

1995 JOINT COMMUNITY-POLICE TRAINING: INTERIM REPORT

by

Marianne Kaiser

The Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium is located at the Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University. It also includes faculty and students from Loyola University of Chicago, DePaul University, and the University of Illinois-Chicago. It is supported by grants from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Chicago Community Trust, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.

February, 1996

INTRODUCTION

This report describes an evaluation of Joint Community Police Training (JCPT) for Chicago residents. It includes the period May through November 1995, during which the project was planned and introduced in selected areas of the city. JCPT, a component of the city's innovative community policing program, known as CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy), is the first large-scale attempt in the country to train neighborhood residents to work together with the police to solve crime and disorder problems in their neighborhoods. The goal of the training is to produce better informed and more organized citizens and as a result, safer neighborhoods.

The JCPT concept envisions police and civilian trainers working side by side to provide a dual-faceted understanding of how CAPS should work. As of the end of November, 1995, approximately 2,100 Chicago residents on 49 beats in 10 police districts received training.

It should be recognized that this type of partnership and this level of commitment to training citizens in their role in community policing has never before been tried. Unifying the diverse entities involved in a project of this scope presents a significant challenge, and this report reflects the growing pains of a new undertaking of this magnitude. Many of the problems that surfaced in the pilot period from May to October have been addressed, and refinements are continually being made in the program.

This is an interim report; as of this date, training is planned to extend through December 1996. The Chicago Community Policing Consortium will continue to monitor the training and survey participants throughout its duration, producing a final report in a timely fashion.

The evaluation team employed four different methods in order to study the planning and implementation of JCPT, examine the nature of the training sessions and performance of the trainers, describe the backgrounds of training participants and their attitudes towards police and CAPS, and assess trainers' and participants' reactions to the training.

First, the evaluation team attended all management meetings that addressed planning, curriculum development, and training development, starting in May, 1994. Evaluators took detailed notes, paying particular attention to problem identification and resolution.

The second evaluation method involved the observation of training sessions. The training observation team developed a format for recording their impressions of the training and selected a sample of beats from the first ten police districts to receive training. Altogether, they observed 10 of 14 civilian trainers and 10 of 21 police trainers on 21 different beats in 10 police districts. A total of 31 training sessions were observed from May through late November. At each training session, observers took detailed notes describing the setting and content of the training as well as the behavior of the trainers and participants. They also recorded evaluative comments throughout the session.

We also developed a questionnaire that was completed by participants at the beginning of each training sequence for a beat. Questionnaires were distributed to participants by civilian trainers,

with the oversight and support of the evaluation team. The questionnaire included 29 questions about residents' opinions of police officers' and citizens' attitudes towards one another and towards community policing, as well as questions about their personal background. It replicated many of the items on questionnaires completed by police officers prior to their CAPS training. A copy of the participant questionnaire is appended to this report (Appendix A).

The fourth evaluation method involved personally interviewing trainers to assess their concerns and suggestions, and participating in informal dialogues with trainers and others at meetings. Trainers ventured their opinions about the administration of the project; curriculum, materials and methods used; the effectiveness of the instructors; problems encountered; and the successfulness of the training.

BACKGROUND

Planning

When CAPS was first introduced in five prototype districts in 1993, community residents who got involved, agreeing to organize their beats, met with frustration because they did not know what was expected of them. The police were also struggling to figure out what they were supposed to do. Beat meetings were often gripe sessions, leaving both police officers and community residents frustrated. Although there was more dialogue about problems that existed in the beat, residents continued to hand off problems to the police.

Residents' and police officers' confusion about their new roles and responsibilities under CAPS suggested the need for training, a conclusion arrived at by both the Chicago Police Department (CPD) and the Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety (CANS). CANS, an independent, non-profit organization founded in 1980 to promote community involvement in public safety, approached the city to discuss the importance of conducting this training, and the role that they might play in conducting it. CANS was the most likely candidate for the job because it had worked for years for the implementation of community policing in Chicago and in so doing, had formed alliances with many of Chicago's most prominent community organizations. Planning for joint community-police training (JCPT) began in earnest in the summer of 1994, when it became apparent that the city would award a contract to CANS that would enable them to develop training materials and hire civilian trainers.

Plans called for training to begin in the spring of 1995 and progress through the city's 279 police beats over the course of the next 18 months. Ten districts were chosen for the first phase of training. The five CAPS prototype districts - Englewood, Austin, Marquette, Morgan Park, and Rogers Park - were logical choices. The remaining five - South Chicago, Chicago Lawn, Monroe, Town Hall and Grand Central - were chosen by CPD and CANS personnel together, with an effort to select districts representative of Chicago's diverse neighborhoods. For project management purposes, four were considered North Side districts, and the remaining six, South Side districts.

Two satellite offices were established for the JCPT directors, community trainers and organizers - one on the North Side at 1733 N. Milwaukee Avenue, and the other on the South Side at 3424 S. State Street, to minimize travel time. The base of operations for police trainers continued to be the Chicago Police Training Academy, centrally located at 1300 W. Jackson Street.

A JCPT Oversight Committee was established to plan and supervise training development. The committee's primary responsibility is to approve the content of civilian training materials, with the goal of ensuring that CANS and CPD materials stay "on the same page." Additionally it serves as a forum for police and City Hall feedback to JCPT staff members and the executive director of CANS. Members include four high ranking CPD personnel, City Hall representatives, the executive director of CANS, and two other CANS representatives. The additional CANS representatives were included at the request of the executive director, in order to provide broader involvement in the planning process.

The oversight committee has six voting members: the Deputy Superintendent of Police and the CPD Director of Research and Development, who are the co-managers of CAPS; City Hall's CAPS liaison; the executive director of CANS; the president of the CANS board; and another CANS board member. The JCPT project manager (a former CANS staff member), who directly supervises the training, is responsible for setting the agenda and making arrangements for all oversight committee meetings.

Initial planning meetings between CPD personnel and CANS staff were amicable but not without some tension, due to their differing philosophies about the training's target audience and related allocation of resources. While the CPD was primarily concerned with the number and demographic representation of beat residents, CANS staff felt it vital to solicit the participation of key community-based organizations and their leaders. They believed that these individuals would be more committed and better networked, and therefore, better able to accomplish CAPS' objectives.

Friction over contract issues, such as health care coverage for the trainers and liability for meeting training goals and objectives, also factored into their relationship. The executive director of CANS wanted to ensure that CANS was not liable for police involvement, and was in control of its own staff.

While these issues have been resolved, the relationship between members of the two organizations continues to show occasional signs of strain. This is due largely to the markedly different organizational styles of the grassroots CANS and the more bureaucratic CPD, and is compounded by the fact that the CPD issued the contract and has ultimate decision-making authority. Furthermore, CANS has historically taken an aggressive and critical role in its dealings with the police, and this dynamic has been evident even in their joint efforts.

Curriculum Development

Originally, JCPT staff members were tasked with writing the curriculum since CPD personnel felt they would be more knowledgeable in addressing the citizen's perspective. Their training product was subject to review and approval by key police personnel, including the co-managers of CAPS, who were not satisfied with the early drafts. After making their concerns known to the executive director of CANS and the JCPT project manager in April, they took an active and directive role in revision efforts.

The resulting curriculum was piloted in early May, then revised and used for the first six weeks of JCPT, although CPD personnel were still dissatisfied with it. By mid-July, the need to further improve the curriculum was recognized, amid reports that training sessions were not standardized. The oversight committee called a halt to the training until the curriculum could be revised. It was rewritten by selected JCPT staff members, CPD personnel, and City Hall representatives, and presented to the trainers in a four-day training session in October. The revised curriculum is very specific, containing instructions and forms for a training series comprised of an orientation session and three subsequent problem solving sessions for each beat. It is also intended to be more interactive, and involve less lecturing.

Selection and Training of Organizers and Trainers

Late in 1994, CANS hired a JCPT project manager and soon afterwards, two training directors and two organizing directors - one of each for the North Side and the South Side of the city. In the spring of 1995, 14 trainers and 28 organizers were hired. Recruiting was accomplished by advertising in local newspapers and at nearby colleges, as well as through more grassroots efforts. Trainer and organizer candidates were interviewed first by the corresponding directors and then by the JCPT project director. CANS and civilian JCPT staff made considerable efforts to hire a diverse group representative of Chicago's population. All lived in Chicago and some had prior organizing or training experience.

There was some debate between CANS and CPD personnel over the number of civilian JCPT staff to be hired. At one point, CANS was promised the funding to hire a total of 50 organizers, but due to budgetary constraints and the skepticism of key police personnel regarding organizers' contributions to training objectives, CANS was later asked to limit the number of organizers to 25. CANS did not have to fire any organizers since a few voluntarily left their positions, but there was lingering resentment over the CPD decision, and frustration over what JCPT staff felt was an overwhelming workload given their staff resources. Consequently, they needed to redistribute the workload among organizers and trainers, and revise the training schedule. JCPT directors reported that staff members were often working 55-hour weeks, when they were actually contracted to work 35 hours a week. Furthermore, the hiring freeze created a sense of job insecurity among trainers and organizers.

Organizers were tasked with working with community organizations and residents in order to rally participation for JCPT orientation and training sessions; develop beat-wide and district-wide leadership; and support localized problem solving activities. They were also expected to

work with and form alliances with local police and other JCPT staff, and to attend and support local beat meetings as well as JCPT orientation and training sessions. The organizers were hired initially because they lived in the districts where they would be working; this meant familiarity with the area and with local residents. After the hiring freeze, organizers still worked on the side of town where they lived, North or South, but took on responsibility for additional districts.

JCPT trainers were responsible for the planning and delivery of training sessions and technical assistance. Their job description goals included creating a core of leadership from local community and police, and enabling community members and appropriate organizations to work together with police to solve crime and disorder problems.

Civilian trainers and organizers were trained for three weeks in May in separate sessions, primarily by their respective directors. Training took place at Loyola University's downtown campus, as well as in the field in their assigned districts. Organizers received intensive instruction in grassroots organizing from the Gammileal Foundation. Together with trainers, they toured the city by bus and learned how to identify locations to target with their organizing strategies, such as churches, community centers, and neighborhoods with block club signs.

Trainers were taught to use a training curriculum that had not yet been approved by the CPD. They also attended a two-day CAPS course at the Chicago Police Training Academy, presented by two police trainers who would eventually be working with them. The course was the same one that had been taught to all district patrol officers and new recruits. Their training also included two days of instruction in skills and techniques designed for conducting "professional training sessions in community settings for community people," taught by consultants. While well intended, this instruction was not firmly grounded in the CAPS framework, due to the consultants' unfamiliarity with the program. Another shortcoming was the lack of specific information on how to deal with diverse populations and situations.

Police trainers were assigned from the pool of trainers who recently had completed CAPS training for 7,500 district patrol officers, recruits, and other CPD personnel. They did not undergo any additional preparation for the JCPT project other than a day-long orientation with the civilian trainers two days prior to the official beginning of JCPT on June 15. Initially, 17 police officers were detailed to the training on a part-time basis; their number increased to 19 in October. The police trainers were unaware of what selection criteria were used in assigning them to the JCPT project. Some expressed disagreement with the assignments that were made, indicating that some police trainers chosen did not want to be involved, and that others who wanted to be involved were not chosen.

Implementation

Civilian JCPT staff began scheduling orientation and problem solving sessions in May, and held the first pilot orientation at the end of May, before the curriculum had been approved by the oversight committee or police trainers were organized to begin. CPD personnel were uncomfortable with this move, since the curriculum was not fleshed out as completely as the police curriculum had been. CPD and City Hall personnel were particularly concerned by the

possibility that citizens were not receiving standardized information. However, CANS staff felt they had no other choice than to begin, because they already had the civilian trainers on their payroll and were under contract to produce the training sessions within a limited time frame. Police trainers were to have been available weeks earlier, but their assignments were delayed due to unforeseen circumstances.

By June the civilian trainers were intensively involved in resident training in the ten districts designated for the first round of training. Six of these were South Side districts: South Chicago, Englewood, Marquette, Monroe, Chicago Lawn and Morgan Park. The other four were North Side districts: Austin, Town Hall, Rogers Park and Grand Central. Four beats within each district were chosen, on the basis of their perceived readiness for the training.

