988 series and evaluation findings.

### C. Participant and Trainer Selection

PMA targeted the training to middle and upper-level law enforcement supervisors and managers. One or more departments and/or agencies hosted each seminar and invited participation on a contiguous, state-wide basis with primary focus on surrounding departments within drivable distance. Variance in participation selection was open and left to the discretion of chiefs and/or assigned liaison of each department represented. PMA assisted in the recruiting efforts by providing mailing labels of PMA members in and around the states of the host site. Program availability was also announced in PMA's newsletter, Police Manager, Crime Control Digest, Law Enforcement News, and CJ The Americas. These efforts helped to bring the 1989 HPPM training to 372 participants representing 189 agencies. Information on ranks represented at the training seminars and demographics are reported for each site in Section IV, B., Table D, found on page 95.

Four of NIJ's approved trainers were available to present the HPPM course over the project period. These trainers -- Lt. Albert Sweeney, Dr. Phyllis McDonald, Dr. Craig Fraser and H. Jerome Miron -- received extremely high ratings on participant's evaluations at each of the seven sites. (See Section IV, Key Events and Evaluation Results, beginning on page 24.)

### D. Pre-Seminar Activities

PMA's milestone chart called for logistical and operational planning between the host departments, trainers and staff.

Program manuals, roles, responsibilities and a Prospectus were sent to each host department and ongoing communication and coordination was maintained both before and after seminar presentation. Each student was charged a fee of \$25.00 in accordance with permission granted by the NIJ, stating that "continued association with PMA through membership will enhance and extend accomplishment of the grant goals. Accordingly, you may include one year's membership fee in the registration for training under this grant."

The workplan called for the project director and trainers to schedule a meeting with representatives of the host department(s) prior to seminar initiation. During these meetings, project staff were given an overview of law enforcement roles and services in the participating communities, lines of command in attendance, prevailing problems and concerns facing officers, and the areas' political climate. Because such diversities naturally exist between attending agencies, such variations were important to determine prior to seminar commencement. These briefings played an important role in addressing student needs, geographical fields and functional differences.

#### E. Evaluation Design

Trainers and staff agreed to shorten the survey instrument used in the 1988 program series based on suggestions of the participants themselves. Questions dealt specifically with four concrete, outlined sessions rather than sixteen, individually titled sessions from the previous year. As the first year of the

HPPM curriculum ended, it was discovered that the program had modified and directed itself in such a way as to differ appreciably from site to site. Additionally, program subjects were of such a vast yet analogous nature, each participant would leave with different perceptions and viewpoints, often applicable only to them and their department.

It is with these beliefs and recommendations that Committee members hoped to eliminate repetitious and/or overlapping answers; provide a less threatening, shorter evaluation instrument; solicit greater input and thought per session; and, obtain a generalized result for each of the four sessions.

Questions were also designed to obtain an overall response to the training program; impart each participants reaction to the four individual sessions and elicit comments on the workshop facilities. The evaluation forms covering each session held over the three days contained thirty-seven (37) separate items to score, rank or respond. The 1988 evaluation survey contained over eighty (80). A copy of the evaluation instrument is attached as Appendix D.

Throughout the five year training series, but in particular within the last two years, many problems with the evaluation instrument were discovered. While each year the Planning Committee addressed as many as technically possible, it was simply difficult, if not impossible, to the control subjective interpretations of a written survey instrument. While few participants objected to providing their name, it must be assumed



that control for reliability is somewhat weakened.

Open ended measurements as those found in Section VI of the Evaluation (See Appendix D) are prone to the greatest degree of subjectivity. Therefore, all comments derived from the Section VI evaluation have been provided in direct quotation for each site. (See Section IV, Key Events and Evaluation Results). While the comment section of each site shall be overviewed, it is in these direct quotes where one finds the direct applicability and expression of worth of the training on the individual student.

To further combat the subjectivity problems, comments were recorded by rank to determine whether there exists differing opinions, learning curves, experience, etc., according to ones rank.

## SECTION IV. HIGH PERFORMANCE POLICE MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINARS

### A. Key Events and Evaluation Results

BOULDER, COLORADO  
March 8-10, 1989

Hosted by the Boulder Police Department, forty-six (46) law enforcement managers participated in the first seminar. All four trainers were in attendance for this training. It was felt important for the secondary trainers (Fraser and Miron) to be in attendance for exposure to the on-site delivery techniques of the program. Trainers McDonald and Sweeney predominately moderated with Miron and Fraser contributing in certain sessions. PMA's grant monitor was appraised of this situation which met with his approval.

Staff and trainers met with liaison to discuss the logistics of the training and composition of the students. Twenty-three (23) departments/agencies representing the states of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nebraska and Texas were in attendance. While predominately attended by members of municipal agencies, all ranks within these agencies were sufficiently represented.

Conference call participants for drug enforcement consisted of Deputy Chief Edward J. Spurlock, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C.; Sgt. Stan Plaster, Narcotics Division, Houston, TX Police Department; and, Sgt. John McNulty, Narcotics Division of the New York City Police Department. Participants for the Community Oriented Policing conference call were Captain James Harrison, Newport News, VA Police Department; Lt. Timothy Oettmeir, Houston, TX Police Department and Assistant

Chief Jerry A. Oliver, Phoenix, AZ Police Department.

Certificates of completion (See Appendix E), thank-you letters, membership materials and a list of participants (Appendix F) were mailed to all students. Results of the Boulder, Colorado training follow.

BOULDER, COLORADO  
March 8-10, 1989

Participants by Rank N = 47  
23 departments/agencies

Sergeants = 10  
Captains = 2  
Civilian = 1

Lieutenants = 25  
Chief/Sheriff = 9

---

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

---

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.0	2-5	42
Informative	4.0	1-5	42
Relevancy	4.2	2-5	42
Presenter Delivery	4.2	2-5	42

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	3.9	2-5	43
Informative	3.5	2-5	43
Relevancy	3.8	1-5	43
Presenter Delivery	3.9	2-5	43

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	3.8	2-5	43
Informative	3.7	1-5	43
Relevancy	4.1	2-5	43
Presenter Delivery	4.0	3-5	42

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.3	3-5	43
Informative	4.1	1-5	43
Relevancy	4.3	2-5	43
Presenter Delivery	4.2	1-5	43

<u>OVERALL RESPONSE</u>	4.0	2-5	43
-------------------------	-----	-----	----

BOULDER, COLORADO  
March 8-10, 1989

Number Students (N) = 47  
Evaluations completed (E) = 42  
Response = n

COMMENTS

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchical or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

I. What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

E = 42; n = 40

Sergeants  
(7 responses)

"...up-to-date information on recent trends and new management styles in law enforcement."

"...broadened my vision quite a bit...exposed to trends I was not aware existed."

"...topics of drug enforcement."

"...pride in the profession and satisfaction of being a sergeant in a mid-sized organization."

"...ways in which to think through problems to which I was unaware existed within the department and the outside community."

"...most interested in the problem and community oriented programs. I think it is something I can use with my own squad."

"...what makes a good manager."

Lieutenants  
(23 responses)

"...information on community and problem solving policing was excellent...provided much valuable information for thought and implementation at my agency."

"...how to best serve the community and accept change."

"...my own values and philosophy is focused. My department, however has moved, within the last few years, from high performing to reactive."

"...better understanding of community oriented policing...conference calls were excellent."

"...an insight into my own way of thinking. It was always easy to blame problems on manpower and money constraints. I now have a better handle on the future."

"...very little...this seminar fell into the same trap as the last several conferences I attended...judge the size of the group that you are attending and gear your lectures to that group...I am tired of big agencies telling the small ones how to do it. Our problems are difference and in many cases, big city solutions will not work."

"...a valuable insight into a dramatic change in the delivery of police services."

"...an enhancement of several ongoing programs within my own agency."

"...background information - the readings; interaction of idea formulation."

"...a sense that I am on the right track as project manager of DPR/COP programs in my agency."

"...new ideas to implement in my unit; reinforced some of my own ideas and projects."

"...to take a look at my organization and see what type of managers we are and how we can improve the work situation."

"...information on high performance management."

"...the seminar sparked many questions and gave me many ideas to follow up on. In regard to my department, the seminar gave me tools to go back with."

"...formula on staffing."

"...better understanding of community oriented policing."

"...an overview of how other departments in the country are dealing with problems."

"...resource allocation and community policing."

"...contacts with others and the new concepts instilled by high performance."

"...overview of state-of-the-art concepts in police service from recognized professional organization. Learned that our department is current with the profession which is encouraging."

"...participating and hearing exchange of ideas from other agencies; particularly enjoyed the two conference call sessions."

"...direction and support for movement that the chief is initiating in the department; insight into community policing. Before it was just another grouping of "buzz" words."

"...high performance policing; community oriented policing - I finally understand it!"

### Captains

(3 responses)

"...an understanding of the concept of community policing."

"...to see that many of the programs which we are doing are on target; looking at repeat calls is a new idea and I will implement at once!"

"...telephone conference on community policing."

### Chiefs

(7 responses)

"...information on involvement of the community in police problems."

"...insights into other department's problems and solutions."

"...high performance policing." (2)

"...excellent; very timely perspective on the "next stage up" for my agency - will be a great help in presenting goals/priorities to by city governing body in April!"

"...having experienced transition (evolution) from a reactive to proactive agency, I was elated to find a model which clearly defines historical and future indicators."

"...realization of some of my shortcomings."

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have been of interest to you or your department?

