

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Police Family Life Education Project (FLEP) Implementations, September 11, 1999, October 2, 1999, April 29, 2000 and June 24, 2000 and Follow-Up Surveys of Families Who Attended Each of the Classes- Final Report

Author(s): Augustine Carre, Nel Linde, Maryilyn H. Appel , Michael Broder

Document No.: 187858

Date Received: April 19, 2001

Award Number: 1998-FS-VX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**FINAL REPORT ON POLICE FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION PROJECT (FLEP)
IMPLEMENTATION - SEPTEMBER 11, OCTOBER 2, 1999, APRIL 29, 2000
and JUNE 24, 2000
AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEYS OF FAMILIES WHO ATTENDED EACH OF THE
CLASSES**

187858

**Program Director-Captain Augustine Carre; Program Manager-Officer Nel Linde
Evaluator-Marilyn H. Appel, EdD; Curriculum Development-Michael Broder, PhD**

The Police Family Life Education Project is funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). The major purpose of the project is "to develop and deliver a program that will provide police recruits and their immediate family members with stress management education that focuses on the role and responsibilities of the law enforcement profession and how it impacts on the family unit, as well as family stressors that may interfere with an officer's safety and satisfactory job performance." The goals to be accomplished include 1) development of a curriculum, 2) implementation of this curriculum in an orientation program for families of four classes of police recruits, and 3) to evaluate the impact of the program and the project on the families and on the recruits.

Officers out of the Academy for some time participated in two focus groups to determine what they thought were their families' needs. These focus groups, as well as a survey sent to a random sample of officers provided the basis for the program and are the needs assessment portion of the evaluation (submitted previously and attached). A preliminary program was developed and discussed with instructors at the Police Academy to determine the specific content of the program. A curriculum was then developed consisting of three topic areas as proposed in the grant application - a film and discussion of the transition from the Academy to the field, Gun Safety, and Stress Management.

According to the proposal we were to find a film that would suffice for this purpose. A search was made but no such film or video was available. What we did use was a video put together by instructors at the Academy that provided an overview of recruit training. The sound was turned off and a narrator provided commentary on each part of the film attempting to bridge the transition between Academy training and life on the streets. This was not exactly what we had envisioned but was adequate for further discussion when the program was implemented.

The gun safety portion of the program was designed with the help of the officers who teach gun safety at the Academy. A special program on gun safety for children was also designed with the help of a community relations officer who taught the gun safety portion of the program to the children who attended. The stress management segment was designed with police officers, Employee Assistance Program (EAP) counselors and a supervising psychologist also from EAP.

Four sessions were held - September 11, 1999, October 2, 1999, April 29, 2000 and June 24th, 2000 which completes the program. Two programs had to be held in the Year 2000 to accommodate classes of recruits beginning after the grant terminated. Since all four sessions of the program were to have been completed by the end of October according to the original grant proposal, an extension of time without further funding was sought and received from NIJ.

An evaluation of the program is composed of three different strategies in addition to the needs assessment; 1) a questionnaire for each of the family members who attended the program; 2) observations of six people who went from one classroom to another gathering data on content,

delivery, amount of discussion, etc., and 3) two focus groups with a random sample of attendees - family members of recruits. These focus groups were scheduled and implemented in January. What follows is a summary based on all strategies. On September 11th 65 adults attended, on October 2nd 134 adults, in April 134 adults and in June 139 adults attended, for a total of 472 adults. In addition an average of 60 children attended each of the four sessions. Copies of the survey, questionnaire, and observation instrument are appended.

September 11, 1999 Session N = 65 Adults (19 Male [29%]; 46 Female [71%]). There were 17 recruits who attended (26%). Family members and recruits responding to survey = ages 15 - 70. Children 14 and below = 40 or more, who were not asked to respond to survey. Total N = > 100. Family members attending included spouses, significant others, siblings, parents, grandparents, in-laws, and children, cousins and best friends. Of the 65 respondents, only 8 (12%), had other family members in addition to the recruits, who are or were police officers.

When asked if, as a result of this program, they might be able to recognize stress in the family 56 (86%) responded affirmatively. In response to where they would go for help, there were many and multiple answers thus totaling more than 100%: 8 would go to another police officer; 29 would go to a family member; 29 would go to an EAP counselor; 5 would go to a non-police department counselor; and 5 responded other. Those who gave multiple responses said they wanted to keep their options open.

In terms of a better understanding of what a police officer does out in the field 61 (94%) responded yes; 64 (99%) responded that they could relate better to the role of a police officer. When asked if, as a result of this program, they feel like an accepted member of the police family 61 (94%) said yes.