Police trainers joined them on June 15, although the CPD's goal had been for them to be working together with the civilian trainers from the outset of the training. Police and civilian trainers met for the first time on June 13 in a day-long orientation designed to acquaint them with one another and officially launch JCPT. The class included a brief overview of the JCPT orientation session agenda and discussion of their training responsibilities, with segments specifically delegated to either the civilian trainer or police trainer, or both. The CPD CAPS co-managers and JCPT project manager addressed concerns and made inspirational speeches, while acknowledging that the training would not be problem free because it was so innovative. The trainers concentrated on getting acquainted with others who expected to work with them in the same districts, with the aid of well-planned exercises. They appeared to enjoy the process and to begin developing working relationships.

As the summer progressed, CPD members of the oversight committee were increasingly concerned by reports that training sessions were not standardized, attendance was sometimes low, and police trainers were occasionally absent due to scheduling miscommunication. They felt that this last item was particularly serious because police trainer involvement was deemed essential for modeling a joint civilian/police partnership for citizens.

After discussing their concerns with the director of CANS and the JCPT manager, they announced at a July meeting of the oversight committee that training would be halted until the curriculum could be revised. One issue to be dealt with was how to distill the essence of the sixteen hour CAPS course for police into two hours of training for the community. Another was how to address groups of residents who bring a diverse range of CAPS knowledge to the training sessions.

During the reorganization period, civilian trainers and organizers kept busy with outreach efforts and completed problem solving training that had already begun on some beats. Police trainers continued teaching recruits at the police academy or worked on related assignments such as writing CAPS training directives and revising the CAPS sergeant's curriculum.

Training resumed once the revised curriculum was approved in October. Civilian trainers were instructed not to go through with training sessions when police trainers were not present. To preclude this from happening, civilian JCPT staff and police training supervisors made a concerted effort to communicate scheduling information more effectively.

Beginning in October, 1995, training expanded to nine more beats within the original ten districts, bringing the total number of beats receiving training in the first six months to 49. Plans originally called for JCPT to be implemented in all of the city's 279 beats by the end of 1996. CANS has tried to develop a schedule that would provide for all 279 beats to receive a minimum of four training sessions, but due to a number of delays, has had to revise it repeatedly. These delays occurred for a variety of reasons, including the break in training while the curriculum was overhauled, the city's delay in signing a recent funding contract, and trainers' decisions to hold more than four training sessions in some beats. At this point, it appears unlikely that training will be completed city-wide by the end of 1996.

To date, the project is not funded beyond 1996. In July, it came dangerously close to losing even that funding in a city budget review. The budget was cut, but ultimately, the city's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) committee voted to supplement city funding in order to sustain the program through 1996, due to its board members' commitment to a training effort they judged vital. But because the original JCPT funding agreement stipulated that CDBG funds would never be allocated to community training, the committee filed a complaint with City Hall protesting the city's withdrawal of funds.

Within the last month, funding has again become an issue - this time with a political twist. At least one city alderman, prompted by established community organizations that felt threatened by JCPT and the appearance of CANS' organizers in their areas, denounced the training effort. The leader of the Council rebellion vowed to organize other alderman to protest this allocation of funds; CANS responded by rallying public support from other aldermen. The outcome of this debate is yet to be determined, but since JCPT enjoys strong City Hall support, it is unlikely that funding will be withdrawn.

TRAINING SESSIONS

Training Process

The JCPT project was originally structured to include an orientation session and two to four follow-up problem solving sessions on each beat, co-taught by civilian and police trainers. After the initial round of training, the number of sessions per beat was set at four - an orientation and three problem solving sessions.

In advance of the orientation, civilian trainers and organizers worked together to promote awareness among community residents and cultivate participation in the training sessions. Safety was stressed in high crime areas, where they were strongly encouraged to work in teams. The preparatory work varied from district to district but included the following types of outreach:

- Presentations - a very brief overview of CAPS and JCPT given at community meetings
- Assessments -identifying key community organizations and leaders

- One-on-ones -talking to selected individuals identified in assessments and determining their level of involvement in the community
- Pre-meetings - informing local leaders about orientation sessions in an effort to get them to "buy in" to the JCPT process
- Planning meetings - working with local leaders and key community residents, such as beat facilitators, to plan the date and location of the orientation session and determine who would assist in co-sponsoring it

The orientation session was an open meeting designed to orient beat residents to CAPS, with a desired minimum of 35 participants. It was expected to provide citizens with a base level of information about how CAPS should work, and to educate them about their roles in implementing CAPS successfully at the neighborhood level. The two-hour sessions were usually scheduled for week nights, with occasional ones on Saturday mornings.

Problem solving sessions were more advanced than the orientations, with a hands-on approach that provided participants with practical experience in problem solving. Again, the desired number of participants was 35, and their projected length was two hours. Optimally, participants would have first attended the orientation, although pertinent information was recapped at the beginning of each follow-up session.

Originally, the number of problem solving sessions per beat was not specified, but was expected to be two or three, each one building on the previous session. When some beats received a fourth or fifth session, however, the CAPS co-managers were concerned that resources were not being used efficiently and that the goal of completing training in all city beats by the end of 1996 would not be reached. The revised curriculum describes precisely how the training can be completed in three problem solving sessions per beat, with flexibility for adding an interim meeting. In part, this number was set in order to evenly apportion resources and ensure that all beats, city-wide, would receive training within the prescribed time frame. However, additional sessions are still being scheduled by trainers to reach more beat residents, encourage completion of assignments, and consult with volunteers who need further assistance. The divergent positions taken by the CPD, in its desire for broad coverage, and CANS, in its concern with the depth of the training, has created tension between the joint partners. This difference of opinion illustrates just one of the many challenges that such a partnership must meet in order to be successful.

As a follow-up to problem solving sessions, technical assistance sessions were designed to help residents access other agencies as resources for solving problems. "Toolbox training" modules were also planned, but only barely materialized. The toolbox sessions were envisioned as a set of specialized training modules, based on citizen interest or need, designed to address problems specific to a beat. Of the following fifteen modules planned, only block club organizing was actually realized:

- Running an Effective Meeting/Agenda Setting
- Block Watch
- Block Club Organizing

- District Analysis
- Profiling a Beat
- Developing Strategies for Action
- Conflict Resolution/Mediation
- Nuisance Abatement
- School/Parent Patrols
- Gangs: What Can the Community Do
- Working with Volunteers
- Outreach: How to Access Resources
- One-on-one Interviewing
- Door-to-door Canvassing
- Organizational Development

An important component of citizen training is that it is meant to be self-perpetuating, or “capacity-building,” which means that citizens are supposed to share the problem-solving skills they have acquired with other residents. An expected outcome is that residents will be able to

rally and train additional residents independently. There is hope that, eventually, residents across the city will network to solve collective problems.

As of the end of November, training on the initial 49 beats included: 36 pre-meetings with 554 residents attending; 69 planning meetings with 584 attending; 65 orientation sessions with 2129 attending; and 170 problem solving sessions with 3298 in attendance. Additionally, a number of technical assistance sessions were provided. Due to the potential for repeat attendance, the total number of residents who received some training cannot be determined from this data, but conservatively, it was at least the number who attended orientation sessions.

On average, the actual number of participants who attended orientation sessions came close to or exceeded the goal of 35 established by the CPD. Turnout was higher on the North Side than on the South Side. JCPT sign-in sheets document an average of 44 civilian participants at North Side orientation sessions and 34 at South Side sessions. Average attendance at 14 orientation sessions we observed was 31 residents, with 42 the average in North Side districts and 20 the average in South Side districts.

Attendance at problem solving sessions fell considerably short of the goal of 35. According to JCPT sign-in sheets, the average attendance city-wide was 19. At 14 problem solving sessions we observed, the average attendance was 16, with an average of 19 participants on the North Side and 10 on the South Side. These figures indicate that approximately twice as many North Siders as South Siders received advanced training in beats observed.

JCPT staff attributed the better turnout on the North Side to several factors. For one thing, the turnout on the South Side was largely church-based, whereas on the North Side it was more political; most of the Community Policing Task Force members were from the North Side. There is also speculation that South Siders, as a whole, are more

disenfranchised. Most of the city's housing projects and abject poverty pockets are there, and the immigrant population includes a high percentage of illegal aliens who are afraid of contact with the police.

Both North Side and South Side training directors reported that problem solving groups are currently functioning independently on some beats as a result of JCPT training, and have even duplicated themselves. JCPT trainers have occasionally been called upon for assistance with the problem solving process.

Training Settings

JCPT sessions took place in a wide variety of community settings, including churches and community rooms of churches, school meeting rooms and auditoriums, local libraries and colleges, senior citizens' housing, and park district facilities.

Most of the rooms were comfortable and well suited to interactive training, with churches and auditoriums being a notable exception. Because of their rigid seating arrangements, participants were unable to regroup satisfactorily for problem solving exercises. While some residents participated successfully in these settings because of their assertiveness, many did not. Another drawback to this type of setting was the lack of tables or other writing surfaces required for the exercises.

It was discovered that the location of the training influenced the turnout at JCPT sessions. For example, sessions held at churches and schools attracted populations with ties to the institution. If the training was moved to another location, i.e., if subsequent problem solving sessions were not held at the church or school that hosted the orientation, attendance fell. Observers recorded:

The principal was concerned that it was only her school community getting involved, and wanted to have the next meeting at the Catholic school.

The organizer wasn't happy with the turnout. Fewer than half of those who came to the orientation were present, and the group was not as racially diverse. She attributed the diversity at the orientation to the location - the church. At services, she has noticed that three fourths of attendees are African Americans. There was only one African American at tonight's session.

Another training site issue came to light during observations at churches (but not necessarily church community rooms). In three instances, observers noted that JCPT sessions held in churches opened with a prayer, usually led by the head of the congregation. This concerned CPD personnel mindful of the law requiring separation of church and state.

Training Curriculum

The original curriculum given to trainers for orientation and problem solving sessions was loosely organized. Although key points were covered, the method of presenting them was left to the discretion of the trainers. Trainers were also given an outline titled *Orientation Session Agenda* to work from, distributed at their training orientation in June. It listed the components of the curriculum, annotated "C.T." for community trainer, or "P.T." for police trainer, to indicate who was responsible for presenting each. It looked like this:

JOINT COMMUNITY AND POLICE TRAINING PROJECT ORIENTATION SESSION AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Presentation of Leaders, Trainers and Organizers (leader or C.T.)
- II. Northwestern University CAPS Survey (C.T.)
- III. Community Introductions and Icebreaker (Goals of Orientation and Housekeeping) (C.T. Set up and P.T. Facilitates introductions and icebreaker)
- IV. What is JCPT? (C.T. & P.T.)
 - What is CANS? (C.T.)
 - What is CAPS? (The rationale from traditional P.T.)
- V. What is a problem? (P.T.)
 - The Crime Triangle (P.T. & C.T.)
 - Solutions (C.T.)
- VI. CAPS 5-Step Problem Solving Process
 - Introduce steps (P.T.)
 - Exercise (C.T. & P.T.)
- VII. Sign-up for problem solving group: Reduce crime & disorder (C.T. and Organizers)
- VIII. Wrap-up and Evaluation (P.T.)
- IX. Adjourn

The revised curriculum, effective October 15, is very detailed, specifying the materials, methods and script to be used for orientations and three problem solving sessions. The curriculum for orientation sessions, designed to span two hours, is comprised of the following five components:

1. *Welcome and Introduction*: includes administering the evaluation team's survey questionnaire, introducing trainers and participants, explaining the CAPS philosophy, describing the purpose of the training, presenting the agenda for the session, briefly explaining the problem solving sessions that will follow the orientation, and reviewing the handout materials. Time allotted: 25 minutes.
2. *What is CAPS?*: covers the new roles and responsibilities for police and community; key elements of CAPS, including beat teams, beat integrity, alternatives to 911 calls, beat meetings, and ICAM; City Service Request Forms; and the idea of problem solving. Time allotted: 20 minutes.
3. *Problem-Solving Process*: learning what constitutes a problem; practicing identifying problems through a problem-solving exercise; learning to recognize the "crime

triangle" - the three sides of every crime problem, including victims, offenders, and location; becoming familiar with the five-step problem solving process. Time allotted: 15 minutes.

4. *Problem-Solving Exercise*: learning to apply the five-step problem solving model to a crime or disorder problem and signing up for problem solving sessions. Time allotted: 45 minutes.