E = 42; n = 21

### Sergeants

(4 responses)

--emphasis on middle management

--methods to better supervise detective bureaus

--dealing with the concept of intended/perceived, particularly in high performance management. Time frame/interpretation strategies in resource allocation/community-oriented policing; "how to sell it to the troops"

--the problem employee, those who refuse or are unmotivated by change

### Lieutenants

(13 responses)

--personnel issues and philosophy with today's changing workforce

--more on futuristics - exciting. Also, standards by which to evaluate programs needs work. I am not familiar with any COP program by which standards have been formulated to evaluate success/failure or where changes are needed.

--good overview

--how to improve police professionalism overall, i.e., the

- quality of officers
- community policing and scheduling alternatives as they relate to improving effectiveness and efficiency of the department
- more specific information on scheduling and schedules
- clandestine lab session needs to be expanded
- less on drugs and more on the specific skills need to enhance or empower high performance management
- take a narrow focus on 1 or 2 selected topics. This runs risk of participation isolation but allows for increased participant satisfaction (fewer effected, but at a higher positive level)
- personnel issues
- dealing with, and the management of, change
- more discussion of Differential Police Response as to how a department involves the citizens and moves toward community-oriented policing
- real life implementation of these concepts

#### Captains

(2 responses)

- specific role requirements of community-oriented policing for various ranks
- I would not change the program - more is not always better. With time being the problem that is, this training was on target

#### Chiefs

(2 responses)

- more examples of high performance model
- how to handle trouble employees (2)

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

E = 42; n = 28

#### Sergeants

(6 responses)

"...increase discussion time between instructors and attendees. Discussions were cut off prior to good debate in order to proceed with lecture. Spend less time on theoretical aspects and more on practical application and discussion of how to solve our problems."

"...allow more time. This should be a 24-hour conference so that sessions are not rushed."

"...good job overall."

"...all excellent instructors. Good refresher, but won't be anything innovative to my department."



"...I thought all facilitators were very good, qualified and knowledgeable."

"...drop the entire section on drugs...we all know its a problem."

#### Lieutenants

(15 responses)

"...extend the time." (3)

"...provide a one page reference agenda showing topics and instructors at a glance. I had trouble at times knowing exactly where we were."

"...more group problem solving on issues affecting police agencies."

"...specifically enjoyed the conference calls; although somewhat slow at the start, once going would have been nice to be longer."

"...less focus on what has been to what is or what should be."

"...allow for open forum with selected topics."

"...look at your audience; talk about county law enforcement also."

"...scale program to mid-sized cities, not 710% of the population."

"...nothing - the conference was well done. The initial advertising was a bit misleading in that it gave the impression that the seminar was 3 full days rather than what actually took place."

"...generally satisfied."

"...I believe it was well done and a good mixture of personalities and styles."

"...more emphasis on "how to" rather than imparting information on theory."

"...the ROP information was useful, but the drug information was old. I work in an area that has had a drug program for years and we have devoted much time and study to this, including some of the materials presented."

"...more emphasis on programs from agencies with 100 to 250 employees; majority of attendees were from agencies with fewer than 170 employees. Could help in getting better perspective in resource needs/allocations. More time for group activities."

"...more time for discussion."

#### Captains

(3 responses)

"...needs greater depth; moved too quickly - I would have like to have been invited in more discussions with the instructors and class members."

"...the telephone calls were good but I would like to have

seen some speakers from smaller departments...big is not always better."

"...should be 4-5 days in length to cover the topics."

#### Chiefs

(4 responses)

"...make sure that you verbally include the small department chiefs in your presentations - this PMA material is more germane to my job than anything else I've experienced through IACP, which seems more oriented toward large departments."

"...perhaps a little more detail on carrying the small business concept to a larger scale, e.g., pitfalls."

"...segregate conferences into department size."

"...more time on developing individual managers; extend to 3 full days."

#### IV. Additional Comments

E = 42; n = 23

#### Sergeants

(3 responses)

"...the staff should be more flexible when questioned - do not force feed the student."

"...enjoyed the method of presentation, it was diverse and minimized boredom. I was not able to complete many of the readings in the manual, but I am very interested in finishing them. They seem very relevant to well-selected."

"...as much as you tried, the relevance for smaller agencies is still quite suspect in my mind."

#### Lieutenants

(15 responses)

"...provide class roster at beginning of class so students can relate names and departments."

"...excellent interaction between instructors; workbook an excellent tool; handouts and materials the best I have received in years; teleconferencing was excellent; provide class roster at beginning of class."

"...telephone conferences were very informative and should be expanded. They were closed with questions pending, and this is an inexpensive way to bring experience together and could be a bigger asset to the program if expanded."

"...additional time on resource allocation."

"...I've attended a number of classes about this and other related topics. The quality of this seminar was good in comparison to those other classes; however, because of the prior exposure, I found it less interesting. My question has always been why is it when change is recognized as a bottom to top

process, do police managers and those holding seminars always fail to focus on the line officer as a target of instruction?"

"...the drug information could have been eliminated to provide more time for community-oriented policing and resource allocation."

"...most in attendance are in agencies 10-100 officers. It would greatly improve us to have information on implementation and not just philosophies. Also, I do not feel the instructors debating on their personal views is of any value."

"...should not try to cover resource allocation in such a short period of time."

"...taking part of the tuition money to have members join the PMA I feel is questionable. I was a member prior to this class, however, I doubt my sheriff will look kindly on the forced membership."

"...instructors compliment each other - good mixture."

"...depending on previous training, drug lab tape was generally basic. Handouts are excellent and will provide good resource."

"...excellent conference."

"...thank you all for a very good seminar!"

"...I am new to the management part of police work and have a lot to learn."

"...continue what is being done."

#### Captains

(1 response)

"...too much time on history of law enforcement - should have gotten to community policing sooner; too much emphasis on drugs even though a very important issue. Most people at this seminar are aware of the degree of the drug problem."

#### Chiefs

(4 responses)

"...I do not believe the segment regarding clandestine drug labs fits into the program. This is not to say that it was not informative or interesting. Particularly liked the teleconference."

"...this would have been more valuable for my manager who was originally scheduled to attend. I have been exposed to much of the information before, which is not your fault."

"...thoroughly enjoyed the seminar."

"...thanks for a great seminar."

BOULDER, COLORADO  
March 8-10, 1989

N = 47

E = 42

OVERALL RESPONSE = 4.0

Students rated their scores across all ranges, favoring community-oriented policing and high performance management as the favorable sessions. Drug enforcement and resource allocation ranked only slightly lower in range, with students perceiving relevancy and informational aspects as less applicable to their assessment of the topical program. Counts for each question remained fairly constant and are consistent with the total population which completed an evaluation (E).

In reading the students comments and suggestions, there is an obvious difference in what each individual obtains from the training. Students of all ranks cited problem solving skills, new ideas, exchange and interaction, reinforcement of programs, broadened perceptions and acceptance of change as just some of the gains brought out by the HPPM training. Some participants found the community sessions to be most beneficial and rewarding while others gained even greater insight into the relationship between the community and their affect on management styles, cognitive processes, reactions and interactions. Rank, per se, appears to be of little influence on the evaluations in Boulder. As was found in the 1988 series, requests for additional topics were made with regard to planning, policy formulation and actual implementation of the programs and philosophy presented. Requests for improvement once again included extension of the

program, greater interaction, refining the focus towards the audience in attendance, and several logistical suggestions. The open-ended measurements, however, reveal that students were largely satisfied with the program and method of presentation.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
April 19-21, 1989

A Prospectus, training manuals, roles and responsibilities were mailed to liaison in late February, with liaison confirming the scheduled dates in March. PMA mailing labels were forwarded to the site and included members in the states of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah and Nevada. Eighty-three (83) students were in attendance representing police, sheriff, railroad and university officials from forty (40) agencies.

The training accommodations provided by an area hotel were selected due to schedule availability and equipment needs. Due to an overwhelming response of interested participants and the small size of the room selected, Day I training was repeated twice, i.e., from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., and again from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The class was broken into two groups and assigned either to the morning or afternoon session. This assignment was completed by the Phoenix liaison prior to program commencement. The students were brought together on the second and third days, having secured a larger room for the remaining of the program.

Trainer McDonald, originally contracted for this site, cancelled due to a family emergency. Trainer Miron was contracted in her absence.

Conference call participants for drug enforcement consisted of Lt. Sony McAfee, Houston, TX Police Department; Chief John Morgan, El Dorado, AK Police Department; and, Chief Stan Knee,

National City, CA Police Department. Participants for the Community-Oriented Policing conference call were Captain James Harrison, Newport News, VA Police Department; Deputy Chief Edward J. Spurlock, Metropolitan Police, Washington, D.C.; and, Chief Larry Holland, Wixom, MI Police Department.