60 (92%) knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to the police officer, 63 (97%) also knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to family members of police officers. When asked if EAP services are confidential, 62 (95%) said yes; and only 3 (5%) had family members that had used EAP services.

When asked if their questions or concerns were addressed, 60 (92%) responded positively.

Respondents were asked to rate instruction in three areas: the film and discussion, gun safety and stress management. It should be noted that gun safety was also taught to the 40 or more children who attended. These children were instructed by an experienced police officer from the Community Relations Unit who instructs on gun safety within the Philadelphia Public School System. The children were enraptured by her teaching and left this part of the program chanting a little ditty that she had taught them about what to do if they saw a gun. Children were also given the opportunity to sit in a police car or van, have their pictures taken behind a two dimensional "police officer" and a two dimensional "police car" both made of heavy cardboard by police officers. The children, as well as their parents, were delighted with the program, but formal data were not elicited from the children.

What follows are three charts which depict the ratings by attendees of each of the parts of the program and instruction. (5 is the highest rating, 1 is the lowest). Numbers were rounded to the nearest percentage so that ratings for each question add up to 100%.

FILM AND DISCUSSION-PROGRAM I

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	No Resp.
18.	42(65%)	14(22%)	5(8%)	0	0	4(5%)
19.	41(64%)	15(23%)	5(8%)	0	0	4(5%)
20.	45(69%)	12(18%)	0	0	1(2%)	7(11%)
21.	44(68%)	12(18%)	3(5%)	0	2(3%)	4(5%)
22.	44(68%)	10(15%)	3(4%)	1(2%)	1(2%)	6(9%)
23.	49(75%)	12(18%)	0	0(2%)	1(2%)	3(4%)
24.	52(80%)	9(14%)	0	0	1(2%)	3(4%)
25.	47(72%)	11(17%)	2(3%)	0	1(2%)	4(5%)
Average %	(70%)	(18%)	(5%)	(2%)	(2%)	(6%)

As shown on the above chart, 70% of the attendees who responded to the survey gave the film and discussion the highest possible rating. Add to this those who rated this part of the program good and a total of 88% thought the instruction concerning the film and discussion were good or excellent. Only 9% thought any less of this instruction and a small number did not respond. The number of non-respondents may have to do with people coming in late after most of the film had already been shown. In general, this part of the program was received very well by those who attended.

Specifically, attendees thought the instructors were very knowledgeable, got their points across clearly, and gave good presentations. (See 23, 24 and 25 above). The program, according to respondents, was a beneficial learning experience and attendees learned a lot about a police officer's job, though responses to these questions were more varied. (See 18 and 19 above). Attendees thought the program was enjoyable and felt that they were permitted to participate in the discussion. (See 21 and 22 above)

The next topic covered in the program concerned gun safety. The program for the children has already been described above. The program for adults was more lecture-oriented and also received very high ratings by attendees. In general the topic of gun safety received highly positive reviews. More specifically, the instruction concerning gun safety received even higher ratings with 90% of the respondents rating this part of the program either good or excellent. Very few did not respond. Again the ratings given to the instructors were very high. Attendees enjoyed and were very attentive during this part of the program, thought the instructors knowledgeable, and felt they gave good presentations. Attendees also learned about and had a better notion of what a police officer does. They were very satisfied with how gun safety was covered.

GUN SAFETY-PROGRAM I

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR*
18.	46(71%)	15(23%)	1(2%)	0	0	3(5%)
19.	43(66%)	15(23%)	2(3%)	0	0	5(8%)
20.	48(74%)	12(18%)	0	0	0	5(8%)
21.	45(69%)	12(18%)	2(3%)	0	1(2%)	5(8%)
22.	47(72%)	8(12%)	4(6%)	0	0	6(9%)
23.	52(80%)	8(12%)	0	0	0	5(8%)
24.	50(77%)	10(15%)	0	0	0	5(8%)
25.	49(75%)	9(14%)	0	0	0	7(11%)
Average %	(73%)	(17%)	(1%)	0	(<1%)	(8%)

*NR=No Response

STRESS MANAGEMENT-PROGRAM I

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	37(57%)	21(32%)	2(3%)	0	0	5(8%)
19.	39(60%)	15(23%)	5(8%)	0	0	6(9%)
20.	43(66%)	10(15%)	2(3%)	0	0	10(15%)
21.	42(65%)	12(18%)	3(5%)	0	0	8(12%)
22.	46(71%)	9(14%)	3(5%)	0	0	7(11%)
23.	48(74%)	10(15%)	2(3%)	0	0	5(8%)
24.	49(75%)	11(17%)	0	0	0	5(8%)
25.	47(72%)	8(12%)	2(3%)	0	0	8(12%)
Average %	(68%)	(18%)	(4%)	0	0	(10%)

This part of the program had the highest percentage of non-respondents, perhaps because this was held after lunch and some people had left beforehand. Eighty six percent of respondents rated this part of the program good or excellent. The specifics of the ratings are similar to those described for the two other topics in the curriculum.