5. *Wrap-Up and Next Steps*: reviewing the key elements of CAPS; question and answer period; emphasizing the importance of community involvement; encouraging participants to attend beat meetings and problem solving sessions and recruit more residents; and evaluating the training. Time allotted: 5 minutes.

Each of the three subsequent problem solving sessions also has a specific curriculum designed for a two-hour time frame. The curriculum for the first one states its purpose as enabling participants to understand the importance of long term problem solving groups; identify and prioritize crime and neighborhood disorder problems; and begin to analyze those problems, using actual problems on their beat. It also introduces the Crime Triangle Action Plan form for participants to use to exchange phone numbers and assign responsibilities for gathering information before the next session.

The curriculum for the second problem solving session is designed to teach participants how to complete the analysis step in problem solving, set goals, design strategies, and create action plans to implement strategies. Participants are required to report back on their assignments from the previous session. Included is the Strategy Action Plan form for detailing steps required, deadlines, action taken, results, and names of volunteers responsible.

The curriculum for the third problem solving session covers evaluating strategies implemented; celebrating successes; redesigning strategies, if necessary; investigating additional resources; and emphasizing the need for continued commitment. It includes eliciting volunteers for leadership from within the group.

Presentation of the Curriculum

Before the curriculum was revised in October, the content and length of JCPT sessions differed widely from one district to the next. Their length varied from one to three hours, and their content was not uniform. On the whole, there was less consistency in sessions taught by civilian trainers when police trainers were not present, although there were exceptions. The following excerpts from observers' notes describe variations in how the original curriculum was presented:

The civilian trainer's presentation was admirable. She explained the CAPS posters as well as the best police trainers I had observed training police officers. She obviously had a thorough grasp of the curriculum and conveyed it well.

I was also surprised at how sloppily the trainer presented the material. . . In particular, I thought he did a poor job of explaining the What is a Problem and Crime Triangle posters, and was inaccurate in describing The Five Steps to Problem Solving.

We had been here for over an hour and not much substantive information had been provided. [This seemed more like a motivational session or pep rally.] Following the break, the trainer told the class that, during the final break, they needed to come over and take a look at the CAPS posters. He said that they would only be “breezed over” during this session.

The case study was skipped because the trainers felt like they had been here long enough. One trainer told the group to take a look at the case study. He suggested that they go home and look at the problem and try to analyze it by looking at the victim, the offender, and location. He also suggested that they try to develop solutions to the problem. He then told the group that they were going to wrap it up.

After October 15, observations of six orientation sessions and three problem solving sessions revealed much more uniformity in curriculum content and length, with sessions lasting about two hours. However, the revised curriculum was still not always followed to the letter; for example, the new forms called the *Crime Triangle Action Plan* and *Strategy Action Plan* were not used in sessions observed. But even though the forms were not used, the trainers had other more

expedient ways of capturing the information, as illustrated in the following excerpt from an observer's notes:

For the first time, I saw one of the forms from the new curriculum. It was a large laminated copy of the Strategic Action Plan, set on one of the easels. However, the trainers didn't use it or mention it. Instead, one of the trainers wrote participants' names next to the strategies listed on the flip chart, as they volunteered to work on them. Later, as residents were getting ready to leave, she suggested they exchange phone numbers, saying, "Maybe write them on your name tag and exchange name tags."

Following are other digressions from the revised curriculum noticed by observers. It should be noted that they are fewer and less serious compared with deviations that were observed before the October retraining of the trainers:

The trainers had a very difficult time getting the group to reach a consensus on which problem to work on. Nine different priority problems had emerged from the three groups, a total of twenty residents. I noticed that the new curriculum directs them to brainstorm as a group about problems on the beat, not break into separate groups to do this. If they had followed the curriculum, they probably would have reached a consensus more easily, and time would have been better spent.

The trainers did not follow the curriculum. For example, they did not address the purpose of JCPT in detail; they skipped some key points, such as changes for the police and changes for citizens, and they didn't mention root causes in defining a problem.

The problem inherent in having only one half of the teaching partnership present the curriculum was illustrated by the following observation, made in a session taught by a police trainer alone because the civilian trainer was teaching the Spanish-speaking participants:

He presented the curriculum as if he were presenting it to police officers rather than to the community, so I felt like some people left the session feeling like they hadn't learned anything. He focused on "traditional policing isn't working" and why police had to change, rather than why community members need to get involved in the process.

Trainers' Reaction to the Curriculum

All trainers who commented on the curriculum were comfortable with the material they were presenting. Police trainers attributed their ease to their six months of experience teaching the same material to police officers. Civilian trainers' comfort stemmed from their previous experience with CAPS and internalization of the material. As one put it:

I didn't think anything that was in there was not feasible or capable of happening. Anything I teach comes from the gut. I believe in it.

Both civilian and police trainers interviewed felt that the revised curriculum was an improvement over what was used during the spring and summer. Comments made by police trainers indicate that the retraining of the trainers with the revised curriculum served to erase their uncertainty about how the civilian trainers had prepared for JCPT and what, specifically, they had been instructed to teach. This confusion was an inevitable result of the lack of co-training of civilian and police trainers at the outset of the project. Police trainers comparing the revised curriculum with the “old” one said:

What old one? We were given a draft that was never followed. From what I understand from talking to the [civilian] trainers, they were winging it from the beginning. All they had was an agenda and the training they had. The curriculum we were using on the police side was what we used for the police in-service.

What's in that curriculum says that we should both know it. I don't have to feel, now, that my co-trainer doesn't know this - that I'm gonna have to carry this meeting.

A civilian trainer also described why the revised curriculum was preferable:

The old one left some serious questions unanswered and did not clarify certain points, which the community raised. It just glossed over it; for example, the definition of problems under CAPS. The old curriculum emphasized that specific incidents were not a problem under CAPS. Under the new curriculum, they took into account that these specific incidents might be what's mobilizing them. So these concerns were addressed -- that these incidents are valid, are still extremely important, and the police will still work on them; but you need to find out whether your neighbors are experiencing some of the same concerns. It shows how neighbors can organize together, and integrates people's frustrations and concerns.

However, some trainers resented the fact that they were not given an opportunity to participate in the revision process, since they felt that their first-hand experience made them well qualified for the task. One said:

It's difficult to change what you've been doing through habit. They should have done this before they started JCPT training. It's too late for that. Our input would have been who should do what [part of the curriculum] and how to transition between them.

They thought there was still room for improvement in the revised curriculum. A police trainer commented:

The goal setting is too advanced; none of the trainers are using it. They'll tell you privately they're not using the forms; they're too complicated.

Another shortcoming was noted by a civilian trainer:

There's nothing built into the curriculum to assess language needs.

Trainers also were unhappy with the way the new curriculum was taught, requiring them to do role-playing and present it to their peers. They would have preferred members of the curriculum committee to model it for them. One said:

I would have liked to see the training directors show us how they wanted it done, and work from there. That would have given us a baseline to work from, rather than to tell us how to do it, and then tell us what we were doing wrong. It was counter-productive.

Training Materials and Methods

Initially, training materials included the CAPS posters, flip charts, and various handouts. Flip charts were used as aids for reinforcing information presented by the trainers, and also for recording variable information such as participants' answers during the exercises and their ideas during problem solving. After the curriculum was revised in October, more pre-formatted flip chart pages were used. Observers noticed that they saved time, were easier to read, and enhanced the trainer's presentation.

Participants signed into sessions on a standard form, listing their name, address, phone number, and community organization affiliation. CAPS brochures, CANS quarterly newsletters, and reprints of newspaper articles favorable towards CAPS were usually available at the sign-in table.

At orientation sessions, folders ("packets") were given to participants. Their contents usually included the session agenda, the Northwestern University Joint Training questionnaire, copies of CAPS posters, and training evaluation form. They often also contained a range of other information, including a problem solving exercise; beat maps; fact sheets about CAPS, CANS and JCPT; information on the new non-emergency police number; and a sign-up sheet for the problem solving session. Some also contained an ice breaker exercise, a graph depicting incarceration rates around the world, names and phone numbers of district police personnel, ICAM fact sheets, biographical sketches of the community trainers and organizers, and an early version of a workbook.

That draft of a workbook had been introduced by JCPT project management at the June orientation for trainers, with the notation that the summer would be a testing period for it. Trainers were resistant to it, believing it would break the momentum of the session. Observers never saw it used in training sessions, although it was distributed to participants at some of the early sessions.

In the revised curriculum released in October, training materials were specified. They included the CAPS posters, flip charts with pre-formatted pages, standardized forms for recording information volunteered by participants, ice breaker exercises, and a packet for distribution to participants at the beginning of orientation sessions. Trainers were informed that a new workbook was being developed.

The new prescribed packet contents were: an agenda, the Northwestern University joint training survey questionnaire, CANS brochure, beat maps, beat meeting schedule, the police non-emergency phone numbers, copies of CAPS posters, various fact sheets and news articles, a handout contrasting traditional policing and CAPS, worksheets for the problem solving exercise, ICAM fact sheet, glossary of CAPS terms, report on the CAPS evaluation findings, and training evaluation questionnaire.

Materials were sufficient, except that during the problem solving exercise, residents were not quite sure about which city services were available to solve certain problems. This could have been alleviated by providing a copy of the resources in the training packet.

TRAINERS

Training Assignments

Rather than establishing training teams, project supervisors on both the CPD and CANS sides made assignments by district. Police trainers were assigned to districts with which they were familiar. Assignments of civilian trainers did not dovetail with those of police trainers, however. In some cases, there were multiple civilian trainers per district, or civilian trainers were assigned to more than one district, while ten police trainers each had sole responsibility for one of the ten districts. When police trainers were on furlough, as was frequently the case between May and September, reserve trainers substituted for them. Likewise, reserves filled in when there was simultaneous training on two beats within the same district, since the police trainer assigned to the district could only cover one session.

The result of not having set teams was a lack of continuity that created problems for the police trainers, civilian trainers, and residents. Trainers found themselves continually adjusting to working with new partners. In many cases, their partners were not the personnel they were told they would be working with and took the time to get to know when they initially all met, in June.

An additional problem for police trainers was that they were sometimes unable to participate in the entire series of training sessions on a beat because of schedule conflicts. Dates were usually set by civilian trainers in cooperation with training participants and communicated to the CPD in two week increments. Police trainers often did not see the schedule until a few days prior to a session to which they were assigned, and by that time, outside jobs or personal plans may have precluded their participation. In those cases, a reserve trainer was assigned.

For police trainers, this meant unfamiliarity with the residents and their concerns, and in some cases, with what prior training they had received. Residents sometimes complained that they felt shortchanged and disappointed when robbed of the opportunity for

developing a relationship with a police trainer. Frustration for all resulted. Civilian and police trainers commented:

When you start working with someone, you want to keep working with them, because you develop a rapport. Both people are very happy to see familiar faces when they show up at a training session because it gives them a sense of confidence to deal with the crowd.

The more that we become a team (police trainers and community trainers), the more we can work together to overcome people's fear. We're not the same team yet because they keep switching the police trainers.

Between May and November, the concept of teamwork promoted by JCPT was not widely modeled by the trainers, with fully 40 percent of the sessions observed taught only by a civilian trainer. In three of these cases, police trainers were on the premises, but language barriers prevented them from participating or necessitated separate language sections, with one taught by the civilian trainer, and the other by the police trainer. In most of the other cases, the absence of joint civilian and police trainers was due to CANS' need to begin training in May in order to fulfill contractual obligations, although police trainers were not yet available; and to continue training in July and August in beats already started, after the CPD had ceased training pending revisions to the curriculum. In the remaining cases, all on the South Side, JCPT staff failed to submit schedules to police trainers far enough in advance; except for one instance, in which a police trainer missed an assigned session.

Civilian trainers were repeatedly admonished, in their October retraining, to cancel a training session if a police trainer failed to show up. This directive was not well received; understandably so, considering the effort required to produce a good resident turnout, and the impact of a cancellation on the community's trust. The rationale behind it was that if a police trainer was not present, it meant that the CPD had not received sufficient notice from the CANS office to be able to schedule a trainer. But when subsequently a police trainer who had been assigned to a session failed to show, the training went on as planned; CANS staff felt justified in proceeding, since the lapse was not their fault.

Since then, steps have been taken to ensure improved communication of scheduling information between the CPD and CANS, and within the CPD. Also, trainers are forming teams in the majority of districts, and coordinating training dates with one another in advance of offering the dates to community participants. Training sessions held since mid-October have been conducted by both partners, except when a rare emergency has prevented it.