Seminar close-out, in the form of mailed materials and certificates of completion were forwarded to all students. Seventy-nine (79) evaluations were completed with the rate of return at 96 percent.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
April 19-21, 1989

Participants By Rank (N = 83)  
40 departments/agencies

Officer = 2      Sergeant = 9      Lieutenant = 37  
Captain = 18      Major = 2      Chief/Sheriff = 14  
Others = 1 (U.S. Marshall)

---

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

---

(I) INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.4	3-5	78
Informative	4.4	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.2	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	78

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	4.4	3-5	78
Informative	4.3	2-5	78
Relevancy	4.3	1-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.3	2-5	78

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.2	3-5	78
Informative	4.2	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.2	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.4	3-5	78

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.5	3-5	78
Informative	4.6	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.5	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	78

<u>OVERALL RESPONSE</u>	4.4	2-5	78
-------------------------	-----	-----	----



PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
April 19--21, 1989

Number Students (N) = 83  
Evaluations completed (E) = 79  
Response = n

COMMENTS

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchical or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

I. What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

(E = 79; n = 62)

Sergeants  
(5 responses)

"...it was presented well and each segment was informative."  
"...refresher on importance of management and ideas on way to improve my <sic> style of leadership."  
"...the research on Differential Police Response was valuable/not previously known to me."  
"...a review of my department reference on new ways of dealing with management."  
"...problems are essentially the same no matter the jurisdiction...my thinking is significantly the same as larger departments."

Lieutenants  
(27 responses)

"...interaction of peers from other agencies; exchange of ideas."  
"...enhanced understanding of the similarity of problems both state and nationwide."  
"...other police agencies have similar problems.(2) There is a real need for leadership and innovation in updated policing

methods."

"...Community-oriented policing." (2)

"...I think that I will become a better manager."

"...new view of organizational structure and how to implement change."

"...valuable information for implementing and complementing our existing neighborhood watch program. Some good ideas on getting officers committed."

"...reinforcement of new department direction received over the last year of new Chief of Police."

"...new insights into community oriented policing; strategies and ways at looking at problems."

"...new ideas and concepts."

"...common problems evidenced by many agencies and lack of control by each agency."

"...overall understanding of community oriented policing; informative as to narcotics problem; model for high performance interesting."

"...opportunity to share ideas and problems with other law enforcement officials outside of the Arizona police community."

"...High performance management and community oriented policing."

"...reinforcement of classes taken at the FBI National Academy."

"...added incentive for problem oriented policing programs."

"...re-thinking some traditional police practices on patrolling."

"...support for the current direction my department is taking." (2)

"...insight into upcoming theories in police management."

"...knowledge of history about drug abuse."

"...the problems existent in other cities and how they dealt with them."

"...new ideas and perspective."

"...managing creativity; knowledge and history of drugs; community oriented policing."

"...drug history and insight gained from various agencies."

"...how far off the mark our department operates in certain areas of concern."

"...new ideas on model policing."

"...drug information and community oriented policing."

### Captains

(17 responses)

"...better understanding of community oriented policing."

(2)

"...problems departments face are shared; reinforced the need to serve the public and communicate."

"...ideas on problem-solving policing; letting the officers make decisions."

"...review of 'known' concepts from fresh viewpoint; new information."

"...an insight into local police problems."

"...insight into how other departments handle current problems."

"...a sense that we are not alone in our problem areas."

"...new ideas for improving employee involvement."

"...quick overview of common problems nationwide."

"...affirmation of beat design concept; anti-legalization of drugs."

"...the concept of high performance policing." (2)

"...we are currently re-structuring our patrol force and meeting with great opposition from the troops. The manpower allocation and community-oriented policing information will greatly assist in this change over."

"...current trends, problems and programs...conceptual approach."

"...in the areas that are applicable, our agency is fairly progressive."

"...perspective ideas in handled community problems."

"...better understanding of drug problem in U.S.; appreciation for the fact that all of us are facing similar problems."

"...we are doing alot of things correctly by accident. Now we know how to define what we hare doing."

#### Chiefs

(12 responses)

"...the idea of letting my sergeant give his men more options to solving problems."

"...problem-oriented and community-oriented policing."

"...insights and ideas about policing that I would not have been exposed to otherwise."

"...an insight into modern, up-to-date law enforcement management and its tools."

"...I now feel we are on the right track with our current program."

"...an objective overview of the training material."

"...new ideas in policing concepts...met many new officers from other agencies."

"...identifying objectives we have set."

"...information on community oriented policing and problem-solving."

"...good liaison - reinforcement of positive concepts."

"...a different look at my department and how we do things."

"...identified some problems in my own agency."

#### Other

(1 response)

"...good information for general management of personnel

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have been of interest to you or your department?

(E = 79; n = 23)

Sergeants

(3 responses)

- search and seizure
- results of differential police response
- more management-oriented topics (2)

Lieutenants

(8 responses)

- managing narcotics units
- internal affairs and personnel issues
- local drug enforcement program implementation
- very well covered - just need more time
- in-depth study of new technologies, especially computers
- extend community policing concepts
- greater emphasis on investigations rather than patrol
- more on narcotics -- issues and strategies

Captains

(5 responses)

- more time on problem solving policing
- local problems
- course should truly address high performance police management principles and activities
- police cooperation and assistance from state agencies; communicable diseases
- current management theory and techniques

Chiefs

(6 responses)

- comprehensive seminar for the time allotted (2)
- would like to attend a seminar on Theory Z management
- more applicable information aimed at extremely small departments
- more on pursuit and use of force policies
- more on problem- and community-oriented policing, manpower allocation and coaching
- target smaller agencies

Other

(1 response)

- supervision on personnel and equipment

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

(E = 79; n = 33 )

Sergeants  
(2 responses)

"...less spent on narcotics history; not relevant in management topic."

"...Mr. Miron was knowledgeable but presented in a very dull, belaboring manner. I felt like he "yelled" to keep us awake."

Lieutenants  
(13 responses)

"...spend more time on the subject matter." (2)

"...be a little more familiar with the 'state of the state.' Arizona law enforcement is very progressive."

"...more time on high performance management as a subject."

"...less lecture and more give-and-take to apply ideas to individual agencies."

"...use instructors from the southwest (2); we are sensitive to experts from back east telling us how to do it better."

"...program was great."

"...more problem-solving sessions; smaller groups and additional time."

"...additional teleconference topics to share ideas, problems and solutions with other law enforcement professionals." (2)

"...shorten or eliminate group problem-solving for it is very time consuming. Total group brainstorming might have expedited the class."

"...reduce size of class."

"...deliver coursebook to participants 10 days prior to course so they can begin reading the materials."

"...more time -- too much too soon." (3)

"...make the last day a full day or add another day for this interesting conference."

Captains  
(11 responses)

"...I'm not source if the title "High Performance Police Management" applies to this course."

"...expand to include all law enforcement agencies., i.e., state, federal, local and sheriff's."

"...expand 8 hours to allow more time for communication with instructor and other managers."

"...orient the program to a management development forum."

"...provide time to discuss local problem-solving."

"...group exercises were not good because of size." (2)  
"...larger room; more seating area."  
"...a good conference."  
"...throw out group exercises in favor of more open discussion."  
"...more training and more involvement of PMA in our area of the nation." (2)  
"...new issues; new methods."

#### Chiefs

(6 responses)

"...have greater knowledge of local situation."  
"...extend program - we ran out of time!"  
"...continue to use outside agency information."  
"...keep material updated."  
"...takes more time for this specific conference."  
"...more time for each presentation; was a very good training program, but too much material to be covered in 16 hours."

#### Other

(1 response)

"...more management information."

### IV. Additional Comments

(E = 79; n = 22)

#### Sergeants

(2 responses)

"...Al Sweeney was an outstanding speaker and very personable."  
"...I think there was way too much emphasis placed on narcotics and not enough on the course topic."

#### Lieutenants

(10 responses)

"...On the first day, too much time was spent on high performance policing; could have conveyed this in half the time. Most agencies have not reached the pro-active level let alone the high performing. Breaking into 4 teams for group planning was not very productive. We were using \$1,600 per hour of manpower. As information receivers, we could have handled more. Not bad, though. Keep at it!"  
"...excellent seminar; unique. Facilities okay, but too crowded."  
"...excellent job by facilitators."  
"...more time needed for presentations. Program involved class well."

"...excellent seminar...thanks for your efforts!"

"...good overall job. Good presentation techniques, well informed, great handout source documents."

"...room was too cold."

"...Al Sweeney - rating 5; H. Jerome Miron - rating 2+; he yelled and spoke over our level."

"...most of the material is not new. Most concepts are wither in use or under study for implementation in my agency."

"...very professionally done. All staff members were well prepared and versed on subject matter. Good job!"

#### Captains

(8 responses)

"...Jerry might improve his delivery by saying more with less words."

"...I like the 1/2 day format -- allows for opportunity to get some work done at the department each day."

"...Jerry's delivery "yelling" becomes irritating and causes headaches - the few times he spoke in a normal tone, he was acceptable and easy to listen to."

"...use the open 1/2 day. Police managers do not have time to lose a full day. Fill the time or rearrange program into 2 eight-hour days. Group exercises are okay for assessment centers

"...not for this. I would have gotten more from direct exchange with other executives in open discussion."

"...the group was too large to have problem-solving exercises."

"...alot of information in a short time."

"...excellent program." (2)

#### Chiefs

(1 response)

"...well done - thank you!"

#### Other

(1 response)

"...overall, very good program."

PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
April 19-21, 1989

N = 83

E = 79

OVERALL RESPONSE = 4.4

According to the trainers, the large size of the class did have an impact on their ability to present information to the students. This is not apparent however, in the closed measurements on the four sessions. A large percentage of students (96%) completed evaluations and counts remained consistent at 78 responses. Average scores for all sessions and across all dimensions fell midpoint between good and excellent. Relevancy and Presenters' delivery lagged slightly behind and is evident in the session on drug enforcement. Open-ended comments reflect these positive scores. Students commented favorably on the manner of presentation, the ability to interact with one another and the reinforcement of positive ideas and empowerment to change. In the sizable group which existed, the program was naturally a reinforcement for some and completely new to others. Recognizing that police departments are not independent with problems--that they are nationwide was credited as a gain for many. The high performance philosophy and techniques were cited often and more favorably than Boulder, CO, conclusions to which cannot be drawn.