At a debriefing session with instructors after this first of four programs, several modifications to

the program were suggested, and these will be discussed along with descriptions of each of the classroom activities. The children's program was very well planned and organized; there were many activities for the children to do and they thoroughly enjoyed themselves. Some excellent points were made in the children's program at their level, especially about gun safety. The children's presence however appeared to be somewhat disturbing to viewing the film and subsequently to those people in the classrooms when the children were outside making noise. It was decided that at the second program, the children would immediately go to the children's classroom while only young adults and older attendees watched the film. In addition, there would not be so many police cars or vans, and these and other outdoor activities would be moved farther away so that the noise would not hinder discussion in the adult classrooms. More supervisors were suggested for the outdoor activities. In addition, there were some few children who were difficult to manage and we talked about ways to gain their attention. The room in which the children were placed was about two-thirds covered by mats. It was felt that this exacerbated behavior problems because mats would, to the children, mean tumbling and noise.

There was also a room for adults with small children - infants and toddlers. In this room, several mats were laid out with a whole array of toys for tots. Parents played with the children on the mats but were nevertheless very attentive to the ensuing discussions. The instructors proved themselves very knowledgeable and answered a number of questions posed by the audience.

In the room where the audience was composed of only adults there was good division of labor, with each instructor talking about his/her area of expertise. The room was a little tight for the number of people and its amphitheatre style lends itself well to lecturing, but not necessarily to discussion. However, the instructors were very careful to answer peoples' questions and many people used the break or stayed at the end of the session to ask more personal questions.

There were six people who went from room to room to observe. Several general observations were made that were thought could help to improve the program. It was suggested that there needed to be more discussion and less lecturing. Introductions were weak and instructors needed to reintroduce themselves - they may have put their names on the board, but did not necessarily match up their own names with those written on the board when they started their individual presentations. It was also observed that although the three topics were covered in each of the rooms, the content and presentation styles varied from room to room. This, in itself, is fine because each instructor has his/her own style of teaching. In some rooms, however, more discussion ensued than in others, more questions were asked, and attendees participated to a greater extent. It was felt that some of the content differed from room to room and instructors were encouraged to stick to the curriculum. Part of the problem seemed to be that instructors were not always clear on what was to be presented and provided their own content within the topic areas. A more structured curriculum with comprehensive lesson plans would alleviate the problem of inconsistent content and variation among the classrooms. Additional training in facilitating discussion was also suggested.

All three presentations received very high ratings, which shows that the families enjoyed the program very much and that a good job was done in presenting and discussing the film, gun safety and stress management. The value and effectiveness of the program for families of recruits is shown not just in these ratings but also in the responses to the other questions in the survey, all of which were very positive.

The report on the second of four programs follows. The program on October 2 brought out double the number of people, as well as double the number of children. This "embarrassment of riches" created some logistical problems which had to be resolved prior to implementing the program. Several resolutions were determined to be feasible. Two classrooms in another building would be used for the adults, two classrooms would be needed for children who would be grouped by age. Additional instructors, as well as supervisors of the children were needed.

It should be noted that funding for lunch was contributed by another police agency and was adequate for the first of the four programs, but with over 200 people expected for the second program, the amount of funds provided would not be enough. Officers in the Academy managed to get donations of food from Deitz and Watson and Coca Cola. Leftover frozen hot dogs and many cases of soda were saved for subsequent programs.

October 2, 1999 Session N = 134 Adults (51 Male [38%]; 83 Female [62%]) (Includes 36 recruits [27%], 11 teenagers between 15 - 19) Family members and recruits responding to survey = ages 15 - 70. Children 14 and below = 87 or more, who were not asked to respond to survey. Total N = > 212.

Of the 134 respondents, 62 (46%) or almost half, had other family members in addition to the recruits, who are or were police officers. These included siblings, parents, other children, aunts, uncles, cousins, spouses, in-laws, friends, grandparents and even great-grandparents.

When asked if, as a result of this program, they might be able to recognize stress in the family 108 (81%) responded yes; in response to where they would go for help, 37 would go to another police officer; 56 would go to a family member; 76 would go to an EAP counselor; 10 would go to a non-police department counselor; and 13 responded other. Those who gave multiple responses said they wanted all the help they could get, would want someone close to home, wanted to keep their options open or had their own insurance.

In terms of a better understanding of what a police officer does out in the field 128 (96%) responded that they now did; 124 (93%) responded that they could relate better to the role of a police officer. When asked if, as a result of this program, they feel like an accepted member of the police family 117 (87%) responded positively.

