

MONITORING/EVALUATION COVER FORM

PROJECT NUMBER 76-NI-05-0001 TERMINATION DATE July 31, 1976

PROJECT TITLE Family Crisis Intervention Teams

SUBGRANTEE City of Cleveland, Police Department

PROJECT DIRECTOR Francis Reagan, Lieutenant of Police

ADDRESS 1300 Ontario Street

OCT 2 1978

TELEPHONE 623-5040

ACQUISITIONS

NAME OF STAFF PERSON WHO COMPLETED INSTRUMENT Francis Reagan, Lieutenant

This Report is for:	<u>Quarter</u>	<u>Due</u>
	<input type="checkbox"/> January-March	April 10
	<input type="checkbox"/> April-June	July 10
	<input type="checkbox"/> July-September	October 10
	<input type="checkbox"/> October-December	January 10

- Check One:
- A. Quarterly Evaluation for the above quarter is attached
 - B. Quarterly Evaluation for the above grant is not attached because this is a continuation grant which was not operational or operational less than half of the quarter.
 - C. Quarterly Evaluation for the above quarter for this grant is not attached because this is a new grant which was not operational or was operational less than one month during the quarter.
 - D. Quarterly Evaluation for the above quarter for this grant is not attached because this is an equipment project, and the equipment is not yet in operation.

53888

If this is the last Quarterly Evaluation for the above grant, check this box

Please return two copies of this form each quarter to:

The Criminal Justice Coordinating



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

DISCRETIONARY GRANT
PROGRESS REPORT

GRANTEE Administration of Justice Division Department of Economic and Community Development		LEAA GRANT NO. 76-NI-05-0001	DATE OF REPORT 10-28-76	REPORT NO. 4
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE City of Cleveland Department of Police 601 Lakeside, Cleveland, Ohio 44114		TYPE OF REPORT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT Family Crisis Intervention Team		GRANT AMOUNT \$240,000		
REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD 11-5-75		THROUGH 7-31-76		
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR <i>Francis Reagan, Lieut.</i>		TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR Francis Reagan Lieutenant of Police		

COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Add continuation pages as required.)

(1) INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of the Crisis Intervention Teams (CIT) was the reduction of crime throughout the 2nd and 4th Police Districts through the deployment of specialized patrol units containing police officers specially trained in crisis management and inter-personal intervention techniques.

This goal was to be accomplished by the Cleveland Police Department through the implementation of the following:

- (1) 20 experienced veteran police officers received special training in the skills necessary to successfully intervene in crisis situations.
- (2) Police dispatchers were instructed to utilize these specially trained intervention officers on calls for assistance involving family disputes, etc., where their skills were most likely utilized in the prevention of criminal offenses.

The Crisis Intervention Team is premised upon two widely accepted and utilized principles of police management. The first principle states that a specialized police patrol effort will reduce crime. The second principle is that an increased police proficiency in the area of inter-personal skills will result in a reduction of criminal offenses such as homicides, assaults and rapes where the assailant is known to the victim, and which are likely to erupt as a consequence of a dispute situation. Thus, the Crisis Intervention Team combined the benefits of these two principles into a viable and workable activity which insured the continuation of the City of Cleveland's crime reduction efforts.

There was no activity in the Family Crisis Intervention Team Grant during the period: 11-5-75 through 12-31-75. The Grant became operational in January 1976.

(2) STATEMENT OF PROBLEM IN MEASURABLE TERMS

The City of Cleveland is divided into 6 areas of Police Patrol. These areas are called Districts and each has its own headquarters. The two Districts in which Crisis Intervention teams are working are the 2nd District located on the near West side of Cleveland and the 4th District which is located in Southeast section of the

RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (Officer)

DATE

city.

The 2nd District encompasses an area of 14.93 square miles and has a population of 137,698 people and which has in recent years in the north and western areas changed in ethnic background and social and economic makeup. In 1974, 18 homicides, 43 rapes (and/or) assault to rapes, and 841 aggravated assaults occurred in this District.