Interestingly, while open and closed measurements scored the session on drug enforcement lower, the lieutenants in attendance desired more information on the subject. Without statistical analysis, it cannot be determined whether this request was caused



by the presenter's delivery, the students present assignment or the need for more information. Alternatively, many attending captains requested more problem solving and high performance techniques. Again this is taken into concept that students differ on the need for problem solving skills.

Students were open with comments differentiating the two trainers. As one is an academic and the other, a practitioner, the differences between delivery techniques becomes very apparent in the evaluations. This consideration was maintained in later sites. Despite the differences between trainers, students remarked with favorably praise for the performance of the facilitators and the presentation of the seminar.

FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
June 14-16, 1989

Representatives of the Fayetteville , NC Police Department, having attended a High Performance seminar in 1988, actively campaigned PMA to bring the training to the Fayetteville area in 1989. The Planning/Site election Committee granted this request by choosing them as a primary training site.

Correspondence and confirmation occurred with assigned liaison in March, 1989. PMA mailing labels were forwarded to the site and included members in the states of North and South Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, Georgia, Tennessee and Kentucky. As liaison had attended a previous High Performance seminar, no impediments to program implementation incurred.

Trainers Sweeney and McDonald were contracted for the training; Lt. Sweeney himself was specifically requested by Fayetteville liaison.

Major George Moyd of the Services Bureau provided opening remarks on behalf of Chief Ronald Handen. Chief Hansen met with the students on the second day of training. Forty-three (43) students were in attendance from North and South Carolinas and Tennessee departments. From the onset, students at this training site were very interactive and congenial. It was felt by the senior trainers that their willingness to be open and participative made this program the most successful of the 1989 series.

Conference call participants included Deputy Chief Edward J. Spurlock, Chief John Morgan and Lt. Sony McAfee (Houston, TX) on

drug enforcement. Uncontrollable equipment problems left Chief Morgan inaudible for most of the telephone conversation. The Community-Oriented Policing call included Chief Larry Holland, Assistant Chief James Hobbs (Tucson, AZ) and Darryl Stephens, Executive Director of the Police Executive Research Forum. Due to technical difficulties at the Conference Center in Atlanta, the call was delayed for one-half hour, resulting in only cursory remarks at the closing of Day III.

Local television and newspaper reporters visited with the trainers and students throughout the three-day seminar. The program appeared on two local television channels within three different time slots.

Certificates of completion have been sent to all participants along with accompanying thank-you letters and a list of participants. Each student completed and submitted an evaluation, leaving this site with a 100 percent rate of return.

FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
June 14-16, 1989

Participants by Rank (N = 41)

Officer = 1      Sergeant = 17      Lieutenant = 9  
Captain = 9      Chief = 0      Civilian = 5

---

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

---

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.1	3-5	41
Informative	4.2	1-5	41
Relevancy	4.5	3-5	41
Presenter Delivery	4.5	3-5	40

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	4.3	2-5	41
Informative	4.2	1-5	41
Relevancy	4.4	3-5	41
Presenter Delivery	4.5	4-5	40

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.1	2-5	40
Informative	4.0	1-5	40
Relevancy	4.1	3-5	40
Presenter Delivery	4.4	3-5	39

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.4	3-5	41
Informative	4.6	2-5	41
Relevancy	4.6	3-5	41
Presenter Delivery	4.7	3-5	40

OVERALL RESPONSE	4.1	2-5	41
------------------	-----	-----	----

FAYETTEVILLE, NC  
June 14-16, 1989

Number Students (N) = 43  
Evaluations completed (E) = 43  
Response = n

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchial or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

VI. COMMENTS

I. What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

(E= 43; n = 31)

Sergeants  
(16 responses)

- "...session materials on drugs."
- "...insight into what other departments are doing."
- "...new insight into problem- and community-oriented policing." (3)
- "...where law enforcement is heading." (2)
- "...understanding that other departments face similar problems." (2)
- "...general knowledge of police management."
- "...resource material, contacts with other departments, idea of positive thinking in problem solving."
- "...information on how larger cities and metropolitan areas are implementing community-oriented policing along with the pros and cons."
- "...empowerment of employees."
- "...community-oriented policing/changes coming in the future of law enforcement."
- "...better understanding of the importance of community policing and problem-oriented policing."
- "...a reminder of what the real issues are."

Lieutenants  
(5 responses)

"...better knowledge/reinforcement of community- and problem-oriented policing." (6)

"...drug enforcement methods."

"...an excellent look at where I am as a supervisor."

"...participating with other members of my department."

"...reinforcement of present activities."

Captains  
(4 responses)

"...new insight into alternative ideas."

"...clear view of the path that the police profession is taking."

"...very relevant to programs which our department are now interested in implementing."

"...a better understanding of the 'philosophy' of high performance management and how to make the various transitions."

Chief/Director  
(3 responses)

"...community-oriented policing - new approach and application."

"...knowledge and insight into community-oriented policing."

"...sessions on community-oriented policing and networking with other workshop attendees."

Other  
(3 responses)

"...insight into community-oriented policing; knowledge of other department's activities."

"...leadership skills; motivation to continue; how to get more with less."

"...update on community-oriented and high performance policing."

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have been of interest to you and your department?

(E = 43; n = 12)

Sergeants  
(5 responses)

"...how to have community-oriented policing in rural areas with a transient population." (2)

"...handling a less educated community or a less educated department where comprehension is low."

"...I believe that the topics covered are of great interest to my department."

"...problem-oriented policing."

Lieutenants  
(2 responses)

"...federal efforts at drug enforcement, i.e., drug czar and more information on the so-called drug war."

"...career development programs and the implementation of same."

Captains  
(1 response)

"...more time on several of the topics covered would have been well spent."

Chief/Director  
(3 responses)

"...policy development and implementation; project presentations; political considerations."

"...at least 30 minutes on colleges and university law enforcement agencies."

"...manpower allocations; more on variable scheduling."

Other  
(1 response)

"...how investigative sections are brought into the community-oriented policing picture."

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

(E = 43; n = 23)

Sergeants  
(11 responses)

"...improve audio system."

"...more emphasis on hard line subjects."

"...more audio visual aids."

"...more time; target how to areas for supervisors to learn how to motivate employees."

"...possibly add time - a lot of information is given in a short period of time."

"...more details on actual implementation of programs, model policies and procedures."

"...give examples of models that would show a basic idea of what to do and how to set up the ideas."

"...improve telephone communications; lengthen the time of instruction."

"...more student input - not just a few to answer questions while the rest only attend the class."

"...extend the time of this session."

"...increase time allotment for high performance session."

#### Lieutenants

(5) responses)

"...more videotapes on different ideas and aspects relating to areas covered."

"...as professionals that both trainers are, I would not change one thing."

"...more time allotted for total conference to increase time for projects and provide more feedback on solutions."

"...spend more time on implementation."

"...provide more problems to be solved by the 'group'(2); improve telephone communication."

#### Captains

(2 responses)

"...extend the conference to cover topics indepth." (4)

"...you were good."

#### Chief/Director

(2 responses)

"...more time for group interaction and problem solving."

(2)

#### Others

(3 responses)

"...add another 1/2 day."

"...provide outlines on team policing concepts and proactive ideas."

"...limit the number of officers from a single department. By having a captain and chief, the subordinates often felt stifled or chilled in the honesty of their responses and questions."



#### IV. Additional Comments

(E = 43; n = 18)

##### Sergeants (6 responses)

"...I very much liked the community-oriented policing presentation. Changes are definitely needed not only with the department but also between upper level managers and mid-management."

"...I would have liked to hear about identifying problems prior to the problem developing exercise."

"...this is the first conference that I have attended in which there needed to be more time for the presentation. We attempted to cover alot of ground in a short time. Thank you - I have enjoyed this conference. I think that you may see a few changes in Fayetteville as soon as we can get our own house in order. If that cannot change - we won't."

"...very good." (2)

"...well done. I would like to attend another workshop given by your team."

##### Lieutenants (5 responses)

"...reduce number of topics or lengthen program schedule. Complete topics were missed or given 'ten words and a pat.' If the source book were pushed more then the very generalized discussions could be more specific and much more helpful."

"...overall it was a very good conference. It is quite obvious that this is the direction law enforcement is going."

"...after you complete your round of these conferences, it would be great to see you come around with a follow-up conference to build upon this one. Prior attendees could them compare notes."

"...very informative and useful - good refresher."

"...enjoyed the conference very much."

##### Captains (3 responses)

"...with a new chief, our department is beginning to change. After this conference, I feel I will be able to help the new chief to improve our department and move forward."

"...excellent job by everyone involved! Thank you for the help!"

"...I feel that this is another quick-fix philosophy of a few that will be outdated in two years. I think community-oriented policing is a good start but we in law enforcement cannot mark the surface of the problem. We must include others (judges, lawyers, legislators, etc.). When we do this we will make a difference."

Chief/Director  
(1 response)

"...presenters were excellent; well-organized and provided an excellent delivery."

Others  
(3 responses)

"...a good session, but too short for the value of information presented."

"...good work."

"...well done."

FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
June 14-16, 1989

As the narrative of this site previously indicated, participants were extremely interactive and participative at the Fayetteville seminar. The broad spectrum of written comments may reflect the diverse learning experiences which can be obtained from this type of program.