113 (84%) knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to the police officer, 100 (75%) knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to family members of police officers. When asked if EAP services are confidential, 114 (85%) said yes; only 9(7%) had family members that had used EAP services. When asked if their questions or concerns were addressed, 123 (92%) said yes.

Respondents were asked to rate instruction in three areas: the film and discussion, gun safety and stress management. Gun safety, as in the previous session, was taught to the 87 or more children who attended by the same Community Relations officer. The children's' program followed the same procedures as previously and was well received. It had been decided at the debriefing after the first program in September that all children would go into classrooms immediately upon entering and adults only would attend the film. This worked out very well and will continue to be the model for subsequent programs.

What follows are three charts which depict the ratings by attendees of each of the parts of the program and of the instruction. (5 is the highest rating, 1 is the lowest)

FILM AND DISCUSSION-PROGRAM II

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	No Resp.
18.	100(75%)	15(11%)	4(3%)	0	2(2%)	13(9%)
19.	92(69%)	14(10%)	6(4%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	19(14%)
20.	91(68%)	12(9%)	5(4%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	23(16%)
21.	99(74%)	17(13%)	3(2%)	2(2%)	2(2%)	11(7%)
22.	93(69%)	12(9%)	6(4%)	0	3(2%)	20(16%)
23.	99(74%)	18(13%)	1(<1%)	1(<1%)	1(<1%)	14(10%)
24.	104(78%)	15(11%)	2(>1%)	0	2(>1%)	11(8%)
25.	105(78%)	13(10%)	0	1(1%)	1(1%)	14(10%)
Average %	73%	11%	3%	1%	1%	11%

As shown on the above chart, almost 3/4 of the attendees who responded to the survey gave the film and discussion the highest possible ratings. Add to this those who rated this part of the program good and a total of 84% thought the instruction concerning the film and discussion were good or excellent. Only 5% thought any less of this instruction and 11% did not respond.

GUN SAFETY-PROGRAM II

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	100(75%)	11(8%)	3(2%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	17(13%)
19.	91(68%)	12(9%)	8(6%)	1(1%)	1(1%)	21(15%)
20.	102(76%)	11(8%)	6(4%)	0	3(2%)	12(10%)
21.	93(69%)	16(12%)	3(2%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	19(14%)
22.	94(70%)	11(8%)	2(2%)	2(2%)	3(2%)	22(16%)
23.	101(75%)	14(10%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	1(1%)	15(11%)
24.	106(79%)	10(7%)	1(1%)	0	2(2%)	15(11%)
25.	116(87%)	10(7%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	0	5(3%)
Average %	65%	12%	3%	1%	1%	12%

The instruction concerning gun safety received even higher ratings with 87% of the respondents rating this part of the program either good or excellent.

STRESS MANAGEMENT-PROGRAM II

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	90(67%)	19(14%)	2(2%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	17(13%)
19.	86(64%)	24(18%)	5(4%)	0	2(2%)	17(13%)
20.	76(57%)	9(7%)	7(5%)	1(1%)	4(3%)	29(22%)
21.	93(69%)	15(11%)	7(5%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	18(13%)
22.	94(70%)	10(7%)	4(3%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	22(16%)
23.	99(74%)	16(12%)	1(1%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	13(10%)
24.	100(75%)	11(8%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	1(1%)	14(10%)
25.	101(75%)	11(8%)	0	2(2%)	2(2%)	19(14%)
Average %	69%	11%	3%	1%	2%	14%

Eighty percent of respondents rated this part of the program good or excellent.

Because the lunch break came between the gun safety presentation and the stress management part of the program, people began to leave after lunch. Most stayed, however and enjoyed the rest of the program. It was decided that for the third series, to be held after two new recruit classes had started in the Academy, lunch would be the last item on the agenda, thus giving people the option to stay or to leave at the end of the presentations.

All three presentations received very high ratings, which shows that the families enjoyed the program very much and that a good job was done in presenting the film, gun safety and stress management topics. The value and effectiveness of the program for families of recruits is shown not just in the ratings provided in the charts, but also in the responses to the other questions in the survey, all of which were very positive. The specifics for questions 18 through 25 are consistent with those from the first program on September 11, 1999.