Teaching Styles and Skills

Most trainers were enthusiastic and had internalized the CAPS philosophy, although

teaching styles and skills of the individual trainers varied widely and directly affected the success of a training session. It should be noted, however, that trainers who were initially less polished improved over time.

Training sessions that were most successful were ones in which the following conditions were met:

- (1) The trainers were credible; they had internalized the CAPS philosophy and demonstrated their knowledge of and commitment to the program.
- (2) The training was interactive; trainers were good facilitators and employed techniques that encouraged participation.
- (3) The trainers were well prepared; they had practiced or coordinated their presentation in advance so that the material was covered thoroughly, instructions for residents' participation were clear, and the session flowed smoothly.
- (4) The trainers were compatible; they worked as a team to provide a consistent perspective and did not allow their egos or other agendas to interfere with the training.
- (5) The trainers had presence; they maintained momentum and did not allow the class to get sidetracked.

The trainers' credibility was important to the success of a class. Observers' notes offer contrasting views of trainers' credibility:

The trainer was convincing, making them believe he had something they needed. The audience was very quiet and attentive. The trainer impressed me with her ability to communicate effectively with community residents, while at the same time presenting herself as a professional and credible representative of the police department. She also developed a good rapport with the residents, because she showed them that she was familiar with their beat and concerned about their problems.

The trainers had a very difficult time prioritizing problems; they appeared confused and so did the residents.

The trainers' uncertainty about how to proceed at the end of the meeting didn't look good. I thought their lack of preparedness diminished their credibility. I assumed this was the first time they had gotten to this point in the process.

Good interaction with participants was a critical component in the training process. In the most successful classes, trainers were good facilitators, working to stimulate discussion. Classes in which training was interactive were described in observers' notes:

In trying to elicit strategies from the group, the trainer frequently referred back to her list titled WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH as an aid for prompting the audience. Many of the residents and police officers contributed ideas.

The trainer asked for a volunteer to read the first paragraph on the PROBLEM SOLVING EXERCISE sheet in their folders. A black woman in her 30's volunteered and stood in front of the group. After she read each paragraph, the trainer asked the group whether it was a problem under CAPS, and facilitated the discussion that ensued.

Classes in which training was not as interactive were also observed:

As the trainer went through the problem solving exercise, he gave all the answers himself, writing on the board as he spoke. There was little involvement by the residents; they didn't like it because they didn't understand why, if they were supposed to analyze the three sides of the crime triangle, they weren't doing it. One woman complained, "Once I leave today, I still won't know what to do."

I thought the trainers reacted to the citizens present, rather than interacting with them. I wondered why they didn't give them constructive feedback on their answers in the problem solving exercise, and offer some of the textbook solutions.

Trainers who had prepared together in advance were more apt to be thorough in their presentations and instructions. Observers learned whether trainers had prepared together through conversations with them. The following observations demonstrate how good teamwork paid off:

The trainers worked well together and made a good presentation. They both appeared relaxed and well acquainted with the material. They were precise, not sloppy, about the information they communicated.

The trainers did a good job of facilitating the discussion and demonstrating how to analyze the problem. They worked well together, playing off one another.

When advance coordination was lacking, it often showed. Sometimes, trainers did not even know who their training partner would be before they arrived at a session. Observers noted the results:

In three of the groups, people seemed frustrated and confused, not discussing much, not writing anything down, and talking about their uncertainty about what they were supposed to be doing. [In my opinion, the instructions were not clear, and the exercise was not adequately explained.]

Then the police trainer asked the civilian trainer if he should, “go into beat integrity and all that.” The civilian trainer replied, “Just briefly.”

While many pairs of civilian and police trainers worked well together, a few did not. When friction existed, it was apparent to the audience. The retraining of trainers in October, however, helped to break the ice and lay the foundation for a better understanding of one another. Before that, the following observations were made:

I would have liked to see the trainers put aside their own differences and not show the group that they were divided.

[One] problem was the attitude of the CANS trainer. He seemed to be very competitive with the police trainer. He also wanted to make it clear to [the police trainer] that these meetings were the domain of CANS, not the police department.

The session was choppy, largely because of the rivalry between the CANS trainer and the police trainer. I attributed it to the CANS trainer’s inability to allow the police trainer to serve with him as a partner. He wanted to control the training and was willing to do anything necessary, including denigrating the police trainer. A lot of the residents were offended.

Observers also recorded many favorable impressions of training teams, both before the October retraining and afterwards. Among them were:

The trainers seemed very comfortable working together. They played off one another well, rather than merely alternating presentations.

I thought that the trainers worked well together. Both of them seemed comfortable with the curriculum and comfortable working with one another.

Trainers who had presence effectively took control and did not allow the class to linger on superfluous issues that were not directly related to the training. Observers noted:

[The trainer] was animated and interactive, always referring to the community as “we” instead of “you.” She had presence, and was skilled at steering the group back to the agenda when they got sidetracked. She also had internalized the CAPS philosophy, and her presentation appeared effortless.

[The trainers] worked hard to keep the residents on track and move the session along at a reasonable pace.

Trainers who lacked presence failed to keep the momentum going, as observations showed:

I would have liked to see a little more control shown by the trainers. They seemed to get caught up in the residents' petty squabbles and easily sidetracked.

Other residents joined in to discuss their displeasure with some of the parents and youth on their blocks. This exchange lasted for a couple of minutes. Neither trainer bothered to cut in. However, after three or four minutes, the other residents started getting restless and complained a bit about the turn that the discussion was starting to take.

Trainers' Roles

Prior to the re-training for trainers in October, observers noticed that civilian trainers usually took the lead in training sessions, functioning as motivators and controlling the pace of the session. Police trainers appeared to plug in segments of the curriculum they had taught police officers, including explanations of CAPS elements such as the crime triangle and five-step problem solving process, and the rationale for change from traditional policing to CAPS. One police trainer offered an explanation for this, noting that the civilian trainers were responsible for bringing the pre-printed flip charts and easels:

You're always going off your civilian trainer because they're the ones who come prepared.

Also, in the early sessions, police trainers sometimes left the room or conversed with other officers present during the problem solving exercises, leaving the facilitation up to the civilian trainer. Observers noted:

Six minutes into the exercise, the police trainer left the room; the civilian trainer continued to circulate among the groups. [This was a familiar situation. The police trainers detached themselves from helping with the exercise at almost all of the sessions I had observed.]

I noticed that the police trainer sat with the other police officers while the civilian trainer went back and forth, passing out supplies. Most of the police trainers I had observed let the civilian trainer facilitate the exercise alone.

There was a sense that police trainers felt the training belonged to CANS and they did not want to tread on any toes. Civilian trainers seemed to perpetuate this notion, making a point of publicly giving CANS credit for the training. Evaluators later learned that this was part of the civilian trainers' formal presentation, intended to establish CANS' legitimacy for conducting the training in joint partnership with the police.

The fact is, that because police and civilian trainers were not co-trained for JCPT initially, police trainers were not entirely certain what to expect of civilian trainers in the

early training sessions. This was especially true if the training team did not prepare together ahead of time, which was often the case, and team members were unfamiliar with one another's styles and personalities.

Since October, when trainers were all trained together with the revised curriculum and had the opportunity to get better acquainted, police trainers have taken a more active role in the training and civilian and police trainers feel more comfortable contacting one another for advance planning. Recognizing the importance of continuing to develop relationships with one another and improve communications, they have decided to hold monthly meetings to exchange information about their training experiences and discuss issues that affect training.

Trainers' Evaluation of Themselves and Other Trainers

For the most part, the trainers felt adequately prepared for the training but thought that it would have been helpful to have trained for it with the other half of the teaching partnership. One civilian trainer, describing the training that civilian trainers had received, said:

We were a little isolated. In the classroom, police-related questions arose that no one could answer - such things as beat integrity, changing shifts, furloughs. We kept expecting the police to be there every week, but they weren't.

Trainers also felt prepared to deal with racially and socioeconomically diverse groups of citizens, but only with multilingual groups if they had the language skills or resources. They commented:

I never met a group that I couldn't talk to or relate with. All we're talking about is their neighborhood.

I can discuss things with just about anybody I run into, provided they don't hate me first.

I've dealt with Asian groups, different age groups, different language groups. Being bilingual and Hispanic has made me aware of cultural barriers and language barriers. We did one multilingual presentation in a school with people who spoke five different languages. We had people who spoke that language [participants] sitting with them and translating as we went.

They thought they were effective in getting the program across to citizens. This opinion was reinforced by feedback they received from supervisors and co-trainers in debriefings, as well as from participants' evaluation forms. They saw evidence of their effectiveness in the formation of stronger bonds between citizens and police, in citizen initiative in reducing crime and disorder, and ultimately, in action taken by third parties as a result of citizen initiative. A police trainer reported:

In some cases, citizens were at odds with some of the police that were there, and my intervention helped. When I explained to them what we were doing, I could see their eyes light up.

Civilian trainers asked to comment about their effectiveness said:

I feel very good. I've had some great success stories.

I think [our success is] evidenced by the fact we were able to get some of the residents in the problem solving groups to do things like title searches, finding out whether some of the buildings owed back taxes, whether there were building code violations; and providing us with information on offenders such as license plate numbers, names, nicknames, and descriptions, and passing that information on to the police, because some of them were afraid to do that on their own. Normally, in a public meeting, people are reluctant to give out that information.

[Evidence of our success was] getting residents on their own to generate arrests of offenders on their block, instead of calling 911. A number of arrests were able to be made which helped to eliminate some of those problems of drug dealing and gang loitering. We were also able to get meetings with landlords and get evictions, and get "no loitering" signs posted. We convinced owners this would give them more leeway in getting rid of loiterers; police could point to the sign and remove them more easily. We wrote a letter to a building manager explaining all our concerns about a building, and right after they got it, they started fixing up the building -- boarding up broken windows and so on. The basement was wide open; there were gangs hanging out there doing drugs.

Trainers felt that other trainers, civilian and police alike, were also effective but that, in some cases, there was room for improvement. Police trainers evaluating civilian trainers said:

The ones I've worked with have been very good (five different trainers). I see them as very motivated, very informed, and very accommodating; very easy to get along with.

I've only worked with a couple. One was fine. The other wasn't as clear on the five steps and all the five steps entailed, so he left that up to me. His focus was on sign-up and stay with the group, and not do any defining; he left it up to me.

Civilian trainers assessing the performance of other civilian trainers remarked:

I noticed some of the trainers had difficulty with some of the parts, like the crime triangle; remembering the three sides and how it fits into the program.

I haven't had a chance to observe everyone, but of the opportunities I have had, it's pretty much consistent. There are a few people who could use some improvement in terms of their delivery and the accuracy of information they're presenting. In the interaction part, where the audience asks questions, they sometimes come up with a snap, quick answer which is totally inaccurate.

Civilian trainers' comments about police trainers included:

I think overall, they're good. I do notice, like with the community trainers, there seem to be different levels of proficiency. Some are lost without their cue cards. I don't know if it's because they haven't internalized it personally, or if they're just doing it from memorization and need their cue cards as a crutch.

I notice most of the police trainers need a little bit more awareness of community dynamics, community issues, community realities. [He commented that police officers tend to live in good neighborhoods.] Some of the communities we're in are primarily depressed, high crime, very low income, with low housing stock value. I think a lot of the police need to be more cognizant of that before they make their presentation to the community. It works both ways. I don't know a lot about the internal operations of the police, and I would benefit from it.

Police trainers did not have the opportunity to observe other police trainers, and therefore did not comment about them.

Many trainers felt that a partnership between civilian and police trainers was slow in coming because of the lack of opportunities to get acquainted with the other trainers and to work consistently with the same partner. The week spent together in training in October was considered a turning point by some. A civilian trainer noted:

Before last week, it was a hit and miss operation. We only had a chance to interact once before, in June at the South Side training. It was, "Let's see, who's gonna show up today?" Getting a police trainer to work with more than once helped us to develop a relationship.

A police trainer said:

I didn't think that we were on the same page. Now that we've had the training we can start together on the same page. Before, we had our curriculum; they didn't seem to be clear on their curriculum. Now we've been trained in the same training and we both know what we should be presenting.