Again; direction, insight, leadership and management style are the theoretical skills most noted to grasp the philosophy and application of, community-oriented and high performance police management. For the Fayetteville area, the relevancy of this approach to policing -- today and tomorrow -- remains with the community. (Evaluations, Session 4).

Participating departments appear both receptive and committed to progressive advancement, according to trainers and staff members. Specific implementation material for such advancement, however, continues to be requested.

Presenter's delivery in Fayetteville was rated high for all four sessions. Quoted comments prove the importance of trainer selection to program success.

FORSYTH, GEORGIA  
August 9-11, 1989

Program announcements were mailed directly by the Georgia Police Academy, assisted by the PMA membership database. Forty-seven (47) students were in attendance from private and public agencies in the states of Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi and North Carolina. Trainers Sweeney and Miron attended.

Introductory and opening remarks were provided by Mr. Bert Kamin, Director of Training of the Georgia Police Academy. Trainer Sweeney detailed the role of NIJ in law enforcement research and training, and that of PMA in dissemination.

The training curriculum was followed according to program outlines with little deviation from stated goals. Conference call participants for the session on drug enforcement included:

Chief Stan Knee, National City, CA Police Department  
D/Chief Hal Robbins, St. Petersburg, FL Police Department  
Investigator Tom Rosskin & Captain Joseph Lisi, New York City, NY Police Department

Trainers cited this particular conference call to have been the most successful call in the series, i.e., informative, audible, relevant and an extremely beneficial learning experience for the students. To appreciate the type of information and experiences which are exchanged in the live teleconference, the issues/topics stemming from the Georgia teleconferences are detailed here to larger degree.

The blend of a small, mid-sized and large agency, whose geographical composition differed yet whose drug problems and programs are similar, reinforces a point made in Georgia that positive approaches can be taken despite differences in manpower, resources and commitment. Conference call participants differed

as to their opinions whether law enforcement is successful, and/or making a difference in the war on drugs.

D/Chief Robbins was disconnected by the AT&T conference operated during the live discussion. However, joining the line was an Australian police official who was visiting with the NYPD. Commander Hotchkins, of the Melbourne, Australia Federal Police, informed the students that heroin was presently their greatest drug problem, stating the Australia has the highest consumption of heroin per capita, in the world. As a result of this popular drug, Australia also experiences a high rate of AIDS. While there is presently no large scale demand for crack, Cmdr. Hotchkins stated that this was "only a matter of time." He remarked with favorable impression of the drug education programs which have been implemented in the United States.

Programs under discussion at this site were DARE and the NYPD's Tactical Narcotics Teams as innovative approaches to drug education and intervention. Students raised such topics as maintaining motivation and morale; jail overcrowding; drug use policies and their differences within departments, and the continued denial by school officials that drug problems exist on campuses.

PMA was notified by Georgia media officials that one department in attendance (Riverdale) has developed plans to implement a Repeat Offender Program as a result of this training. Community Oriented Policing conference call participants included Captain James Harrison, Newport News, VA Police Department; Lt. Mike Masterson, Madison, WI Police Department; and, A/Chief Jim Hobbs, Tucson, AZ Police Department.

Captain Harrison explained the COP concept as a "community partnership with the police," expounding that departments can have all the programs desired, but they will only be effective with community involvement. He further explained the POP concept as a philosophy which looks at all angles in solving problems, using conventional and nontraditional methods.

Madison, WI representatives feel COP is the process of "getting closer to the people you serve," while POP proposes working "smarter, not harder."

In Tucson, AZ, COP and POP concepts are naturally intertwined under the name Community Based Problem Oriented Policing. This, states A/Chief Hobbs, calls for the empowerment

of people, both internally, through department mission statements and personnel goals, and externally, by making program successes a community-wide responsibility. Hobbs noted that COP is not a vogue concept as many officers believe it to be. As fellow telephone participants had shown, different areas of the country are taking similar approaches under different names.

Forty-five evaluations (45) were completed, with the rate of return at 95 percent. Certificates of completion, thank-you letters, publications and a list of participants were mailed to each students. Results of the Forsyth, Georgia training seminar follow.

FORSYTH, GEORGIA  
August 9-11, 1989

Participants By Rank (N = 47)\*  
31 departments/agencies

Officer = 1      Sergeant = 3      Lieutenant = 12  
Captain = 3      Major/Commander = 4      Chief/Sheriff/Deputy = 14  
Other = 8\*\*

\* Only 45 registered on-file

\*Consists of Special Agents with the Bureau of Investigation

---

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

---

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.3	3-5	45
Informative	4.4	3-5	45
Relevancy	4.3	2-5	45
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	44

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	4.3	2-5	45
Informative	4.3	2-5	45
Relevancy	4.4	2-5	45
Presenter Delivery	4.4	2-5	45

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.2	3-5	44
Informative	4.2	3-5	44
Relevancy	4.0	2-5	44
Presenter Delivery	4.5	3-5	44

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.4	3-5	45
Informative	4.6	3-5	45
Relevancy	4.3	1-5	45
Presenter Delivery	4.7	3-5	45
OVERALL RESPONSE	4.4	3-5	45

FORSYTH, GEORGIA  
August 9-11, 1989

Number Students (N) = 47  
Evaluations completed (E) = 45  
Response = n

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchical or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

COMMENTS

I. What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

(E = 45; n = 31 )

Officer

"...greater concept of management styles and their effectiveness."

Sergeants

"...I gained a direction in which to concentrate my efforts for the future."

"...overview of police trends; reinforcement of ideas."

"...expanded the overview of community-oriented policing that my department is already doing."

Lieutenants

"...understanding the possibility of salvaging my department and why three others have fell through."

"...confirmation that we are in the people business, selling service."

"...management of personnel."

"...new outlook on community policing; how to plan operations further."

"...changing trends."

"...community-oriented policing." (2)



"...policies which make the community more involved in problem solving."

"...reinforced my feelings towards policing."

"...valuable information."

#### Captains

"...insight into total program development."

"...information on community-oriented policing."

#### Majors

"...new insight into community-oriented policing." (3)

#### Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs/Sheriff

"...ideas for improving management techniques and philosophies."

"...insight into new ideas on policing."

"...insight into future of law enforcement."

"...the concepts [my department] are tentatively implementing are tried and true."

"...knowledge of what others in different parts of the country are doing."

"...thoughts and ideas currently employed by other departments in implementing community-oriented policing."

"...community-oriented policing and drug enforcement."

"...information on related topics in drug interdiction."

"...reinforcement of beliefs."

"...basic knowledge of community- and problem-oriented policing."

"...involve the lower level employee with community problems."

"...information on drug programs."

"...direction which moves the goals of my department, and the means and methods of movement into the 20th century."

#### Other

"...exposure to new programs instituted on a nationwide basis."

"...an overview of uniform agencies and attempts by agencies from other states to solve problems."

"...ideals from Burns and Nelson model."

"...drug enforcement information; strategies and methodology."

"...information on relevancy in other areas of the country."  
(2)

"...organizational evaluation."

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have been of interest to you or your department?

(E = 45; n = 9)

Lieutenants

"...more time devoted to drug areas."  
"...undercover drug operation management."

Majors

"...techniques directed towards managing police officers."

Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs/Sheriff

"...more material on departments under 10 manpower."  
"...more depth on legal trends and issues."

Other

"...more on program implementation and usage."  
"...more emphasis on management/supervision of employees."  
"...more information on management of narcotics units."  
"...a lot more emphasis on effective drug and organized crime enforcement projects."

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

(E = 45; n = 16)

Sergeants

"...how to adapt programs to smaller agencies."

Lieutenants

"...have them more often."  
"...more time to deliver the lecture." (2)  
"...maintain the enthusiasm and highlight the benefits of accepting the attitude, both internal and external."  
"...the program is already good."  
"...excellent conference."

Captains

"...have students list programs at their departments and, through some medium, get this to other students for information sharing."

### Majors

"...increase the amount of time you allot yourselves in presentation to allow for questions and answers. There were many questions or discussions I had or wanted to have and was not afforded the opportunity."

### Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs/ Sheriff

"...include more ideas for the smaller departments." (2)

"...longer session." (3)

"...more time for telephone interviews."

"...increase discussion time."

### Others

"...less time on community policing and more on management development."

"...overall approach was good. Course was more for a uniformed, 1st line department than an investigative support unit."

### Additional Comments

(E = 45; n = 14)

### Sergeant

"...a very good job by Al Sweeney."

### Lieutenants

"...very good conference."

"...excellent."

"...thanks for taking the time to come here and present this program."

"...name of the program is misleading; thought this was more directed to personnel management."

"...give mailing addresses and phone numbers of guests on conference calls so students can contact them later for followup on new or different ideas."

### Captains

"...very pleased."

### Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs/Sheriff

"...though I am sure there are reasons that may prevent it, consideration should be given to making the seminar a full eight hours longer."

"...good job!"

"...instructors very good."  
"...you did damn good.!"  
"...excellent presentation."

Other

"...good program for chiefs/managers. Little operational utility for specialized units/agencies. However, the general material was excellent."

"...overall, very good."

FORSYTH, GEORGIA  
August 9-11, 1989

Sessions were rated positive and mean scores ranged between 4.0 and 4.5. Presenter's delivery again averaged highest for the COP session. Scores in Georgia remained consistent with prior sites despite a disproportional number of Chiefs and Special Agents in attendance. Area municipalities are depressed -- of resources, manpower, technology and growth -- and this is reflected by cited needs for improvement, change, and advancement. The encouragement for progressive change adds even greater credibility to the submitted scores.