Several modifications or suggestions for the program were made as a result of the survey and were implemented: 1) only adults were to be present at the film (children were placed in classrooms right at the beginning of the program - implemented for the second program); 2) the schedule is revised for the third session of the program with lunch as described above at the end of the program rather than between two segments; 3) food seemed to be a rather important issue and food sources were found and food contributed (implemented second session and will continue); 4) children's activities were moved away from the building so as not to disturb classroom activities with adults (implemented second session); 5) additional emphasis was placed on using a discussion format rather than a lecture format, however additional training in group discussion is needed; 6) more structure in the curriculum is needed in order to bring about more consistency in how the topics were covered by the various instructors in the different classrooms; 7) a new film is needed that places emphasis on the transition from the Academy. These surveys of the first two programs served as formative evaluation of the program. They have been very

helpful in adjusting the program to the needs of the attendees. Also helpful were the training sessions for the instructors and the post-program debriefing sessions were especially helpful. Most of the modifications in the program that were suggested above in the training and debriefing sessions will be implemented in subsequent sessions.

In the final analysis, responses from the almost 200 family members who attended one or the other session, shows this program to be both highly valued by the families of the recruits and highly successful. The video that was used in sessions 1 and 2 will be used for sessions 3 and 4 because there is no time or funds for making a new video. Curriculum modifications will be made and instructors trained in discussion techniques.

April 29, 2000 Session N = 136 Adults (51 Male [38%]; 84 Female [62%] 1 did not respond) (Includes 27 recruits [20%], 8 teenagers between 11 - 20) Family members and recruits responding to survey = ages 21 - 70. Children 9 and below = 70 or more, who were not asked to respond to survey. Total N = > 200. Age range of family members attending = infants and toddlers to age 70+. Family members attending included spouses, significant others, siblings, parents, grandparents, in-laws, nieces, nephews and children. Of the 136 respondents, 48 (35%) or about one third, had other family members in addition to the recruits, who are or were police officers. These included siblings, parents, other children, aunts, uncles, cousins, spouses, in-laws, friends, grandparents and even great-grandparents.

When asked if, as a result of this program, they might be able to recognize stress in the family 113 (83%) responded yes. In response to where they would go for help, 17 would go to another police officer; 47 would go to a family member; 61 would go to an EAP counselor; 9 would go to a non-police department counselor; and 13 responded other.

In terms of a better understanding of what a police officer does out in the field 127 (93%) responded yes; 127 (93%) responded that they could relate better to the role of a police officer. When asked if, as a result of this program, they feel like an accepted member of the police family 121 (89%) said yes.

120 (88%) knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to the police officer, 116 (85%) said they knew that EAP services are free to family members, and 119 (88%) believed that confidentiality was maintained. Only 3 (2%) had family members that had used EAP services.

When asked if their questions or concerns were addressed, 130 (96%) said yes.

As in previous sessions, respondents were asked to rate instruction in three areas: the film and discussion, gun safety and stress management. Gun safety was taught to the 70 or more children who attended. All children went into classrooms immediately upon entering and adults only attended the film. This had worked out very well and was maintained for the third program.

What follows are three charts which depict the ratings by attendees of each of the parts of the program and instruction. (5 is the highest rating, 1 is the lowest)

FILM AND DISCUSSION-PROGRAM III

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	No Resp.
18.	88(65%)	23(17%)	14(10%)	0	1(1%)	10(7%)
19.	86(63%)	26(19%)	13(10%)	2(1%)	1(1%)	8(6%)
20.	73(54%)	24(18%)	8(6%)	6(4%)	3(2%)	22(16%)
21.	88(65%)	21(14%)	9(7%)	3(2%)	1(1%)	15(11%)
22.	97(71%)	16(12%)	4(3%)	0	2(1%)	17(13%)
23.	104(76%)	15(11%)	4(3%)	0	0	13(10%)
24.	112(82%)	10(7%)	1(1%)	0	0	13(10%)
25.	109(80%)	12(9%)	3(2%)	0	0	12(9%)
Average %	70%	13%	5%	1%	1%	10%

As shown on the above chart, 70% of the attendees who responded to the survey gave the film and discussion the highest possible ratings. A total of 83% thought the instruction concerning the film and discussion were good or excellent. All in all this part of the program was received very well.

GUN SAFETY-PROGRAM III

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	102(75%)	15(11%)	4(3%)	2(1%)	0	13(10%)
19.	86(63%)	21(14%)	8(6%)	3(2%)	2(1%)	16(12%)
20.	99(73%)	17(12%)	5(4%)	0	2(1%)	13(10%)
21.	91(67%)	18(13%)	8(6%)	1(1%)	2(1%)	16(12%)
22.	98(72%)	17(12%)	4(3%)	0	1(1%)	16(12%)
23.	107(78%)	11(8%)	4(3%)	0	1(1%)	13(10%)
24.	111(81%)	8(6%)	3(2%)	0	1(1%)	13(10%)
25.	108(79%)	9(7%)	4(3%)	0	1(1%)	14(10%)
Average %	74%	11%	4%	1%	1%	10%

The instruction concerning gun safety received even higher ratings with 85% of the respondents rating this part of the program either good or excellent.