The 4th District encompasses an area of 15.6 square miles, and has a population of 183,666 people. Like the 2nd District the ethnic background and the social and economic makeup has also changed in recent years. In 1974, the following crimes occurred. 71 homicides, 73 rapes (and/or) assaults to rape and 1094 aggravated assaults.

With a highly trained Crisis Intervention Team assigned to each of the above Districts we hoped to reduce the crimes mentioned previously in which a family relationship and/or friendship occurs between the victim and the offender.

(3) STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES AND WORKING ASSUMPTIONS WHICH PROVIDED THE CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION AND TRUST FOR THE PROJECT.

Under the provisions of the Family Crisis Intervention Program, Grant No. 76-NI-05-0001 the initial training for 2nd District Officers took place at the Public Auditorium, at East 6th and St. Clair Avenue from January 5, 1976 through January 8, 1976. Ten Patrolmen, 3 Sergeants, and a Captain from the 2nd District were trained. Also trained at that time was a Lieutenant and

Sergeant from the Communication Control Center. A total of 18 veteran officers received the training. Training was conducted by Law Enforcement Training and Research Associates, of 320 Judoh Street, San Francisco, California 94122.

Eighteen officers from the 4th District successfully completed their Family Crisis Intervention Training from February 9, 1976 through February 12, 1976 at the above Auditorium site and this training again was conducted by Law Enforcement Training and Research Associates. Included in this class of trainees were 12 Patrolmen, a Captain, Lieutenant and 2 Sergeants from the 4th District and also a Sergeant from the Communication Control Center.

A sufficient number of officers were trained in each District to provide for operational deployment seven days a week in assigned Family Crisis Intervention teams and also to provide for trained personnel manning these cars even in the event of sickness, days off, etc.. Superior Officers from the 2nd and 4th Districts were also trained in order to provide direction and proper implementation of this program. Communication Control officers were also trained to coordinate this program so that Radio Dispatchers would utilize these specially trained Intervention officers on calls for assistance involving family disputes where their skills would most likely be utilized in the prevention of criminal offenses.

In a Departmental Notice 76-35 entitled Family Crisis Intervention Project, Chief Lloyd F. Garey officially designated the starting date of this program, March 1, 1976. At that time Commanding Officers of the 2nd

and 4th District were required to designate one patrol car for each of the three platoons that was to be known as a Family Crisis car. These cars are to be manned only by officers trained in Crisis Intervention techniques. In addition, to assure coordination with the Communications Control Center, the officers in charge of these Stations must notify the Communication Control Officer in charge and advise him which car has the trained officers on each shift change.

Departmental Notice 76-35 also enumerated the conditions of the Grant in that there will be an evaluation of the Cleveland Police Department Family Crisis Intervention Project through the collection and analysis of data on Family Disturbances, Family related Crime, the attitudes and opinions of the Police Officers toward the Crisis Intervention Training they had received.

Also included in this Departmental Notice was the fact that both trained and untrained officers were required to make the Family Disturbance Report and the Attachment B, Family History report, in addition to any required Departmental report. These reports were required under the conditions of the Family Crisis Grant and provided data for the Human Resources Research Organization (HUMRRO). Detailed instructions on reporting and record keeping were part of this Departmental Notice.

On March 15th and March 16th, 1976 representatives of Human Resources Research Organization interviewed the police officers trained in the Family Crisis Intervention Program in the 2nd and 4th Districts respectively. All trained officers were interviewed on the following topics:

- (1) Attitudes and opinions toward training
- (2) Suggestions for improving training
- (3) Personal and biographical data
- (4) Previous work histories
- (5) Cleveland Police Department work history.

(4) STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC INDICATORS AND MEASURES TO BE USED TO ASSESS RESULTS OF THE PROJECT IN TERMS OF BOTH (1) ABOVE AND INTERMEDIATE PROJECT OUTPUTS. DATA SOURCES AND APPROPRIATE COLLECTION METHODS WILL BE NOTED IN THIS PARAGRAPH.