Open-ended measurements of Forsyth, Georgia are primarily repetitive of comments found in prior site evaluations, particularly, with their mid-and large-sized counterparts. The applicability, however, of the training on smaller departments was regarded by the Georgia participants as speculative at best.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND  
September 6-8, 1989

A representative of the Providence Police Department made a personal visit to the PMA offices in April of 1989 and was provided with the High Performance prospectus and program requirements. Upon completion of departmental review, the Providence Police Department accepted host site responsibilities, confirming the training dates of Sept. 6-8, 1989. Liaison developed an extensive information package which was mailed to approximately 89 agencies in Eastern Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. Trainers Sweeney and Fraser were contracted for this site. Providence College was selected as the training site for its ability to accommodate all logistical and equipment requirements, and because of a long standing relationship enjoyed between the College and the police department. Because of the close proximity to the site, both trainers (Sweeney & Fraser) elected to drive rather than fly. Seventy-six (76) students registered from twenty-seven (27) agencies and were in attendance for commencement of the program.

The President of Providence College provided welcoming remarks. Colonel Walter Clarke, Chief, Providence Police Department, opened the seminar by providing the audience with the department's own objectives for the training seminar: education and networking.

After participant introductions and individual self-assessments, trainers deviated from the published curriculum as

it pertained to drug enforcement due to President Bush's address to the nation televised on September 5th.

Craig Fraser lectured using the recently released National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) survey. Dr. Fraser followed his lecture with an open discussion on long range strategies, utilizing the speech by President Bush televised the previous night.

Drug conference call participants included D/Chief Hal Robbins, St. Petersburg, FL; Chief Stan Knee, National City, CA; and, program newcomer Chief John Cease, Morgantown, WV. These leaders discussed their own beliefs as to the impact of the Bush/Bennett strategy on the local level. All agreed that President Bush's mandates will take a long time to reach local law enforcement, if at all.

The Community-Oriented Policing conference participants included Captain James Harrison, Newport News, VA; Lt. Mike Masterson, Madison, WI; and, Chief Larry Holland, Wixom, MI. Discussions again focused on the pivotal role of the middle manager to the success of COP/POP and the need for empowerment within this philosophy.

Seventy-three (73) evaluations were completed, with the rate of return at 96 percent. Completion materials were again forwarded to all students.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND  
September 6-8, 1989

Participants By Rank (N = 76)  
27 departments/agencies

Officer = 1      Sergeants = 24      Lieutenants = 23  
Captains = 18      Major/Commander = 2      Chief = 6      Civilian = 2

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.4	3-5	78
Informative	4.4	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.2	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	78

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	4.4	3-5	78
Informative	4.3	2-5	78
Relevancy	4.3	1-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.3	2-5	78

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.2	3-5	78
Informative	4.2	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.2	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.4	3-5	78

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.5	3-5	78
Informative	4.6	3-5	78
Relevancy	4.5	2-5	78
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	78

OVERALL RESPONSE

	4.4	2-5	78
--	-----	-----	----



PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND  
September 6-8, 1989

Number Students (N) = 76  
Evaluations completed (E) = 73  
Response = n

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchial or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

VI. COMMENTS

What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

(E = 73; n = 63)

Patrolman

"...probably a renewed hope that changes can be made."

Sergeants

"...knowledge that all agencies are subject to the same problems...ideas on ways to solve these problems."

"...my attitude has changed positively about policing in general."

"...to know that change can be made and made effectively if only on a small scale."

"...new approach to policing."

"...the need to work closer with the community and motivating my officers to this fact."

"...a new insight in police management."

"...information and interaction."

"...more information with which to assist me in performing my job."

"...new and different ideas and a beginning with which to learn more."

"...community policing does work."

"...ways to motivate officers....different ideas on problem

solving. I like the idea of using various city agencies to assist in solving police and community problems."

"...an insight into a new philosophy on police methods which will be very valuable into the future."

"...it was important to realize that there are management models which are better suited than ours."

"...the opportunity to look at more contemporary methods of policing and how these methods may be applied even if only in a small way."

"...I enjoyed discussing the community-oriented method of policing and will utilize this approach to a greater degree within my city."

"...good source of information....[seminar]...gave different directions to look at from the traditional way."

"...better insight into community-oriented policing and results that can be achieved."

"...a different aspect of policing involving the community and other agencies."

### Lieutenants

"...fresh perspectives of...[policing]...really charged my batteries."

"...methods which let officers work their own cases."

"...community policing, problem solving and management styles."

"...exposure to new ideas."

"...the knowledge that police work must change to keep up and survive."

"...interaction with members of other departments, especially [trainer] Al Sweeney."

"...new ways and ideas of handling today's and tomorrow's policing."

"...different working management styles."

"...some valuable ideas as to how police management is changing across the country."

"...community and problem solving policing."

"...community policing." (4)

"...better understanding of high performance police management...enjoyed use of telephone conference calls."

"...that we have to get our officers back working with, and in, the community."

"...insight into the trends affecting police management."

"...always room for change."

"...a feeling of satisfaction. Having been a supervisor for 17 years in patrol and detectives, I have gone from a drill sergeant to a liberal boss who cares for his people, and they produce. This equals the PMA philosophy."

"...a clearer understanding that police work is more than just statistics."

### Captains

"...the value and insight of community programs."

"...community policing techniques." (4)

"...recharge of batteries...belief that I can make a difference."

"...information on DARE and new ideas of problem solving to consider. Also, the importance of advising the community and union prior to any action."

"...our department has to change to community policing."

"...the importance of change to an organization."

"...introduction to concepts and practical considerations of problem-oriented policing."

"...have learned what I attempted to do years ago, only then I was told this was wrong."

"...I realized that I am not, and have not been, satisfied with status quo for the past couple of years."

"...new views on police management."

"...insight on the different ways of changing direction [in order to] gain better management of the department."

"...the need for policy change."

"...hearing new views, available programs and networking."

"...letting subordinates act on their own."

### Deputy Chief/Chief

"...ideas for improving my own department."

"...coming from a small department, I was pleased to find out that we all share the same problems."

"...how to introduce community-oriented policing into the department and community."

"...new perspectives on implementing the problem solving philosophy in my department."

"...organizational insight."

### Other

"...realization of a new concept."

"...clarity on community-oriented approach - something we have been discussing for several months."

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have been of interest to you or your department?

### Sergeants

--how to get this message out to our leaders and politicians so they push these concepts

--tactics

--more information on changing an old police department's ideas into newer, more effective models

- new problems in dealing with officer drug use and policy to deal with such
- how to really sell community-oriented policing to the town counsel and other politicians
- drugs/alcohol problems within departments
- management of investigative operations (2)
- more information on allocation of resources
- scheduling

### Lieutenants

"...I don't believe too many topics should be entertained at this time. It is best to concentrate on a few topics with greater absorbtion than many topics with little retention."

- boosting morale; motivation for new concepts and expected change
- internal corruption controls
- research and planning
- implementation of programs
- ways to introduce new ideas to chiefs
- ways to introduce to the community
- more on narcotics management

### Captains

- discussions with chiefs of departments with same problems as my department
- differential policing; model policies; other training regarding transition
- managing specific problems; motivation, discipline, problem officers
- application [of this training] to a specific city and its unique problems
- use of deadly force, hot pursuit
- more management related issues, less emphasis on drugs
- management/supervision of new employees; the problem employee

### Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs

- negotiating with union personnel
- motivation
- managing problem employees
- impact on union vs management in improving programs
- more indepth review of various programs -- from planning to working model
- implementation

II. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

(E = 73; n = 42)

#### Patrolman

"...get more of the people who can make a difference to attend."

#### Sergeants

"...more time."

"...more discussion periods, smaller groups."

"...invite city/town officials, mayors, council members, school officials."

"...advertise in larger circles."

"...knock off the heavy emphasis on drugs. At times I thought we were attending a drug seminar."

"...have more of them."

"...get this type of training into our training academies. Our troops are still coming out trained to loot, shoot, murder, kill and lock up or issue tickets rather than serve the public. That is our true job but its importance is not being stressed."

#### Lieutenants

"...more film footage from other departments in their manipulation of programs discussed. Programs discussed should also have delved deeper into the subject matter."

"...extend to a one week course." (2)

"...change the name of the conference, it is misleading. I would have sent a different mix of personnel."

"...extend a day or so." (3)

"...have them more often so that more police managers could attend." (2)

"...introduce new material (other topics); lengthen time."

"...smaller groups so workshops/problem solving is more manageable. Increase time so more can participate."

"...this was very good."

"...having nothing else to compare to, the nature of the people involved will build and improve these sessions progressively."

"...more visual aids; follow-up conferences."

#### Captains

"...change visual aids, already in book."

"...not a thing! This was very, very well done."

"...for Rhode Island officers, how the Police Bill of Rights statutes fit into the management scheme."

"...have one or two individuals from other departments who are actively involved in these concepts, to appear in person for more lengthy discussions, especially during break times."

"...gear some topics to smaller departments. Much seems to always relate to larger organizations."

"...skip the practical exercise in which the class was broken up into 4 groups. Taking away money and manpower constraints makes exercise unrealistic."

"...I felt the presenters and information was top-notch. I have been stimulated by the session. Change nothing."

"...have ranking policeman take part in discussions."