STRESS MANAGEMENT-PROGRAM III

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	88(65%)	19(14%)	11(8%)	0	1(1%)	17(12%)
19.	83(61%)	24(18%)	11(8%)	1(1%)	1(1%)	16(12%)
20.	74(55%)	18(13%)	6(4%)	3(2%)	3(2%)	33(24%)
21.	86(64%)	18(13%)	7(5%)	1(1%)	2(1%)	22(16%)
22.	99(73%)	17(12%)	3(2%)	1(1%)	0	16(12%)
23.	101(74%)	16(12%)	4(3%)	0	0	15(11%)
24.	108(79%)	12(9%)	1(1%)	0	0	15(11%)
25.	102(75%)	13(10%)	5(4%)	0	0	16(12%)
Average %	68%	13%	4%	1%	1%	14%

Over eighty percent of respondents rated this part of the program good or excellent.

It had been decided that for the third series lunch would be the last item on the agenda, thus giving people the option to stay or to leave at the end of the presentations. This seemed to work out well and many of the attendees stayed for lunch anyway.

In summary, several modifications in the program were made and implemented as a result of the surveys: 1) only adults were present at the film; 2) the schedule was revised making lunch at the end of the program 3) food seemed to be a rather important issue and additional food sources were found; 4) children's activities were moved away from the building; 5) additional emphasis was placed on using a discussion format rather than a lecture format.

June 24, 2000 Session N = 139 Adults (51 Male [39%]; 81 Female [61%] 7 did not respond) (Includes 38 recruits [27%], 6 teenagers between 11 - 20) Family members and recruits responding to survey = ages 21 - 70. Children 9 and below = 70 or more. Total N = > 200. Of the 139 respondents, 51 (39%) or more than one third, had other family members in addition to the recruits, who are or were police officers.

When asked if, as a result of this program, they might be able to recognize stress in the family 118 (85%) responded in the affirmative. They would go for help to another police officer; to a family member; to an EAP counselor; to a non-police department counselor; or other.

In terms of a better understanding of what a police officer does out in the field 132 (95%) responded positively, 137 (93%) responded that they could relate better to the role of a police officer. 131 (98%) feel like an accepted member of the police family.

128 (92%) knew that EAP services are provided at no cost to the police officer, 118 (85%) that EAP services are provided at no cost to family members, 128 (92%) believe that EAP

services are confidential. Only 8 (6%) had family members that had used EAP services.

When asked if their questions or concerns were addressed, 118 (85%) said yes. What follows are the ratings (5 is the highest rating, 1 is the lowest)

FILM AND DISCUSSION-PROGRAM IV

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	No Resp.
18.	90(65%)	24(17%)	9(6%)	1(1%)	2(1%)	13(10%)
19.	87(63%)	25(18%)	6(4%)	2(1%)	1(1%)	18(13%)
20.	96(69%)	13(10%)	5(5%)	1(1%)	3(2%)	18(13%)
21.	97(70%)	15(11%)	10(7%)	0	2(1%)	15(11%)
22.	98(70%)	14(10%)	5(4%)	1(1%)	2(1%)	20(14%)
23.	111(79%)	8(6%)	4(3%)	0	2(1%)	15(11%)
24.	113(80%)	8(6%)	1(1%)	0	2(2%)	15(11%)
25.	106(76%)	8(6%)	5(4%)	0	1(1%)	19(13%)
Average %	72%	10%	4%	1%	1%	12%

A total of 82% thought the instruction concerning the film and discussion were good or excellent. This part of the program was received very well.

GUN SAFETY-PROGRAM IV

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	113(81%)	12(9%)	1(1%)	0	3(2%)	10(7%)
19.	100(72%)	14(10%)	3(2%)	1(1%)	5(4%)	16(11%)
20.	103(74%)	11(8%)	4(3%)	0	3(2%)	18(13%)
21.	109(79%)	9(6%)	5(4%)	0	2(1%)	14(10%)
22.	104(75%)	14(10%)	3(2%)	1(1%)	3(2%)	14(10%)
23.	116(83%)	6(4%)	1(1%)	0	3(2%)	13(10%)
24.	116(83%)	6(4%)	0	0	3(2%)	14(11%)
25.	108(79%)	7(5%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	18(13%)
Average %	78%	7%	2%	1%	2%	11%

The instruction concerning gun safety received even higher ratings with 85% of the respondents rating this part of the program either good or excellent.