It should be noted, however, that some trainers did feel that partnerships had formed prior to the retraining. One police trainer reported:

In my case, very definitely. Every single one of the trainers said, "Are you coming back? Can I work with you again?" At least four of the CANS trainers, I've formed a partnership with.

Aside from the lack of opportunities to work together, there were other factors that interfered with the formation of partnerships. Some civilian trainers reacted negatively to elements of police culture that seemed to establish barriers between them and sworn personnel involved in the program. One commented:

There are some very real dynamics that prevent us from being more of a solid team. There seems to be an inherent attitude of "us and them." During the critique sessions (last week), the police trainers seemed very sensitive to being critiqued by their peers and others, anyone who isn't a superior.

Also, I think the dynamics of carrying a loaded firearm in a room with others with no firearms sets up barriers to trust, communication, and building strong relationships. Put us all in the room with loaded firearms and then see how we interact. It gives you a sense of, "I have more control." and, "I am not to be questioned because I am the authority."

Putting them into civilian clothes helped, but again, get rid of the firearms. I think if the police department is really sincere about partnerships, they could find a way to do this. I don't think any of us is going to commit a crime in the middle of a training session.

A civilian trainer also remarked:

The police department is like a fraternity. If you're not part of it, you're not as good as "us."

The "us vs. them" mentality seemed to be felt more by civilian trainers than police trainers, and may be an offshoot of CANS' transition from the role of watchdog of the police to partner with the police. An observer noted how one civilian trainer described the training:

We're training the community to put pressure on the district commander and the beat officers to get things done.

This attitude was conveyed to residents in early training sessions by more than one civilian trainer when police trainers were not present, as noted by observers:

The trainer told the residents, "We want the entire group to call narcotics [division of the police department] and hold the line for an hour. This is a strategy we need to utilize. They need to hear more than one voice."

The trainer said, "When you strengthen your partnerships others can help you to hold the police accountable and put pressure on the police. Those who are against us do not respect us." [He meant the police.]

A woman complained, "The beat cops aren't even here. Supposedly, two beat cops were supposed to be here tonight." The trainer said, "Take a note. The beat cops are not here tonight. They're supposed to be a part of the partnership."

Overall, trainers believed that other trainers, both civilian and police, were dedicated to the project, but felt some pressures and frustrations about things beyond their control. For civilian trainers, frustration stemmed from insufficient communication with supervisors, a perceived lack of support from the CPD, and the tenuousness of their employment status. Police trainers were also frustrated with what they perceived as a lack of support from the CPD, as indicated by delays in delivery of the CAPS orders and promised technology and failure of middle management to implement CAPS in some districts.

Comments made by civilian trainers about how they felt about the project included:

I've gotten feedback that some of them feel that there's not enough concrete direction or sufficient supervision. Sometimes we don't see our supervisors for a week at a time because they're at meetings. If you have questions, they're not available. If you know they're gonna be at an all day meeting, you don't want to call them.

Frustrated, because there are a lot of roadblocks in it and there doesn't seem to be anyone on the police side asking us our concerns. Even when we had the training (October) no one asked us what are some of the things we're facing out there. Where was Chuck Ramsey to talk to us? Why hasn't Rodriguez addressed what we do? Why hasn't anyone come out in public and addressed what we do, instead of telling us we have to wait for these orders. Why weren't these orders out in June? Police officers don't feel the commitment either.

Police trainers also shared their thoughts about how civilian trainers felt about JCPT:

I truly believe they're extremely motivated and they're behind the project one hundred percent, but at the same time, I feel the pressure they're under to get a good turnout is tremendous; they're willing to settle for more, rather than "who." I think their feedback is putting undue pressure on them to do more and more now.

I think they're very serious about it; it's a matter of life and death for them. I asked one of the directors why there's this feeling that it's just got to work; was it a matter of a job for them? I think they're over-committed.

Police trainers' comments about how police trainers felt were:

We would like the cooperation with the department members from the top all the way down.

*Most of the trainers, if not all, think the training is beneficial. They're dedicated to the CAPS philosophy. A lot of them would rather be on the streets instead of here spinning their wheels, but they believe in the philosophy. The CAPS whole philosophy requires input from the top down and the bottom up. It's a two-way street. A lot of police officers feel it's a one-way street; we're feeding information from the bottom up, we're out there teaching people. We're very happy the orders are coming out in January, but we promised them in June; that makes liars of us. The laptop computers aren't here. If they're coming out with something and it's going to affect us, come to us. It's the old style management -- **you** make decisions, **we** follow them.*

My feeling is that I think we're losing the program, not because the officers in blue don't want to do it, but because we're not getting the support from middle management. Somewhere between the upper echelon that wants to make it work and the lower level that wants to make it work, someone is giving somebody a snow job.

Civilian trainers also expressed their opinions about how police trainers felt:

I think they also feel frustrated. They tell us how frustrated they feel. They don't feel the commitment from their bosses to this project, either. They would like to follow through on one beat.

I sense that some of them view it with somewhat of a contempt: "We'll put up with these community trainers now, and once this is over we'll go back to doing what we've always done." Not taking this seriously - "us" and "them;" a hesitancy to make it a true partnership. Fifty cops in a classroom is a totally different world than ten people in a church basement.

Trainers' Evaluation of the Training

Trainers tended to be optimistic, with some reservations, about whether the first round of JCPT was successful. Police trainers were more cautious than civilian trainers, commenting that the project's success could not be measured without the perspective of time or depended upon who was trained - whether they were people who were actively involved in their communities. They said:

I think I should reserve comment until the trained community members actually get involved in the beat meeting process. It's too early to tell. Maybe six months down the road, see if those people we trained are still there, at beat meetings.

It varies. When you work with groups that are educated in what's going on in their beat, that helps. The more successful meetings were ones where people had a

vested interest in the community, and knew something about police procedures. I had one meeting with senior citizens, 75 and over, who could care less.

Civilian trainers were more positive, gauging its success by the number of participants and visible results in the community. When asked their opinions of whether JCPT was successful, they replied:

Yeah, in terms of the number of people we were able to get out, and in terms of the actions we were able to get in their respective beats.

Yeah, I think it has been successful. I don't think it has been as successful as it could be, because the beat officers aren't working with us. I know that, citywide, we've had drug dealers leave a corner, prostitutes get off; we've had abandoned cars towed and moved. More than that, we've made community members aware that they have to stand up for their rights and take ownership of their own individual blocks, and made them aware that beat officers can't do it all by themselves.

Trainers found that most participants were eager to become involved in the problem solving process, but they did encounter some resistance to the training. They did not, however, find it insurmountable, as their comments indicate:

The resistance that the majority of us encountered from the community was their fear of getting involved, their fear of actually doing something against the criminal element. The more that we become a team (the police trainers and civilian trainers), the more we can work together to overcome people's fear. We're not the same team yet because they keep switching the police trainers.

The resistance I encountered was frustration with the whole world, as it were. Once I addressed their frustration, their resistance usually stopped. I would make them understand that this was a training session to help them work on the real problems. Sometimes the explanation had to be carried two or three steps.

They don't see how the training will really change things because they don't think the police will change and they don't feel they've got an appropriate level of police response in their neighborhood. There's venting about past incidents. I think we'll continue to encounter it because it's the first opportunity that people get to open up, with the police, or about the police.

There's always gonna be some resistance from citizens; police are used to dealing with it. The more empowered citizens are, the more they'll work with you.

They observed that some citizens had misconceptions about the training, believing that they would be solving actual neighborhood problems at the orientation session, or that the JCPT trainers would lead their local problem solving group, continuing to direct their ongoing efforts. In some beats, citizens desired this type of leadership, while in others,

they feared the displacement of their own leaders. Trainers described participants' misconceptions:

"If we really aren't gonna solve the problems, why are we here?" They want to work on real problems right off the bat, not pretend problems. It's confusion about what JCPT really is - training.

That's what's missing in JCPT - that this isn't a separate group; this is training. We need to get this across before the meetings. The community group perceives CANS as coming to remove the established leaders and put in their own leaders. It's a fear of losing their power.

The primary concern is the length of time that we spend on the beat. By the time they get to know us, and get involved with us, boom! We're gone. The community has a real big concern that we're not staying long enough. I spend a lot of time with the community; I interview more than anybody - doing key interviews. I talk to whole block clubs, so by the time they come to orientation, I know most of them.

Trainers found that citizens also had misconceptions about CAPS and were confused about its relationship to JCPT. Some did not realize that, with CAPS, they were expected to take on new responsibilities, and that JCPT was intended to prepare them for that. Trainers reported:

People want to know what the police are gonna do and what the city's gonna do. Then they ask what they can do to help. Most people have the misconception that police officers are walking the beat. That's been the most asked question, "I thought more police would be around. Where are they?" Most citizens don't seem to know that it's not just the police; that we're talking about partnerships with citizens. We need to promote it.

It's not so much concerns about the program, but concerns about crime and safety and the police that they have. They feel that very little gets done at beat meetings; they call them CAPS meetings. They don't see how it all fits in -- the JCPT training, the beat meetings. When they asked about the JCPT training at beat meetings, most of the beat officers seemed uninformed about it. Maybe the commander knows, but the beat officers don't. The police don't ask the community what their problems are, or say they want to help; they just listen.

Trainers' Concerns About JCPT

The trainers had some concerns about how the training was being organized and administered. For one thing, JCPT management was criticized for not having standard operating procedures and tighter controls in place. As a result, civilian trainers and organizers occasionally missed internal meetings and failed to receive complete phone messages. One civilian trainer reflected:

There's a lot of uncertainty as to directions when they are given because sometimes there's a lot of last minute notification, and in some cases there's a total absence of notification of meetings for trainers. There's a lack of efficient communication.

Maybe there needs to be certain structural procedures defined in black and white; controls in place as there would be in a private organization. We need to have those things in place to make it more effective; tighter controls for accountability.

Overall, trainers thought the turnout at training sessions was good, but not always representative of the population in the beat. This could occur despite an organizer's best efforts; sometimes, the weather appeared to be a factor. Trainers did note, however, that the degree of organization varied from beat to beat due to the nature of the personnel hired. Some organizers, for example, were afraid to do door knocking; others lacked the tools needed to bring people out, such as bilingualism. Trainers commented:

We need more organizers and trainers who are multilingual. A department as big as the police department has to have these resources somewhere.

Are residents turning out? Some yes, some no. There are 15 to 30 turning out per meeting. It usually drops to half when they get to problem solving. Some of the flyers advertise, "Beat meeting. JCPT training," so they come expecting a beat meeting.

Some trainers had more positive comments to make, illustrating the variety of experiences in a project of this magnitude. They said:

Some of those organizers have reached people who wouldn't ordinarily come to a police meeting.

From what I can see, it's organized fine. I've never been to a meeting where there were less than 25 people, so that means to me that organizers are getting people out. The organizer, trainer, and supervisor are there and seem to know what they're supposed to do.

They felt that the marketing of JCPT and CAPS could be improved in order to increase participation in training sessions, and to dispel the fear or resentment felt by established community groups who were threatened by their presence. Among their comments were:

We only get fifty residents per orientation. What will be done about our marketing strategy to reach the other thousands living in the beat?

More has to be done with the publicity, marketing, and communication. People have to be informed of what JCPT is before CANS comes into the neighborhood. If we're all working for the same goal, why are we butting heads?

Some were very concerned about the friction between CANS and other community groups, and the fear that this might undermine the training. One trainer remarked:

The biggest, main problem, and I think all others stem from it, was the clash between the CANS organization and established community organizations, including the police. The established community organizations saw this as a threat to their power and wouldn't work with them [CANS].

Another spinoff from that is that the community group may already be addressing the problems that the problem solving group was working on, so there's a duplication of effort. For example, the problem of a drug building: almost two-thirds of the preliminary work was already being done. If the two groups had worked together, they would have known that; they could be working on a different problem.

A neighborhood relations officer also raised this issue, and noted that some community groups that felt threatened by JCPT had enlisted the support of their aldermen to protest city funding of the project. He related:

Community members already have their CAPS groups working on problems and they are offended - are made to feel they're not doing a good job with problem solving, so CANS was brought in to show them how to do it right. Some of them have brought this to the attention of powerful politicians and it's been brought up downtown.

Other trainers' concerns about the training process were: how to sustain participation throughout the four-session training series, and how to achieve noticeable results in the community within the time frame of the training series. They said:

We lose people in the process. There are 60 at the orientation, but only 15 at the problem solving sessions. How do we maintain their interest and number?