"...change nothing. It was well organized and professionally presented."

"...very little."

#### Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs

"...provide handouts that might be available from departments that have tried new methods."

"...perhaps send material prior to seminar to facilitate review."

"...provide a top level seminar for chiefs and deputies."  
(2)

"...make conferences longer."

"...need to set participants up with the tools to deal with change."

"...no need to improve...an excellent presentation."

#### Other

"...well planned and well presented. Personal appearance by one of the chiefs from the departments contacted by phone would enhance question and answer component."

"...more of them."

#### IV. Additional Comments

(E = 73; n = 27)

#### Sergeants

"...conference is run in a very professional manner and held my attention for all three days."

"...found the live phone discussions useful and informative. Lt Sweeney does a great job as a captivating instructor."

"...I think this was an excellent conference which allows us to look at the present and future of policing and share ideas concerning our direction."

"...Al Sweeney was very informative and has the ability to hold attentions with great delivery. The other instructor was very dry."

"...repeat audience questions prior to answering them so that everyone knows what was asked."

"...great conference, informative and definitively raised my awareness."

"...more time."

### Lieutenants

"...I truly believe that the quality and understanding of instructors, particularly Al Sweeney, make this a learning process acceptable enough to want to go back and do something."

"...I am in my 20th year of law enforcement. By far, this was the most motivating seminar, even though some aspects were dry. Lt. Al Sweeney does not let you fall asleep. Good speaker."

"...all of it was very informative and I will most definitely work with my personnel to implement."

"...It was a real pleasure to have such an outstanding instructor as Lt. Sweeney."

"...phone conferences were very good."

"...Instructors did an excellent job and kept everyone interested."

"...there should be a mandatory follow-up seminar."

"...Al Sweeney and Craig Fraser are two dedicated professionals in the police field and a credit to the seminar."

"...Lt. Sweeney is an interesting and informative speaker. I enjoyed the program."

"...Lt. Sweeney is one of the best instructors I have had in 13 1/2 years."

"...I was impressed with the instructors and their attitudes. This was not a boring seminar and well worth the participation. Unfortunately, my work hours hindered my total attention. It is a very inspirational seminar and would be a highly recommended seminar to other departments."

### Captains

"...Al Sweeney is an excellent instructor. Right among of wit, and familiarization with area to prove he is not an outsider."

"...thanks for the information and assistance in addressing the future."

"...very satisfied with the seminar."

"...outstanding; fast moving. Wish it was a day longer to discuss problems in starting a community-oriented program."

"...Al Sweeney is top shelf."

"...Al is very informative and a good presenter."

Deputy Chiefs/Chiefs

"...This was a very motivating 2 1/2 days. Thanks again."

"...I especially liked the split day sessions -- it does away with boredom and allows time to do other things in the case of execution workload."

"...I enjoyed the three days very much, especially the quality of the instruction."



PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND  
September 6-8, 1989

Participants rated each session and dimension higher than any other site in this series. The lowest empirical score obtained was 4.3 for drug enforcement informativeness. This session was the only which holds range scores of 1. Participants also rated presenter's delivery higher than any other site for the sessions on high performance and community oriented policing. The close working proximity of the trainers (Boston) to the students should be considered with these scores.

Open comments solicited are extensive and detailed on pages 71-78.

NOTE: As is apparent by the evaluations thus far, all sites reveal very broad yet very particular findings which are, in some cases, specific to both the site and the individual evaluating the course. This was found in previous seminar series as well. Generalizations aside, evaluation scores and comments for the remaining sites -- San Bernardino, CA and Newport News, Va -- are provided verbatim as recorded and are not interpreted in any manner.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA  
November 15-17, 1989

Due to the postponement of PMA's annual conference in Long Beach, CA, the original dates for training (November 7-9, 1989) were pushed up to November 15-17, 1989 to accommodate those participants who had originally planned to attend this conference. Unfortunately, exorbitant room charges precluded the conduct of the three-day training on the Hotel Queen Mary as scheduled. Long Beach liaison immediately searched for alternative training sites. A city-wide convention, also scheduled during these dates, made it impossible to secure local facilities. The police training academy and local universities were also unable to accommodate, therefore the Long Beach Police Department reluctantly declined the invitation to host.

Alternatively, the San Bernardino, CA Police Department accepted this invitation and secured the site facilities required. A personal letter addressed to the Chief was mailed to agencies in Southern California and Arizona. PMA announced the training to its entire membership in a separate mailing. Thirty-three students (33) from fifteen (15) departments were in attendance. Participants from Virginia and Maryland registered as well.

Due to the difficulty in securing the date for this seminar, all but one trainer was able to accommodate the training to his schedule. In searching for a second trainer to join Lt. Sweeney, PMA staff contracted Chief Stan Knee, an NIJ-approved trainer used by PMA in prior seminar series and a frequent

participant in the drug enforcement teleconference call. This action was approved through the Grant Monitor.

Captain Jim Harrison, also a frequent participant in the COP conference call was in attendance to speak personally with the students on Community Oriented Policing. James K. Stewart, Director of NIJ, was also present and addressed students on policing in the 1990's.

No problems were incurred at this site and all requisite materials were forwarded to the students, completing their course instruction.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA  
November 15-17, 1989

Participants By Rank (N=33)  
15 departments/agencies

Sergeants = 15      Lieutenants = 13      Captains = 3  
Chiefs = 2

---

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

---

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.3	2-5	28
Informative	4.1	3-5	28
Relevancy	4.5	4-5	28
Presenter Delivery	4.5	4-5	28

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	4.0	2-5	29
Informative	4.0	3-5	29
Relevancy	4.3	3-5	29
Presenter Delivery	4.1	4-5	29

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.2	3-5	29
Informative	4.1	3-5	29
Relevancy	4.3	3-5	29
Presenter Delivery	4.3	3-5	29

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.3	3-5	29
Informative	4.4	3-5	29
Relevancy	4.6	3-5	29
Presenter Delivery	4.6	3-5	29

OVERALL RESPONSE

4.2	3-5	28
-----	-----	----

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA  
November 15-17, 1989

Number Students (N) = 33  
Evaluations completed (E) = 29  
Response = n

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchical or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

COMMENTS

I. What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

Officer

"...overall view and understanding of COP and POP and similarity of nationwide problems."

Sergeants

"...exposure to different thoughts and philosophies." (2)

"...identified the need for more problem solving to supplement community oriented strategies."

"...the grass is not greener on the other side of the fence."

"...networking with managers, exchanging information."

"...recognition of what 'policing' is all about--getting back to the basics with the community."

"...encouragement. There are other voices in the wilderness."

"...discovered that community-oriented policing is wide spread."

"...discovered what other agencies are doing."

"...L.A.P.D. is currently attempting to apply these concepts in several divisions across the city. I gained new ideas and learned proven concepts."

### Lieutenants

"...contacts with other managers; ideas to try in home department."

"...a much better understanding of POP, COP and Directed Patrol Operations."

"...different ideas and networking." (2)

"...this {seminar} was a rekindling of enthusiasm which will be valuable to reach my goals."

"...regained perspective that the community, and their resources are the most valuable to combat crime."

"...orientation towards futuristic methods of providing police services; traditional modes of police response need to be re-thought."

"...comments regarding POP from across the nation."

"...this was a review/update of information that our agency has been reviewing and soon to implement."

"...good information on COP."

"...Chief Knee's presentation, even though interrupted, was the most informative with reference to my present position."

"...good information on COP."

"...ideas, ideas, ideas."

"...giving subordinates more freedom to do the job."

### Captains

"...keeping up with relevant issues is crucial; gained a great deal from interaction."

"...an understanding of contemporary trends in nationwide law enforcement."

### Chief of Police

"...a affirmation that I am on the right track and a shot in the arm to keep it going. Lot's of valuable information that will assist those endeavors."

II. What other subjects/topics (not covered)  
would have been of interest to your or  
your department?

### Sergeants

"...topics were covered very well. Due to different departmental structures, internal information should be emphasized. The evolution of police work, e.g., 'hue and cry' shows the true value of community policing."

"...more details on gang related crimes."

"...supervisory styles, human relations."

"...more on actual personnel deployment in organizations with POP already in place."

"...examples of mission or policy statements of departments"

which have accepted the philosophy of POP on COP."  
"...implementation issues -- policy regarding change--who decides?"  
"...dealing with problem employees."

#### Lieutenants

"...a focus on situational leadership."  
"...everything covered was state of the art information."  
"...information on community group activities supported by the department."  
"...specific implementation models for POP, e.g., productivity impact of personnel."  
"...more case studies of POP."

#### Captains

"...discuss the future of police unionism and its' impact on management."

#### Chief of Police (no response)

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

#### Sergeants

"...three full days; perhaps some role playing."  
"...outstanding conference! One of the best I have attended in fourteen years."  
"...consider: guest speakers, week in length, increase breaks and promote greater interaction."  
"...ensure you have top rate instructors. The presentation from the National City chief could be improved."  
"...cover and discuss some of the articles in the Sourcebook."

#### Lieutenants

"...nothing--this was an outstanding class for police middle managers."

"...focus on material in Sourcebook."

"...concentrate on fewer issues, but cover them in-depth."

"...expand on telephone conferences."

"...class needs to be a least a complete three-day session."

(2)

"...conference was good and should not need change."

"...telephone conferences which include line personnel." (2)

Captains

"...develop programs with new and unique information."  
"...clearly state who target group is in mailed literature."