STRESS MANAGEMENT-PROGRAM IV

Question #	Ratings					
	5	4	3	2	1	NR
18.	94(68%)	15(11%)	9(6%)	1(1%)	2(1%)	18(13%)
19.	87(63%)	20(14%)	8(6%)	0	3(2%)	21(15%)
20.	87(63%)	13(10%)	6(4%)	1(1%)	3(2%)	29(20%)
21.	93(68%)	19(13%)	4(3%)	0	2(1%)	21(15%)
22.	101(73%)	12(9%)	3(2%)	0	3(2%)	20(14%)
23.	107(77%)	11(8%)	1(1%)	0	2(1%)	18(13%)
24.	108(78%)	9(6%)	1(1%)	0	3(2%)	18(13%)
25.	103(74%)	8(7%)	3(2%)	0	1(1%)	24(17%)
Average %	70%	10%	3%	<1%	2%	15%

Eighty percent of the respondents rated this portion of the program as good or excellent.

The specifics for questions 18 through 25 are consistent with those from the first, second and third sessions. Responses are within normal limits and are not significantly different in any way.

Reports from observers who went from room to room to observe instruction showed that for the most part presentations were professional and well-organized. Presentations varied in the amount of participation of the audience and some were more formal than others. Most reports agreed that more audience participation would enhance the program. Content of instruction varied from room to room - topics remained the same (gun safety, stress management), but were presented differently. In at least one instance, stress management was not emphasized as much as the observer thought was sufficient, considering that the grant proposal was geared to this aspect of the program. Also mentioned, and seems to be a good point, that the vocabulary used in the presentations should be geared more to the civilian audience - many of the words used would be labeled as "police language."

In the final analysis, with responses from over 600 family members who attended one or another of the four sessions, this program appears to be both highly valued by the families of the recruits and highly successful.

Follow-up Survey of Family Members. The follow-up survey was conducted on 11/29/00. Fifty families from each of the four training sessions was sent a survey (attached). Of the 200 surveys sent out, 61 were returned, 13 from session one on 9/11/99, 10 from session two held on 10/2/99, 20 from session three held on 4/29/00, and 18 from session 4 held on 6/24/00. The survey was sent out approximately five months after the last session, so it stands to reason that

there would not be as many responses from earlier sessions. There is no significant difference between the numbers of responses returned from the two earlier sessions, just as there is no significant difference between the number of responses from the latter two sessions.

The age range of people responding is 18 to 75, and the ages of their recruits run from 19 to 47. Relationships to the recruits ran the gamut from children to grandparents. Most of the responses came from mothers, fathers, and spouses and 77% of responses were from females.

When asked if there were other police officers in the family, 70% responded in the negative. Of the respondents who answered in the affirmative, one respondent has 6 police officers in the family, one has 3, five have 2, and 9 have only one. The relationships again were very varied, most were cousins or uncles.

Ninety percent of respondents declared that they would recognize stress in the family. They would go for help in the following order - EAP, a family member, another police officer, a non-departmental counselor, and another (unnamed) source of help.

Ninety-seven percent of respondents said that the program helped them feel that EAP or the department would be there in a crisis. Ninety-two percent were prepared for what their police officer would be doing in the field, and the same percentage named the program as preparing them to relate better to the role of a police officer.

Ninety-five percent of respondents knew that EAP services were provided at no cost to the officer, but only 82% realized that EAP services are provided to the family members at no cost, others did not remember or were not sure. Ninety-three percent, however, knew that EAP services are confidential.

Ninety-eight percent said their questions and concerns were addressed during the program, and 95% said they would use EAP services. And all but one person said they would encourage families of new recruits to attend a similar program.

It would appear that families who had attended the Family Life Education Program were still pleased with their experience even after five months and up to 13 months after the program. The follow-up survey confirms the results of the surveys of the each of the programs separately and demonstrates how valuable and how valued this program is by families of recruits.

Follow-up Survey of Recruits Who Attended Program: We attempted to do a focus group with recruits who attended the program with their families. Scheduling conflicts made this form of follow-up impossible. We could not get the number of recruits together that we needed to run a focus group that would provide us with valid data. Therefore, we sent out a survey that could be responded to anonymously and that would be returned to the Captain of the District in which the recruits were working. For some recruits this survey came nine months to a year after they had attended the program. Since a focus group would provide us with answers to open-ended questions, we decided to do a survey that would allow longer and more comprehensive responses. The problem with open-ended questions is that responses cannot be quantified and the evaluator has to do some interpreting, which can become somewhat subjective. That being said, we tried to categorize responses to the questions and have come up with some interesting and provocative data. There were 14 questions asked, one of which asked about facilities, etc. and another for additional comments. So essentially there were 12 questions about the program to which recruits

were asked to respond. The responses, in narrative form, will follow each of the questions. Verbatim responses are available if needed.

1. What do you think your family members remember most from their experience at the Police Academy from the program you attended for families of recruits?