The Human Resources Research Organization (HUMRRO) was awarded the contract "To Provide Technical Assistance in the Evaluation of the Cleveland Police Department Family Crisis Intervention Team Project".

HUMRRO proposed to conduct its evaluation of the C.P.D. Family Crisis Intervention Project through the collection and Analysis of data on (1) Family Disturbances, (2) Family Related Crimes (3) The attitudes and opinions of Police officers towards the crisis intervention training they received.

Family Disturbances

HUMRRO provided the C.P.D. with Family Disturbance Report forms to be completed by 20 trained officers and a comparable group of 20 untrained officers after each family dispute to which they respond. It was proposed that these forms be filled out for a period of 3 months following the

completion of training.

HUMRRO's analysis of the data obtained from the disturbance report forms will answer the following kinds of questions about the nature of family disputes in Cleveland.

- (1) What are the major causes of family fights (e.g., alcohol, financial problems, children, relative, etc.)?
- (2) What actions do Cleveland Police Officers take to resolve family disputes? Are there differences in the actions taken by trained and untrained officers?
- (3) What are the types and frequencies of referrals made by trained and untrained officers?
- (4) In what percentage of family disputes in Cleveland is there a weapon involved?

Family Related Crimes

HUMRRO proposed the following steps as a means of evaluating the impact of the CPD crisis intervention project on family related crime statistics:

- (1) CPD personnel will identify the names and addresses of the first 300 families involved in domestic disputes to which the 20 trained officers will have responded immediately following completion of training.

- (2) CPD personnel will identify the names and addresses of all families involved in domestic disputes to which untrained officers will have responded during the period in which the trained officers responded to their first 300 dispute calls.
- (3) HUMRRO personnel will then select a random sample of 300 families from the total number of families involved in disputes to which the untrained officers responded during the period mention in (2).
- (4) CPD personnel will record all Police calls made to each of the 600 families cited above for a period of 6 months following completion of training. Attachment B is an example of the form which CPD personnel might use to record such data.
- (5) HUMRRO personnel will then analyze the data to answer the following kinds of questions:
 - (a) Do trained officers tend to spend more time on dispute calls than do untrained officers?
 - (b) Do families initially visited by trained officers tend to have fewer repeat calls than do families initially visited by untrained officers?
 - (c) Do calls made by trained officers tend to result in fewer arrests than calls made by untrained officers?
 - (d) Is there a difference in the subsequent assault and homicide rates between family initially visited by trained officers and families initially visited by untrained officers?

Attitudes and Opinions of Officers Toward Training

As previously indicated HUMRRO personnel interviewed each of the 20 trained officers concerning attitudes and opinions of the officers toward training.

The primary purposes for collecting this data is to determine the satisfaction of the officers with the training they received, and to obtain their suggestions for improvement and modification of future family crisis intervention training projects.

The Cleveland Police Department received a copy of the biographical data form and the results of interviews with the Police Officers trained in the Family Crisis Program in the 2nd and 4th Districts respectively. All trained officers were interviewed on the following topics.

- (1) Attitudes & opinions toward training.
- (2) Suggestions for improving training.
- (3) Personal and biographical data.
- (4) Previous work histories.
- (5) Cleveland Police Department work history.

Out of the 28 officers interviewed 75% or 21 officers had no previous training related to family crisis intervention. There was also a feeling that their supervisors had mixed feelings, both positive and negative about the training (about 67%). Positive attitudes were registered in the 14% area and 10% in the don't know category.

Sixty percent (17) of the officers participated in this training felt positive about the merits with 25% registering mixed feelings. Only 2 officers reported having negative feelings on this matter.

In answer to whether the training program was offered at a convenient time, qualified yes and yes voters predominated as opposed to a no vote on this question.

In answer to ranking the types of instruction on an effectiveness level from 1 to 5, (1 - least effective, 5 - most effective). Small group exercises rated highest, followed by role play, and then team teaching.