Additional Comments

Officer

"...let more agencies know about PMA."

Sergeants

"...keep up the excellent work."  
"...consider 'power' as a possible subject area."  
"...gained a great deal by attending this seminar."

Lieutenants

"...informative and enjoyable."  
"...good course."

Captains

"...keep up the good work."  
"...very good session. I thoroughly enjoyed attending and  
look forward to hosting the seminar next month (James Harrison)."  
"...well organized; good learning environment."



NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA  
December 6-8, 1989

Representatives from the Alexandria, VA Police Department noted interest in hosting a "High Performance" seminar by contacting PMA staff, requesting information be forwarded to the department. Confirmation was given to PMA on June 20, 1989 and the dates of October 4-6, 1989 were selected. Alexandria liaison was assigned and began the internal planning required for implementation. PMA was notified in early September that the proper signatures had not been obtained for the implementation of this program due to questions stemming from Alexandria's financial division. PMA staff members were under the assumption that such authorization had been obtained due to conversations with the Assistant Chief who had originally requested programs information. Additionally, it had come to our attention that the Chief had fully expected to host this program. Staff was then notified that the paperwork would be "walked through" as expeditiously as possible and a determination made of the ability of assigned liaison to fulfill the host department responsibilities. Liaison informed the PMA during the third week of September that, after spot checking surrounding departments, there was no interest or support in hosting the seminar program. This was disappointing as NIJ representatives were expected to be in attendance.

Newport News, VA, serving as a secondary site, readily agreed to host the training program. In order to allow

sufficient time to design an announcement and mail to prospective agencies, the seminar was scheduled to commence December 6-8, 1989. PMA filed an time extension without cost with the NIJ Grant Monitor, Jonathan Budd, in order to complete training requirements, which was approved. Captain James Harrison was assigned as liaison. Mailing labels were forwarded to assist in registration and a personal invitation was extended to the Alexandria Police Department.

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA  
December 6-8, 1989

Participants By Rank (N=43)  
10 departments/agencies

Corporals = 2                      Sergeants = 17                      Lieutenants = 16  
Captains = 4                      Major = 3                      Chief = 1

Assess on a 5-point scale (5=excellent; 4=good; 3=average; 2=poor; 1=very poor) the sessions from the following perspectives: Clarity -- Was the information clearly presented? Informative -- Was the presentation helpful in providing you with new solutions to your agency's needs? Relevancy -- Is the information relevant to you, your job and your agency? Presenter Delivery -- Style and Expertise.

Session 1: High Performance Management Model & Police Issues

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>N</u>
Clarity	4.2	2-5	41
Informative	4.2	2-5	41
Relevancy	4.3	2-5	41
Presenter Delivery	4.3	3-5	41

Session 2: Drug Enforcement Programs & Issues

Clarity	3.7	1-5	41
Informative	3.7	1-5	41
Relevancy	3.6	1-5	41
Presenter Delivery	3.6	1-5	41

Session 3: Resource Allocation Issues

Clarity	4.0	3-5	40
Informative	4.0	3-5	40
Relevancy	4.0	2-5	40
Presenter Delivery	4.2	3-5	40

Session 4: Community Oriented Policing

Clarity	4.5	3-5	40
Informative	4.3	2-5	40
Relevancy	4.4	2-5	40
Presenter Delivery	4.5	3-5	40

OVERALL RESPONSE	3.9	205	41
------------------	-----	-----	----

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA  
December 6-8, 1989

Number Students (N) = 43  
Evaluations completed (E) = 41  
Response = n

Four open-ended measurements were used to determine participants' overall assessment of the training program. Many participants supplied several comments to each question; others declined to comment at all. Several provided remarks which were not necessarily solicited by the intended question, but are furnished as recorded. Emphasis has been added where recorded. Numerical figures following statements indicate the number of times the reply was recorded. Responses were categorized according to participant's rank to determine whether any hierarchical or philosophical differences could be determined. Missing ranks from comments section means no responses were given. A content analysis was performed for these responses as follows.

# # #

What did you gain most from attending this workshop?

Corporals

"...the particulars of COP and its' extent of implementation nation wide."

"...material on high performance."

Sergeants

"...actual planning ideas (specifics) for moving into era of community policing."

"...insight into futuristic policing."

"...COP." (2)

"...an alternate way of looking at crime problems."

"...information on POP."

"...a foundation of information to build upon."

"...high performance aspects."

"....the ability to solidify what I have been doing with my staff into concrete concepts which have direction."

"...basic understanding of the future of police depts."

"...a broad understanding of the role of the police department within the community and where goals should be directed towards."

"...I know that I can change my way of thinking to implement progress even if the department does not."

"...COP and POP."

### Lieutenants

"...more complete understanding of COP and POP." (2)  
"...focus on direction and change energy level."  
"...what other agencies are doing with community policing."  
"...reinforcement of need to get away from 'traditional',  
reactive policing styles."  
"...futuristic policing trends."  
"...COP information."  
"...confirmation of current departmental strategies and  
programs."

### Captains

"...different approaches to common problems."  
"...old style, new terminology."  
"...sharing ideas."

### Majors

"...good information on COP."

### Commander

"...overview of program."

What other subjects/topics (not covered) would have  
been of interest to you or your department?

### Corporal

"...actual implementation of high performance management."

### Sergeants

"...more on drug enforcement."  
"...how to get judges/prosecutors involved."  
"...add more inter-mechanics, i.e., 'meat' to the program."  
"...within subjects, more detailed explanation of  
characteristics of community policing."

### Lieutenants

"...[seminar] was very informative."  
"...more time should be spent on basics and the ideas which  
can be brought directly to your department."  
"...how to sell programs to community and other government  
and agencies that do not want to get involved." (2)

III. In your opinion, what could we do that would help us improve the professional conferences that we deliver to police managers?

Corporals

"...you could teach specific management techniques."  
"...less statistical analysis of unimportant points."

Sergeants

"...expose executive staff to this program."  
"...stick to management concepts."  
"...more time is needed to gain proper insight into these programs."  
"...lessen use of statistics."

Lieutenants

"...clarify purpose of training through statement of objectives."  
"...spend more time at the beginning on the basics."  
"...the drug information was very general and shed little light on new solutions."  
"...leave out the drug lecture."

Captains

"...learn more about what the local departments are doing."

Majors

"...less emphasis on drug statistics."

Commanders

"...continue to hold this type of workshop for mid-managers."

IV. Additional Comments

Sergeants

"...I enjoyed this greatly -- very informative."  
"...good seminar; timely subject matter; good interaction."  
"...I found the course very rewarding, informative and enlightening."  
"...I have been exposed to most of the material covered from other sources and independent reading."  
"...less drug statistics."  
"...overall, an excellent program."

### Lieutenants

"...allow more time for additional group interaction and instruction."

"...High Performance, as a title may be a misnomer. Lt. Sweeney was a '5'; Mr. Miron, perhaps too removed from policing in his approaches to be fully accepted."

"...too much time spent reviewing statistical information. Aside from this, the seminar was very good. Lt. Sweeney is an excellent facilitator."

"...time allotted is insufficient; rushed through materials but overall, a good workshop."

## B. Workshop Flow and Activities: Site Comparisons

TABLE A

WORKSHOP FLOW AND ACTIVITIES BY SITE  
(Based on average per individual response)

### Lectures/Presentations

	<u>CO</u>	<u>AZ</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>GA</u>	<u>RI</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>VA</u>
N =	47	83	41	47	76	33	43
Time Allotted	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.0
Opportunity for Questions	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.3
Relevancy of Visual Aids	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.1
Use of Text(s)	3.6	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.5

### Workshop Flow

Sequence of Sessions	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.3	3.5
Session Transition	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.3	4.0

### Individual Work

Utility of Individual Work	3.3	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.5
Time Allotted	3.1	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.6

### Materials

Participant Workbook	4.0	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1
Participant Sourcebook	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2
Visual Aids	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.3	3.9
Handouts	3.7	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.0

TABLE B

WORKSHOP IMPACT BY SITE  
(based on average per individual response)

	<u>CO</u>	<u>AZ</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>GA</u>	<u>RI</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>VA</u>
N =	47	83	41	47	76	33	43
Informative	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.0
Useful	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.2	3.9
Relevant to Agency	4.0	4.0	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.1



TABLE C - FOLLOWUP

	<u>CO</u>	<u>AZ</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>GA</u>	<u>RI</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>VA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
N =	47	83	43	47	76	33	43	
Inform Chief Executive	21	28	13	22	42	11	8	145
Discuss with Staff	36	58	25	30	52	23	24	99
Organize Meeting	19	41	26	25	40	12	21	184
Request Information	12	46	15	21	30	14	13	151
Contact city/experts	4	14	6	6	9	3	4	46

TABLE D

## PARTICIPATION AND RANK - SITE TOTALS

	<u>Chief*</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Capt</u>	<u>Lt</u>	<u>Sgt</u>	<u>Cpl</u>	<u>Ofr</u>	<u>Civ</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
CO	9	0	2	25	10	0	0	1	0	47
AZ	14	2	18	37	9	0	2	0	1	83
NC	3	2	9	9	17	2	1	0	0	43
GA	14	4	3	12	3	0	1	0	8	47
RI	6	2	18	23	24	0	1	2	0	76
CA	2	0	3	13	15	0	0	0	0	33
VA	1	3	4	16	17	2	0	0	0	43

---

\* Includes Sheriff's personnel and Deputies

Other includes U.S. Marshalls and Special Agents