They can't do the problem solving well in a week. They need four to six weeks to truly address a problem, and it looks like the police officers are not doing their job if they come back without an answer in a week.

Another concern of trainers was that, on the police side, certain elements of CAPS integral to JCPT have not yet materialized in some districts, namely, beat integrity and beat team meetings. There were reports that, in some districts, beat officers and sergeants were still being rotated every three months. A CPD manager acknowledged that beat integrity had not been implemented city-wide, saying:

In some places, it may never be in place, due to management issues and activity on that beat.

A police trainer offered another view, suggesting that CPD personnel were not universally supportive of CAPS:

Everyone has fallen back on the old style, in the middle band of the spectrum. The chief of patrol is still asking for numbers, rather than quality. That has to be somehow gotten rid of, in order to make it work. In other districts, people are being taken off the beat at the whim of watch commanders: "You didn't get enough tickets, so you're off the car." I'm of the opinion that there are a lot of commanders out there who are telling Ramsey everything's going fine, and they're not.

In fact, many trainers felt that district personnel were unsupportive of their efforts, including some district commanders, other ranked personnel, and beat officers. A major concern of both civilian and police trainers was the lack of beat officer participation in training sessions. They noted that if beat officers were in attendance, they often failed to interact with residents or participate in problem solving exercises with them. Among their comments on this subject were:

The biggest problem we encountered was lack of cooperation from the beat officers and the individual districts. The individual problems have never been addressed. The general answer we get is that we have to wait until January, when the orders come down from the department to the commanders.

No one has told the police who we are and what we are and why we are out there. (The commanders know, but the beat officers don't.) And we have very little respect from the beat officers for what we're doing.

There is a continued lack of beat officer participation in the groups. And in many districts, the lack of support from the district commander and other high ranking personnel in the districts - like Commander (name), talking a good game, then telling his beat officers they could leave the problem solving meeting.

The department must get middle management on line so they don't come to meetings and say, "We've already been to training. We don't need this," with their beat team standing behind them.

If the partnership [between beat officers and residents] isn't exemplified here, people will never be working with them out in the community. Who gives the beat officers their practical training if it's not us? How will they get it?

Some beat officers have no idea what JCPT is. This was mentioned to them in police officer training, but it didn't register.

When we did the police in-service, we did it in a vacuum. The goal is to eliminate the training in a vacuum.

The issue of getting police to better coordinate their efforts was raised repeatedly in trainers' meetings in October and November. Civilian trainers appealed to police trainers to encourage beat officers' participation, but one police trainer explained how peer culture impeded the process:

She said that she had a blue shirt on and the beat officers had blue shirts on, so she couldn't tell them what to do. She added that civilians might think of this as a suggestion, but police think of it as an order.

CPD project managers responded by pointing out that beat officers were unable to attend every one of the problem solving sessions, but that their commanders would continue to be encouraged to have them attend. They stressed the importance of having a representative from the training session report on the group's activities at beat meetings, and assured trainers that once the new CPD CAPS orders were issued, January 1, the problem would diminish.

However, it was revealed at the November trainers' meeting that the orders might be delayed; that trainers should not count on having them to motivate beat officers. At that point, the trainers began to take a more hands-on approach to management issues, beginning with suggesting creative strategies to convey their mission to district personnel. Among the strategies they proposed were:

- police trainers, as CAPS instructors, visit each district to conduct training at beat meetings, beat team meetings, etc. (*"Why aren't they utilizing us?"*)
- at roll call training, sergeants inform beat officers about JCPT, who CANS is, who the police trainers are. (*"Why can't the sergeants just inform their officers right after taking attendance?"*)
- police and civilian trainers introduce themselves to district commanders just prior to beginning training in their districts.
- police and civilian trainers or police training supervisor attend role call training to explain JCPT.
- the training bulletin on JCPT (composed by two police trainers) should be expedited. (*"But it has to go through R&D where it gets nit-picked to death. It might take four or five months to come out."*)

The trainers agreed that, prior to beginning training in a new district, they would arrange to meet with the district commander to explain JCPT and determine whether the commander desired to have the police training supervisor discuss JCPT at roll call training in his or her beats.

It was also announced at the November trainers' meeting that the December issue of the FOP newsletter would contain an article detailing what beat officers' roles are and what they are expected to do in JCPT training.

In addition to these issues, trainers also identified needs that they felt the project had neglected to address. One was the need to target the large non-English speaking segments of the population. They noted that the curriculum was lacking a mechanism for assessing the language needs on a beat; some trainers reported that they made a point of asking whether everyone present spoke English. They also felt that more multilingual trainers and materials were needed, pointing out that only one of the police trainers was bilingual [Spanish], the set of Spanish materials was incomplete, and other languages they encountered, such as Polish, were ignored. One trainer expressed this concern:

I think there needs to be more sensitivity as well as action taken to discern the needs of different language and cultural groups if this program is really going to reach large populations in the city. For example, Chinatown. There are no Asian trainers. If we're going to make it effective, we have to be good marketeers and reach all those people.

Another need identified was for problem solving resources for trainers. It was suggested that each trainer have a binder containing information about resources needed to deal with problem solving issues that arose in training sessions; for example, names and phone numbers to call in order to close down a nuisance tavern. At the November trainers' meeting, volunteer committees were formed to address these needs.

Finally, police trainers thought that eliminating the requirement of wearing uniforms to training sessions would enhance the training. They felt that their uniforms presented a barrier between them and their audience. In particular, they cited the problem with immigrant populations, such as Polish and Hispanic, for whom the uniform has a threatening connotation.

TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

Profile of Civilian Participants

Survey data collected at orientation sessions indicates that participants were generally representative of district populations, as described by the 1990 census. Most participants completed survey questionnaires, which were available in both English and Spanish. They were administered by civilian trainers and organizers at the beginning of sessions, prior to the presentation of the curriculum, with efforts made to do so in a standardized way.

Altogether, 1346 participant questionnaires were collected and keyed in time for the interim report. Tables 1a and 1b display the demographic characteristics of participants, by district. A comparison of this profile with 1990 census data in Table 2 reveals that orientation session participants were generally representative of district populations.

Of the 54 specific comparisons between participant and census data presented in Table 2, large differences were found in 17 of the comparisons, or 31 percent.¹ Since the number of participants in each district was small, some discrepancies will exist between participant data and census data; differences of ten percent or greater between the participant and census percentages are considered large.

Of the six demographic groups described at the top of Table 2, large discrepancies occurred most frequently for the following four variables: percent black, percent who own their home, percent with income over \$40,000, and percent who are college graduates. The large differences in percent of blacks occurred in four of the nine districts (8, 12, 22, and 23). Large differences in percent of homeowners were also found in four districts (7, 12, 22, and 24). Three districts (4, 24, and 25) had large differences in percent of college graduates and three (15, 24, and 25) also had large differences in percent with income over \$40,000.

In all of these cases, the demographic group described was over-represented at orientation sessions, except for those with incomes over \$40,000; they were under-represented in two of the three districts in which large differences occurred.

For each of the other two variables - percent Hispanic and percent age 65 and older - only one or two districts showed a large difference. Hispanics were under-represented in two of the nine districts (12 and 24). Senior citizens, 65 and older, were over-represented by 21%, a significant amount, in District 7.

Of the six demographic groups, the percent of college graduates and percent of home owners showed the most consistent difference across districts, with over-representation in eight of the nine districts.

Description of Civilian Participants

Many of the residents who participated in training sessions were active members of the community. Some had deep roots, due to length of residency or histories of community service, that were revealed in introductions. They were likely to be experienced in attending beat meetings, which they called "CAPS" meetings, in

¹ The figure of 54 specific comparisons comes from multiplying nine districts by the six variables: percent age 65 or older, percent black, percent Hispanic, percent who own their home, percent with income over \$40,000 and percent of college graduates.

areas where the meetings were functioning. Among them were block club organizers, beat facilitators, presidents of housing associations, and clergy.

Also participating were individuals who did not necessarily live in the beat but had a vested interest in the community. Included were local business owners, building managers, property owners, representatives from the alderman's office, park district personnel, school staff members, and in at least one case, police from an adjacent suburb.

About one third to one half of those who attended orientations continued with problem solving sessions. Most who attended problem solving sessions had also attended the orientation, so with the addition of a few newcomers, turnout at problem solving sessions was typically half or less of the number who had attended the orientation. There were beats in which the turnout at problem solving sessions was significantly higher than at the orientation, but they were exceptions.

Trainers and organizers were cognizant of the need to attract a turnout representative of citizens living in the beat, although they met with varying degrees of success in this regard. More diversity among beat residents was observed at orientation sessions than at problem solving sessions. Diversity decreased as participation in problem solving sessions diminished.

JCPT personnel cited minority groups' fear and distrust of the police as impediments to their participation. One training organizer commented on the difficulty of getting African Americans to attend training sessions in a racially diverse neighborhood:

African Americans don't like the police. They don't trust them, or whatever.

A civilian trainer made a similar observation about the Hispanic population:

I gather the Spanish residents are afraid to come, because some of them may not be residents. Because the police are gonna be there, they're afraid to come; they don't want to be involved with the police.

This fear was recognized by other trainers and was addressed in some training sessions. At one orientation session conducted in Spanish, the civilian trainer told the class:

The problem of immigrants is not just language, but that they are afraid to get involved.

He indicated that the reasons might run deeper than merely their fear of disclosing their citizenship status:

What is your opinion of the police in Mexico? (Laughs break out.) Which of you wanted to be a cop as a child? In Latin America, not many are proud to be a police officer. The salary is low. They have a bad reputation in Latin America.

Observers noted that Hispanics' negative view of police seemed to be at least partly due to experiences they had had in Chicago:

The trainer said that [a female Hispanic] had come to a beat meeting with a group of Hispanic teens, upset that police were harassing them and others like them in the area. The way the police treated them was a major problem for them. The teens said that they weren't gangbangers; they are the future of the community and they want to help.

[A male Hispanic] said that he had a stepson and recognized that youths sometimes got stopped by the police for no reason. He asked the group not to take it as a negative if it happened to them, but to take it as a positive, because it meant that the police were trying to do something in the neighborhood.

The black Hispanic woman said she filed a police report but has heard nothing. Later, the civilian trainer told me privately that the woman's experience with the police is typical. He said, "Their experience with the police has always been negative. They have never seen them as a provider of something that could help them." He added that the practical implementation of CAPS is to have the beat officers work with the community, but that the commander usually tells beat officers to sign out before the problem solving exercise at orientation sessions.

Altogether, three Spanish language sections of orientation sessions were observed. All on the South Side, they averaged seven participants each. They were conducted by civilian trainers alone while police trainers taught the English sections, and there were no local police officers present.

The practice of dividing participants by language was not always well received. In an observation on the North Side, it was a sore point for some of the English speaking residents:

There were no Polish speaking trainers and the Polish speaking residents [who also spoke English] were very upset that the Spanish speaking residents were given a session of their own in their own language. One complained, "The session should be in English. After all, this is America. If they can't understand English, then why are they here?"

Another added:

It should be in English! I have several ethnic people on my block. How can I call them and say anything when they don't understand me? We're not solving anything if we split up like this!

These observations point out some of the challenges faced by the JCPT trainers and organizers in dealing with a city as diverse as Chicago. Beats vary markedly in racial and socioeconomic composition, degree of previous community involvement, and amount of crime. Negotiating these variables while successfully training residents to join and maintain problem solving efforts is a very difficult job.

Police Participants

District police were present at some of the training sessions observed, either in the form of beat officers, watch sergeants, neighborhood relations officers, district commanders, or a combination of these. Although it was the understanding of the trainers that beat officers should be actively participating in the training, many of them did not seem to be clear about their roles and responsibilities in this regard. They were supposed to have been informed about it in the CAPS in-service they attended earlier in the year where, according to the curriculum, trainers were to have told them:

In the coming months, there will be another round of problem solving training for the beat officers. This time, it will be held in conjunction with members of the community, and it will be held on your beats. Trained facilitators will visit all 279 beats in the city - helping you and community members on your beat use the skills you learned in your classroom training.

However, when JCPT arrived, beat officers were not required to attend the training sessions, in all districts. It was encouraged, but only if they were on duty at the time and there were not pressing job-related responsibilities. At some JCPT sessions, beat officers in attendance did not seem to know what the training was all about, or to feel favorably towards it. One neighborhood relations officer assessed the situation:

The sergeant picks at random who should go [to the JCPT training] and the beat guys don't like it.