With respect to subject content area covered in the training for helpfulness in a similar type ranking was used. 1 - least helpful, 7 - most helpful. Safety features, defusing, mediation and brief interviewing were cited as most helpful in descending order of importance.

Most of the officers feel that this type of training would be most beneficial both before he begins his duties as a Police Officer and after he has had some experience. They also felt that this type of training should be required of all patrolmen rather than on a voluntary basis.

Among other observations that can be made is that the officers rated familiarity with police procedures, police experience, teaching experience, as important criteria for instructors who would handle this sort of training.

Suggestions for Improving Training

Apparently the 28 trained officers had positive feelings about the

worth of the Crisis Intervention training. They appeared to react most favorably to the type of instruction featuring small group exercises followed by role play and team teaching. They also expressed themselves as reflecting a liking for subject area coverage in safety features, defusing a situation, techniques of mediation and art of brief interviewing. Approval of viewing themselves on video tape in simulated crisis situations was also indicated. Interviews also reflected that this type of training might also be quite valuable in an officers basic training and as a refresher course and also it could be required rather than voluntary. Class sizes should be limited to about 18 to 20 officers. Also significant in the response to the query about instructor experience or qualifications was the fact that familiarity with police procedures, police experience, teaching experience seemed to be the criteria in this area.

Personal & Biographical Data

The interview data on the 24 officers assigned to the Crisis Intervention program revealed the following:

The average or mean age of the participant officer is 34 years. There are 25 white officers and 3 black officers in this program. The large majority of the officers are married as opposed to the single, separated or divorced category. Most of these officers have been married only once, and average 11 years of marriage with 2.3 children per family.

Eighteen of the 28 officers have completed 12 years of education through the high school level. Out of the 28 officers, a considerably lesser number

of these officers have completed specialist training, or Junior college, or Senior college. Four of the 28 officers have earned college degrees. Seven officers do not plan to earn a degree and seven are undecided about continuing their education to degree achievement. Only an average of 2 officers in the group have participated in educational or in-service programs since joining the Department.

Three quarters or 75% of the officers in the program have no police officers in their family and only seven officers have this police background in their families.

Cleveland Police Department Work History

Statistical information gathered in connection with the trained officers work history discloses the following facts:

Of the 28 officers in the Crisis Intervention Program, their average time on the Department is 9.5 years. There are 22 Patrolmen, 4 Sergeants and 2 Captains in this program.

When questioned as to whether they are satisfied with their job on the force (on a scale of 1 to 10), 10 - most satisfied, the mean answer was 7 indicating above average satisfaction. Half of these officers work on an off duty basis at some other job.

Average overtime earned per week is 4 hours, and 2 hours are spent in Court in an average week.

Twenty-three of 28 officers have been wounded or assaulted while on duty, an average of three times. Fortunately, out of the 23 assaults reported, only 5 were serious and 18 less serious. Also reported was the fact that some of these assaults were sustained while handling family dispute calls. Fourteen of 22 officers gave this information. The officers also reported that they respond to an average of 9 family disputes per week.

Some other questions proposed to the officer during the interviews dealt with attitudes or opinions in connection with family disputes.

Sixty-seven percent of the officers felt that police officers should be called upon to intervene in family disputes, where it is to prevent injury or if one of the persons has been drinking, etc.. They also felt that other officers shared the same opinion.

In answer to question about the fact that the Department should hire psychologists or social workers to assist the police on family dispute calls, a majority of the officers interviewed felt that the Department should not hire social workers but there should be someone whom the police could call on to help. They also expressed themselves on the relative importance of interviewing in family disputes as compared to their other duties. Twelve officers out of 23 felt it was the same as any of their duties, six officers feel that it is less important than other duties, 3 officers felt it was more important than some other duties and 2 officers felt it was more important than most other duties.

When questioned on a police officer being evaluated or considered for promotion and the consideration given by the Department to his record of dealing with family disputes, the large majority of officers believe that little or no consideration is given to this area of skill. They feel however that some credit should be given, as much as other parts of his record.

Almost 90% of officers engaged in the Crisis Intervention plan to remain in Law Enforcement field.