Overwhelmingly, recruits responded that the most memorable part of the program was the gun safety portion for the children. Several said that their child is still repeating the little ditty, or talk about the Eddie the Eagle video even a year after the program. Several other issues were touched upon that are important to note: families appreciated the friendliness and openness of the staff, their professionalism, the efforts of staff to make them feel comfortable, and that the staff made every effort to tell the real story without sugar coating and with the cons as well as the pros of police work. Families had a better understanding of what police work was like and of how well police officers were trained.

2. Is there some specific information that you think they found especially useful? What?

Several responses focused on understanding the stress that P/Os have and where to get help, such as from the EAP. The EAP was mentioned many times in response to this question. Gun safety was mentioned again by several responders. Other issues touched upon included scheduling, shift work, working on holidays, and being supportive of the P/Os job.

3. What did you think they expected when they were invited to participate in the Family Life Education Project?

Most expected a general overview of the police department, to be shown what the recruits go through in Academy training. Many came with questions. Others expected a tour and many had no expectations.

4. How do you think these expectations changed after they experienced the program?

Most replied that their families were very impressed - they learned a lot in terms of information. More important they felt that the department views families as an integral part of police life. They gained insight into police life and they felt more comfortable with their recruit becoming a police officer - they saw how much support the department provides.

5. What information learned at the Police Academy have they used?

They learned to be more tolerant of work schedules, to interpret behavior more skillfully, to adjust to the stress, to be more supportive, that the job can be a comparatively safe one, where to go for help and that their P/O may not be around for family and holiday functions.

6. How has the experience helped you or your family members to cope with the job more effectively?

"It helped by making us all aware that everyone has some anxieties and it's how they're handled within the family that makes a difference." That about sums up the responses to this question. Other responses include: they understand the stresses, they talk to them more, they show more concern, they know what to expect.

7. What portions of the program do you feel had a negative impact on you or your family? A positive impact?

The program was received by an overwhelming number of families as very positive - most said there were few negatives, e.g., the realistic dangers an officer faces, the discussion of the possibility of an officer being killed (but this turned into a positive because of the honest, organized discussion that ensued). The positives included the feelings of pride shown by the instructors in their jobs, the extensive training, the rewarding experiences of a P/O in the field, the possibility of advancement and furthering their education.

8. What issues might have been included in the program that were not discussed? What might have been deleted?

Most responses reflected that everything was covered and nothing should be added or deleted. However, in some break-out rooms some subjects were not discussed that were discussed in other classrooms, e.g., advancement in the department, special units and what they do, insurance and benefits, support networks for families.

9. What would you suggest as ways to improve the content or delivery of the program?

One officer suggested that we bring in a field officer to talk about his/her experiences on the job and how they deal with certain kinds of issues. (This must have been a response by an officer who did not have the month long field experience training that the Academy now provides for its recruits). Some instructors needed to be more knowledgeable about some of the subjects they discussed so that they could answer questions. For the most part, the officers felt that the program was well presented. Families might like a tour of the facilities.

10. Do you think your family is able to recognize stress in the family if it happens? What clues would they have?

Everyone who responded to this question said "yes." They mentioned irritability, mood changes, being temperamental, being quiet, being distant or withdrawn, being angry, being short-tempered, etc.

11. Do you think your family members gained some knowledge about what a police officer does out in the field that they didn't know about before this program? What in particular?

Those who responded "no" already had other family members on the force. Those who responded "yes" learned about the dangers and the stress, about how exciting the job can be, that we do more than just arrest people.

12. Did the program change their attitudes about how they feel about being a member of the police family? How? Explain.

Those who responded "no" already have family members on the job; those who responded "yes" were more understanding and comfortable with my being an officer, realized how well trained we were, became more supportive.

13. Comment on the logistics - the facility, the timing/scheduling, the food.

Most responded positively, were appreciative of what had to happen (the planning, organization and training of instructors) in order to put on the program, were appreciative of the food (except for the vegetarians), liked the timing and the pacing. Would like the program to be held earlier in their training.

14. Any other comments from you or any of your family members about the program?

Most felt that the day was interesting, worthwhile, well organized, well thought out. There was a suggestion that the children's gun safety program be used in all the schools.

To Summarize: Even up to a year later the program was viewed very positively by both P/Os and their family members. Most thought that the program should be continued on a regular basis for all recruit classes. What this survey brought out were: increased comfort by families of recruits after experiencing the program, a greater understanding of stress and where to go for help, such as to the EAP, and that families felt more a part of a police family. The program accomplished its goals extremely well according to the various forms of evaluation that were implemented.

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 678
P.O. Box 678, Springfield, MA 01103-0678