An observer confirmed that there were beat officers who did not want to take part in training sessions:

The trainer asked the beat officer about a loitering problem that was occurring on the block where three of the residents who were present lived. The officer's response was very sarcastic. He seemed like he didn't want to be here at this meeting.

Beat officers who attended JCPT sessions often left without interacting with residents or failed to participate in problem solving exercises with them, as observers noted:

Once again, the beat officers failed to contribute to the session. During most of the time that they were present, they basically sat talking to one another or to the trainers. They did not engage in any dialogue with the community residents. They also failed to take notes or ask questions about the problems that the group was identifying.

The police officers were conferring in two groups near the entrance. They were not participating in the discussion groups.

Occasionally, there was friction observed between beat officers and civilian trainers, particularly when there was no police trainer present. At one session on the South Side, an observer noted:

The beat officer and the trainer seemed to be bumping heads. He didn't seem to take kindly to her asking him about the status of the police department's technological equipment or her asking him to report out to the group. Clearly, he had not come to the meeting prepared to make any type of statement or report.

A civilian trainer assigned to the North Side, however, reported a contrasting view:

My experience has been that beat officers have participated very well, consistently. But at one meeting, a beat officer stood up and asked why he had to be there, and his sergeant handled it on the spot. He got a CR number and filed a complaint.

When beat officers did attend training sessions, trainers acknowledged their presence and often praised them, even asking residents to applaud them. When they actively participated, observers noted how well it worked:

The beat officers' presence was a definite plus. The community was able to bounce ideas and problems off the officers and get their opinions and suggestions about how they could best tackle the problems. Both were actively involved in the process and had positive things to say to the residents.

The beat officer pointed out that the first location named was technically not on the beat, but across the street. He also questioned the intersection identified as a gang hang-out for the third problem listed, and asked if they could mean Fullerton and Cicero. The group agreed. [I could see the value of having local police present for the input that only they could provide.]

The two beat officers took an active role. They explained the entire organization of the police department and how the watches operate. They presented the information as if they were into CAPS, and kept stressing, "We are here to work with you, and the only way that we can help you is if you call us." They gave out the district phone number. They gave the impression that they were serious about working with the community and lent a positive police presence to the session. This was especially important because there was no police trainer present.

If beat officers were unable to participate, the involvement of other police, especially neighborhood relations officers, lent credibility to the training and punctuated the CPD's commitment to CAPS:

The beat officers left the session early, but it was apparent that their purpose for attending the orientation was simply to make an appearance. The neighborhood relations officer was present throughout the session. I think the group appreciated her comments and responses to their concerns. I noticed that after the meeting, several of the residents went up to her and shook her hand.

[I noted] the commander's eagerness to get involved and answer questions for the residents. The police and the community were also very comfortable and familiar with one another.

But the results of not having beat officers present were also noted by observers - the loss of opportunities for police to become acquainted with the residents they would be working with, to exchange information with them, and to provide reassurance that they would work in partnership with them. Observers reported:

There were no beat officers present at this problem solving session. Clearly, there was a lot of useful and important information provided by the residents. It would have also been good to have a police officer respond to the residents' problems and remind them that it would take time and hard work to solve this and any drug problem.

The neighborhood relations officer spoke up. He said that because the beat officers weren't there, he felt the residents were missing a lot of public safety input.

Some of the police trainers expressed the opinion that beat officers and neighborhood relations officers were tired of going to meetings, feeling that they had too many to attend, with beat meetings, JCPT training sessions, and other community meetings. One trainer believed that some neighborhood relations officers were weary to the extent that they were willing to undermine the JCPT training. He noted that on one occasion when they arrived late for a training session they announced that they had come from "the competing meeting." They were referring to a problem solving meeting held by neighborhood residents who had embraced CAPS in their prototype district.

Participants' Reaction to the Training

Most participants were attentive and cooperative during training, and seemed interested in learning what they could do to fight crime in their communities. The majority appeared to understand the material and participated willingly in exercises and discussions. The most successful training sessions were ones in

which residents were already somewhat organized or active in the community and understood the purpose of JCPT; trainers were credible, compatible and well prepared; the training was interactive; and local police participated.

More training sessions were observed to be successful than not. A sample of these sessions is described in excerpts from observers' notes:

Overall, there was a lot of participation on the part of the residents. They seemed like very organized and cooperative individuals. Many people were actively involved in trying to develop solutions to the problems. Each group had an identifiable facilitator, note taker and presenter.

I thought this was a very productive and well organized session. I got the impression that the citizens came away from the training ready to work as a community on solving problems on their beat. Their level of discussion in the groups was admirable.

They [residents] seemed to work well together and respect each others' opinions. They were very professional and positive. They seemed to believe that together they could solve any problem that came their way.

The residents were listening closely to what the trainers were saying and appeared to find the training informative. Many of them were taking notes and reading the materials along with the trainers. At the end of the session, the residents seemed eager and enthusiastic about the training and the possibility of being able to solve problems in their beat. They also expressed their appreciation of the fact that the trainers had chosen to come and work with their beat.

The community residents were dedicated to improving their neighborhood, and appeared to have a keen sense of what was happening on the beat. People seemed very comfortable with one another and bonded by their common interest of fighting crime in the neighborhood. I believe that this is a group that welcomes the opportunity to implement CAPS.

A few less successful training sessions were also observed; they were some of the early ones. In these cases, either the session dragged on for too long, the presentation was not clear, the trainer was disrespectful towards participants, or participants were unwilling to take on responsibilities. Details are provided in the following excerpts from observers' notes:

The residents didn't seem to be enthused about working on a problem solving exercise. They were actively discussing the task at hand, but some were noting that they were ready to go. Many of them were confused about what they were asked to do. [Note: The participants had been there over an hour and a half at this point.]

Some of the residents seemed to be offended by the way the civilian trainer was speaking to them, and also to the police trainer. He was cutting them off while they were speaking and going on to say what he wanted to say. He did this with several people and there were visible signs they did not like it. One of the residents remarked, "That's why I didn't want to come."

When the civilian trainer asked who would accept the responsibility for finding out some information, all present named one individual there who lived closest to the problem. He accepted the responsibility reluctantly.

As previously noted, most participants appeared to welcome and enjoy the training. There were a few, however, who expressed the view that orientation sessions fell short of their expectations, primarily because of the way they were marketed - as opportunities to engage in problem solving with local police officers. They attended orientation sessions expecting to work with police on real problems in their neighborhoods, not practice. The following observations made at training sessions illustrate their frustration:

A white male about 30 said angrily, "Frankly, this meeting was a waste of my time!" He explained that he thought that this would be a meeting where they could confront the police with their problems, not learn something theoretical - it was billed as "problem solving."

One of the residents who helped to organize the session remarked that people thought it was too academic, that their opinion of the orientation was that, "It was too much like school." She added that a lot of them didn't have much education.

In one group, a black male in his early 50's asked, "Do we have to use the case study?" He did not see the need for using the location discussed in the case study when there were real problems on the beat. A white female in her late 60's repeated his concern, "I don't see the point. This does not affect my own community."

When the civilian trainer asked the participants what they expected from tonight's session, half of them said they came to the orientation expecting to talk to police.

Those who attended problem solving sessions appeared more satisfied that what was promised, problem solving in their beats, was delivered. At one session, an observer noted:

In closing, the trainer asked for a one word evaluation from each participant to describe how they felt about the session. What they said was: "encouraged, do-able, important, interesting, the right direction, invigorating, energy, promising, great beginning, interesting, commitment, motivating, it's a start, interesting, effective."

Participants' Feelings About Community Policing and CAPS

Residents of prototype districts often extolled the benefits of CAPS in training sessions. For example, one said:

We have had CAPS in our area for two or three years now and I have seen some improvement. Neighbors have been able to go to the police and let them know what the problems are in the community, and it has been working.

Residents of other districts welcomed the opportunity to learn about CAPS. Generally, the concerns they expressed reflected their frustration with a perceived unresponsiveness and insensitivity on the part of local police. It would have been helpful to have beat officers present at these sessions to make themselves known to residents and demonstrate their commitment to working with them.

One concern that was recurring was residents' fear of being identified by police as the caller when they reported criminal activity. Observers recorded their remarks:

But they [the police] always ask where you are. Giving your name can be hazardous to your health.

It's a little obvious if I grab my son and go inside, and the cops show up in 20 minutes.

The man said that when the police came they rang his doorbell and identified him. He didn't like it.

Some were concerned that police would be unresponsive because their previous experience with the police had not always been satisfying. For example, an observer recorded:

One of the older white men in the group complained that police didn't ticket these offenders; that a police officer had told him at a beat meeting that he would ticket those cars and trucks that night, and he didn't do it.

Others were unsure of how to meet or establish a rapport with their beat officers, as one observation revealed:

In response to one complaint, the police trainer replied, "You get a hold of your beat officer." The woman said, "I don't know who he is!" [She sounded frustrated.]

Among questions frequently asked by residents about CAPS were those having to do with beat officers' accountability. An observer noted:

Someone asked what the community could do if they found that the beat officers were not upholding their end and doing what they said they would do. The trainer responded, "If that happens on a regular basis in that neighborhood, then individuals can get together and come together as a group who are concerned, without the beat officer and solve the problem."

Often, participants were unclear about the purpose of beat meetings. Observers noted variations in the way they were depicted by both trainers and participants:

An Hispanic woman related that a police officer at the local station said they didn't want a lot of people to show up at the beat meetings, that they wanted representatives from community organizations to come and take the information back to their groups. The police trainer told her that that was wrong, that it was "anti-CAPS", and they were giving her misinformation. He said, "Beat meetings are open to the public; if 200 people show up, the police have to deal with it."

The civilian trainer said there will be a change in the way the beat meetings operate between now [May] and the fall. A black female participant in her 50's stated, "More community people will run the meetings instead of just the police." The trainer explained the change. He said the beat meetings were currently run by Neighborhood Relations officers; now, the meetings were to be co-planned and run by the beat officers and the community. "There will be a new partnership."

Someone in the audience asked a question about beat meetings. The civilian trainer replied, "That's like a 911 meeting where police sit in a line behind a table and people throw complaints at them."

At one session, a neighborhood relations officer told residents how they could benefit from their beat meetings:

Your beat meetings have not gotten into bad habits yet; you can make the beat meetings work. Don't come in and make it a 911 session. You can make it the good, productive meeting that it should be. We can't just hope that the police will do everything for you.

Participants were also curious about whose responsibility it would be to educate the rest of the community in how to do problem solving. Most caught on quickly, as noted by an observer:

[A female] said she could see that, "We're going to be the people who are the coordinators when it comes down to it."

Yet, a few seemed to feel helpless when it came to encouraging community participation, as one observation illustrated:

The trainer said, “We all know people who don’t want to do anything. Tell them about your successes. This will help to get them involved.” A black female in her late 40’s responded, “We can’t encourage people to get involved.” Another black female in her late 40’s added, “I try to, and they say, ‘You do it.’” The trainer said, “Try to get a commitment out of them.” Everybody started to talk at one time. They all were saying that they had worked to get people to become involved and had failed.

Participants’ feelings about community policing and CAPS were also measured by the survey instrument, administered to them in JCPT orientation sessions before they were exposed to the training. The data collected so far indicates that generally, participants are more optimistic than pessimistic about the ability of community policing to succeed; however, the large proportion of neutral responses indicates a significant degree of uncertainty.

The questionnaire asked participants’ opinions about the CPD’s ability to successfully carry out community policing, and the extent to which they felt police would be open to, trust, and rely upon citizen input. As shown in Table 3, most felt positive about the ability of the police to succeed, with 61 percent agreeing that, “Police will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them,” and 54 percent disagreeing that, “Police are so focused on crime and violence in the community that they will never find time to address other concerns.” It is important to note, however, that one-fifth to one-fourth were neutral about each statement.

Participants were consistently more positive than negative about the police-citizen partnership in terms of their expectations about police. Almost twice as many participants (41 percent) agreed that, “Police are quite open to the opinions of citizens” as disagreed (24 percent). Three times as many participants (58 percent) agreed that, “Police will rely on citizen input to help set priorities and do their job well,” as disagreed (20 percent). Furthermore, 60 percent of participants disagreed with the statement, “Police will never trust citizens enough to work together effectively,” while only 14 percent agreed.