(5) STATEMENT OF RESULTS ACHIEVED BY PROJECT UTILIZING INDICATORS DEVELOPED IN PARAGRAPH 4.

The Family Crisis Intervention Grant was scheduled to run from November 5, 1975 through July 4, 1976. Training requirements for the 20 officers enrolled in this program were concluded in January and February of 1976. Program implementation was started on March 1, 1976. HUMRRO representatives interviewed our officers on March 15 and 16, 1976. The results achieved thus far shows that the Cleveland Police Department has complied with all of the conditions of the Grant in instituting a viable and working program. Further measurable results will have to await HUMRRO evaluative study.

On Thursday morning, June 24, 1976 at about 11:30 AM met with Miss Charlotte Heinecke, Research Associate of the Human Resources Research Organization. The purpose of Miss Heinecke's visit was to ascertain the progress of the Family Crisis Intervention Program.

Miss Heinecke also stated that the Family Crisis Program had been

extended through July 31, 1976. Specific directions were given to this Department on the collecting of the Family Disturbance Reports and the Family Logs.

- (1) On September 1, 1976 all Family Disturbance reports shall be mailed to HUMRRO.
- (2) After July 16, 1976 the Family Log reports should not contain any new names.
- (3) Family Log reports should be kept until October 1, 1976. At this time the Family Log report should be sent to HUMRRO.
- (4) This will allow sufficient time for evaluation by HUMRRO.

Miss Heinecke inquired into the number of Family Crisis Reports made as of June 24, 1976 by the 2nd and 4th District. My inquiry to these Districts revealed the following information:

2nd District	Trained Car - 9	Untrained Car - 9
4th District	Trained Car - 38	Untrained Car - 17

In view of the original 600 family profiles set up by HUMRRO for the evaluation study, the results hardly meet the standards required and set forth by the HUMRRO Organization. Miss Heinecke stated that unless there was a decided improvement made in the families contacted by the Crisis Intervention teams the original evaluation method may have to be modified.

In July 1976 the Cleveland Police Department received correspondence from Human Resources Research Organization. The nature of this

correspondence was that it requested a modification and a time extension for providing technical assistance in the evaluation of the Family Crisis Intervention Team Project.

The reasons cited for the proposed modification and time extension were that the proposed modification represented a more realistic approach to the data collection effort in view of the actual incidences of family disturbances in the City of Cleveland and the dispatch procedures of the Cleveland Police Department. It was the opinion of HUMRRO that data collection efforts as of June 24, 1976 were far below the levels originally anticipated. The request for time extension from August 31, 1976 to October 31, 1976 was also made and needed in order to collect a sufficient sample of Family Disturbance reports and to log families involved in domestic disputes for a sufficient time period to permit a valid statistical analysis.

In order to accomplish the proposed modification in the data collection effort by the 2nd and 4th District personnel, HUMRRO devised a Attachment B (MOD 1) form that the Cleveland Police Department would use to record data. The Attachment B (MOD 1) form is a log that contains the following information:

- (1) Data
- (2) Name of Disputants
- (3) Addresses of Disputants
- (4) Time spent on call

(5) Final Disposition - Resolved, Referral,
Arrest, Other.

The Attachment B (MOD 1) form is designed to record information on all police calls dealing with domestic disputes for a period of three months (till October 1, 1976). This form was to be completed by all officers in the 2nd and 4th Districts except the 20 trained officers and the comparable group of 20 untrained officers. For these officers the recording of calls will continue to be recorded by the use of the Family Disturbance Reports.

It is the intention of HUMRRO to match the names and addresses of disputants obtained from the Family Disturbance Reports and the Family Disturbance Logs (Attachment B - MOD 1) to determine frequency and disposition of family crisis interventions to each family.

Chief Lloyd F. Garey reviewed the proposal for modification and time extension and Departmental Notice 76-35 dealing with the Family Crisis Intervention Project was amended by Departmental Notice 76-141 advising all officers from the 2nd and 4th District of required changes in the data collection effort and the necessity for compliance and participation by all District cars. Also stipulated was that collection of Family Disturbance Reports, Attachment B Logs, and Attachment B (MOD 1) Logs would continue to be made by 2nd and 4th Districts until October 1, 1976.

On September 30, 1976 arrangements were made to visit the 2nd and 4th District for collection of the Family Disturbance reports. The following

are the summaries of the reports collected from these Districts:

2nd District

Designated Family Crisis Trained Car Reports. (White in color)	36
Designated Family Crisis Untrained Car Reports. (Yellow)	40
Attachment B (MOD 1) Log - Families contacted in Family disturbances and logged. (White)	64

4th District

Designated Family Crisis Trained Car Reports. (White in color)	70
Designated Family Crisis Untrained Car Reports. (Yellow)	14
Attachment B (MOD 1) Log - Families contacted in Family disturbances and logged. (White)	64

The above reports were forwarded to the Chief's Office for mailing to the HUMRRO Organization for analysis and evaluation.

At this time it is difficult to state whether this program has been totally successful. The fact that modifications had to be made in the collection data report and increased time made necessary for a statistical study would seem to warrant against this conclusion. Some observations can be made however.

It is my opinion that the original program might have been too comprehensive in the sense that 600 families represented too large a statistical

profile to shoot at for study purposes.

Acknowledging the fact that it was necessary for both the trained officers and the untrained officers to have to make the Family Crisis Report and Logs for more complete analysis of families, I believe this created a built in factor of reluctance on the part of the untrained officers. They might have felt this just represented another report required and since they had not been trained in this area of expertise they may not have attached the significance it deserved.

One of the greatest deterrents to this program might have been the fact that there was only one trained car per platoon that was a designated Family Crisis Car. If this car were available for assignment most of the time, certainly the number of Family Crisis reporting incidents would be considerably larger. Family Crisis cars were often dispatched to assignments of higher priority, and thus not available for specific calls of family disturbances. Perhaps if there had been two or three trained family cars per platoon, this problem may have been solved. It is difficult to fault a Communications System that operates on a system of priorities of need, and is also cognizant of the need for quicker response time to all police service and complaint requests. It should be observed at this point that during the entire period of the grant, response time to calls for police service has decreased and also the City of Cleveland has shown successive decreases in serious crimes.

I believe that had the Attachment B (MOD 1) log been introduced for all cars in the 2nd and 4th Districts except the trained cars who made the Family Disturbance Report and the accompanying log, more statistics would have become available. Whether or not this would have supplied HUMRRO with desired data, I cannot say. It's evidenced by the fact that both Districts turned approximately 64 contacts each in a relatively short period of time, from August 19, 1976 up to October 1, 1976.

It was also my impression that most of the officers who were trained for this program thought it quite beneficial. This was reflected in interviews with the officers and is also borne out in a HUMRRO interview with the officers. The officers were also of the opinion that this type of training would be of value before he begins his duties as an officer and also after he has had some experience in the field.

The HUMRRO final report should be able to attest whether this program was successful. If their finding is that crime was reduced in the 2nd and 4th Districts and a contributory factor was, that this was accomplished by the deployment of specialized Police Patrol Units specially trained in crisis management and interpersonal techniques, the primary goal of this program has been accomplished.

(6) SIGNIFICANT ADMINISTRATIVE, BUDGETARY, OR PROGRAMATIC PROBLEMS
CONFRONTING THE PROJECT DURING THE GRANT PERIOD.

Efforts were made to ascertain why officers from the pilot districts

were able to contact only limited numbers of families in this program. Investigation thus far reveals that in dispatching police cars to complaint assignments, family crisis cars are often already dispatched to assignments of higher priority, thus not being actually available to specific calls of family disturbances. Factors entering into the dispatch priority of police cars are the seriousness of reported crime, suspects on the scene and the continuing need of quicker response time to all police complaints. Dispatch priorities can in fact militate against more frequent dispatch of designated family crisis cars to family disturbances.

END