Participants also had high expectations about their own abilities to make community policing work, as shown in Table 4. It contains 11 statements that assessed their opinions about the extent to which citizens would be open to, trust, and rely upon police input; and about how responsible citizens would be in taking the initiative to solve crime and disorder problems and work with each other and the police to make community policing succeed. Fifty-four percent disagreed that, “Citizens will never trust police enough to work together effectively.” Forty-six percent agreed that, “Citizens will be able to prevent crimes before they occur,” and 60 percent agreed, “Citizens will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them.” However, about a third of those questioned disagreed with the statement that citizens were open to police

opinions, suggesting they perceived a significant level of distrust among their peers.

More than anything else, regardless of the district in which they lived, participants were most optimistic about the willingness of citizens to involve, recruit, and train other community residents to take responsibility for their neighborhoods. Between 66 percent and 76 percent of respondents agreed with four statements affirming citizens' abilities to perform these activities. About one third thought that citizens' expectations of what police could do to solve neighborhood problems was exaggerated.

Table 5 shows a comparison by district of participants' responses to five dimensions of CAPS, for ten districts.² Each of the five dimensions displayed at the top of Table 5 represents multiple statements from the training questionnaire; they were created by combining statements that deal with related concepts.³ Since data for each of the five dimensions came from a unique number of questionnaires for each district (number of participants answering those questions), the median number of cases is reported in the far right column. An explanation of the scores can be found at the bottom of Table 5.

Table 5 is presented in graph form in Appendix B, Figures 1- 5. Each figure compares responses from the ten districts to a single dimension of CAPS.

Overall, there are not very large differences across districts in average opinion about any of the five dimensions shown at the top of Table 5. The largest range of average responses across districts is 0.53, regarding whether citizens are capable of community policing (Figure 4); while the smallest range is 0.29, regarding whether citizens will play an active role in furthering community policing in their neighborhoods (Figure 5). This means that participants from all ten districts showed the highest agreement with the statement, "Citizens will play an active role in furthering community policing in their neighborhoods," than any other.

Despite the fact that differences across districts are not large, examining the variation that does exist reveals stable differences between participants' levels of optimism about community policing. Each district was ranked in order from one to nine in accordance with how optimistic its participants' responses were to each of the five dimensions shown in Table 5.⁴ The overall rankings for the nine

² In addition to the 10 districts listed in the far left column, a handful of participants also attended training meetings in District 03, which is excluded because there were too few questionnaires to analyze.

³ Listed below are the questions used to create each scaled statement in Table 5. The text for each question number can be found in Tables 3 and 4.

"CAPS is unrealistic" Q2, Q6, Q7, Q10, Q14, Q15

"Police & citizens open" Q1, Q8, Q9

"Police are capable" Q3, Q4, Q5

"Citizens are capable" Q11, Q12, Q13

"Citizens play active role" Q16, Q17, Q18, Q19

⁴ "Optimism" is measured by higher levels of *disagreement* to the first statement, "CAPS is unrealistic," and higher levels of *agreement* to the other four statements. For each of the five statements, the most optimistic

districts are displayed in Table 6. It shows that participants in JCPT orientation sessions in Districts 22 and 23 were the most optimistic, followed by those in Districts 24, 4, 8 and 7. Participants in Districts 25, 12, and 15 were the least optimistic about community policing, comprising the bottom third of the group.⁵

Another use of Table 6 is to compare its findings to Tables 1a and 1b, to determine if participants in the most optimistic districts differ demographically from those in the least optimistic ones. For this analysis, Districts 22 and 23 constitute the optimistic group, and Districts 12 and 15 comprise the pessimistic group. Demographic characteristics which differ noticeably between the two groups are those related to income and education. Participants in the optimistic group tend to have higher incomes and be better educated than those in the pessimistic group.

In the two optimistic districts, an average of 48 percent of the participants reported incomes over \$40,000, compared with an average of 18 percent of pessimistic district participants. Correspondingly, those with incomes under \$20,000 averaged 27 percent in the optimistic group and 55 percent in the pessimistic group.

Also, in the two optimistic districts, an average of 39 percent of the participants reported being college graduates and 89 percent were high school graduates, compared with an average of 18 percent of pessimistic district participants being college graduates, and 67 percent being high school graduates.

In summary, the survey questionnaires completed thus far by 1346 JCPT participants reveal that they are supportive of community policing. They have a great deal of faith in their own abilities to make community policing succeed, as well as having confidence in the police. There are stable, if small, differences across districts in levels of optimism about community policing and citizen and police relations. Furthermore, differences in opinion appear related to the socioeconomic variables of income and education level.

It is important to keep in mind that this sample is small and that the project is in the early stages of data collection; therefore, findings should be viewed with that consideration in mind.

district was ranked first and given nine points. The least optimistic district was ranked ninth, and assigned one point. Under this type of scoring system, the maximum sum of ranks possible is 45 (getting the highest score of nine points on all five statements), while the minimum sum of ranks possible is five (getting the lowest score of one point on all five statements). Scores for the districts included in this analysis were: District 22 - 38; District 23 - 36; District 24 and District 4 - 30; District 8 - 28; District 7 - 25; District 25 - 16; District 12 - 13; and District 15 - 9.

⁵ Only nine districts (4, 7, 8, 12, 15, 22, 23, 24, and 25) were used in this analysis; District 10 was excluded because of its low number of cases.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations are based on: observations of JCPT trainers' and managers' meetings and 31 training sessions between May and November, 1995; conversations and interviews with trainers; and the opinions of 1346 training participants surveyed. The sample of training sessions observed represents 13 percent of the total of 235 training sessions held, and includes 10 of 14 civilian trainers and 10 of 21 police trainers on 21 different beats in 10 police districts.

1. The training process had an uneven beginning, largely due to the innovativeness of the project. Last minute budget cuts and unforeseen circumstances that prevented police and civilian trainers from beginning together also were contributing factors. Had a detailed curriculum been developed at the outset, and had police and civilian trainers been able to be co-trained with it and start teaching simultaneously, many of the communication problems could have been avoided and training most likely would have been more consistent. As of October, when trainers were co-trained with the revised curriculum, they have a clearer mutual understanding of training expectations and improved communication with one another. Furthermore, learning about one another has enabled civilian and police trainers to better understand each other's perspectives and the constraints faced by each.

The monthly trainers' meetings begun in November provide an opportunity for the trainers to continue to develop good working relationships, important to the project goal of modeling the joint partnership. They are also an effective means of communicating internal JCPT issues to supervisors and should continue for the duration of the training.

2. The diversity of training situations must allow for some flexibility in presentation of the curriculum, yet the importance of thorough coverage of the curriculum content should not be overlooked. Since October, observations have shown that, for the most part, key concepts are being communicated successfully even though they are not always presented in a standardized manner. Methods prescribed by the curriculum are not being consistently used - for example, the forms for documenting volunteer actions; however, trainers are compensating by substituting other methods that they find more expedient. There are inevitable tensions between management's desire for uniformity and the need to be responsive to diversity. If project managers are concerned about variations in methods used, steps should be taken to assess whether the prescribed forms and

methods meet the needs of trainers and training participants, and to establish whether alternative methods are acceptable. It is important to do this before training expands to other districts.

3. One of the keys to the success of the training is the modeling of the joint partnership by the trainers. While successful training partnerships formed in some beats early in the process, in other beats trainers were paired with one another for only one or two sessions, and not always successfully; or training was conducted by only one half of the partnership, with mixed results. Training teams should continue to be formed, as has been recently done, to ensure that co-trainers are practiced and compatible and there is continuity in the beat. It is recommended that new teams concentrate more on advance preparation together. Training dates should continue to be set jointly by civilian and police trainers in cooperation with community members so that, whenever possible, the same pair of trainers is able to conclude the training series they start.

4. Most training settings were conducive to training, with the exception of sites with fixed rows of chairs and aisles - for instance, churches and auditoriums. This type of configuration deprived participants of the opportunity to group properly for exercises. Another complication of meeting in churches is the issue of whether it is appropriate to open a city-sponsored meeting with a prayer. In some communities prayer may be expected, while in others people may be uncomfortable with it. This issue was unanticipated and further illustrates the diversity of participants involved in the project, as well as the challenges faced by trainers. Whenever possible, training sites that are better suited to grouping for exercises should be identified.

5. The JCPT program was predicated on the assumption that certain components of CAPS would be in place: beat integrity, beat team meetings, and more intangibly, a pro-CAPS attitude among beat officers and other district personnel. Since this has not yet occurred citywide, it is important for the trainers to emphasize patience and remind citizens that an organizational change this massive takes considerable time to implement.

6. A previous evaluation⁶ completed in June 1995 showed that CAPS training for police officers assigned to district law did not adequately cover working with the community; that their training would have been enhanced by exercises such as mock beat meetings and mock beat team meetings, and videos of actual beat meetings. JCPT training was intended to complement that training, yet the importance of participating in it has apparently not been communicated to all beat officers. For these reasons and, also, lack of experience, some beat officers were not prepared to participate in problem solving with community members at JCPT training sessions. Reinforcement of their training and assistance in implementing CAPS should be provided in each district by personnel experienced with the

program, as soon as possible. Consideration should be given to the JCPT trainers' offers to assist at beat meetings and beat team meetings. The forthcoming in-service for beat officers covering how to run a beat meeting is a step in the right direction. Provisions should be made for sergeants and lieutenants to also receive supplementary training to help them implement the program, since police culture dictates that officers wait for instructions from superiors.

7. More communication about JCPT within the CPD is needed so that all police officers are fully aware of the program. The trainers' initiatives regarding strategizing for training in new districts are commendable. Plans to meet with district commanders and explain JCPT at roll call should be carried out. Using the FOP newsletter as a tool for communicating the importance of the training is a good idea. Internal CPD communications should also be used to impart information about the training project as often as possible.

8. Implementing a city-wide training program in a place as large and as diverse as Chicago has been difficult, because of the multiplicity of cultures involved. The city's cultural diversity requires a broader range of skills than many trainers possess, such as bilingualism. As training expands to more beats, methods to assess and target market needs will have to be developed, and consideration given to the resulting impact on organizers, trainers, and materials. Creative strategies might include identifying key community residents who could fill the role of interpreter at training sessions, or obtaining translators through the city's Department of Human Services.

9. Marketing of JCPT has been limited. Currently, there appears to be widespread confusion about the intent of the training. Some residents already active in local community organizations feel threatened by the presence of JCPT trainers in their neighborhoods, fearing a loss of power or displacement of their leaders. This misunderstanding has caused friction and divisiveness among community residents and between community groups, with repercussions in the city's political arena. Community support is needed in order for JCPT to succeed in the long run. Contact should be made with established neighborhood problem solving groups and the general public to clarify the purpose of JCPT; one way to accomplish this would be through beat meetings.

10. More training sessions were observed to be successful than not. In general, they were ones in which participants were stakeholders in the community; residents were already active in the community and understood the purpose of JCPT; trainers were credible, compatible, and well prepared; the training was interactive; and beat officers or other local police participated. Orientation session participants were generally representative of district populations as described by the 1990 census, and most appeared interested in the training and in the empowerment it promised. Trainers believe that other indicators of the training's success are increased citizen awareness and the visible improvements achieved in neighborhoods city-wide.

11. Survey data collected so far indicates that training participants are generally optimistic about the ability of community policing to succeed. Participants from all districts included in the training showed faith in the abilities of both police and citizens to fulfill their new roles and responsibilities. They also agreed that citizens would play an active role in furthering community policing, including recruiting and training other community residents to take responsibility for their neighborhoods. The degree of optimism does vary slightly from district to district, with the most optimistic districts averaging a higher number of participants who are high school and college graduates and have incomes over \$40,000, compared with the least optimistic districts.

In conclusion, the JCPT project appears to be providing participants with some immediate benefits: improved problem solving skills and hands-on experience in cooperative problem solving at the neighborhood level. Long-term benefits envisioned include producing more organized, involved communities and building the capacity within the community for long-range problem solving, because police alone cannot solve the city's crime problems. By involving residents and other neighborhood stakeholders at the grassroots level, a true partnership can be achieved in which police and the community share responsibility for solving crime and disorder problems. With JCPT, they are striving together to make a difference in Chicago's residential communities, no small task considering the innovativeness of the project and the diversity involved.