

180443

CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION TRAINING
PROGRAM ANALYSIS

180443

Bradley J. Russ
February 13, 1998

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and its grant recipient, The Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC), are responsible for conducting a series of training seminars that focus upon child protection issues. One such training program is entitled, Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE). This 4 1/2 day seminar is designed to provide law enforcement officers, child protective services investigators, prosecutors and other appropriate personnel with information and investigative techniques to enhance their ability to conduct successful child sexual exploitation investigations.

Like most training programs, OJJDP and FVTC conduct an evaluation at the conclusion of the course to gauge student perceptions of the relative value the training provides with respect to the duties they perform. The information contained in a post course evaluation provides insight into the achievement of course objectives, perceived value of the training to the student and instructor competency. However, both OJJDP and FVTC recognize that a more accurate measure of a training program's success lies in its ability to provide students with the tools they need as well as the motivation to **effect change** at the local level.

Motivating and assisting students to effect change upon their return home requires several things to take place. First of all, the training must go beyond increasing the level of awareness students possess about various issues. Well designed training programs illustrate events that students can relate to in their everyday activities and allows them to see for themselves the strengths and weaknesses of their current response. Training should also transcend the lecture process and expose students to situations they have yet to encounter. Students are challenged by a series of practical exercises or scenarios which allows them to measure both their agency's level of preparedness as well as their ability to effectively respond to child sexual exploitation

situations.

The first rule of effective training is to know your audience. Because the majority of CSE attendees are law enforcement investigators, who carry a constant caseload, it is very difficult for them to initiate new programs or procedures. Consequently, the CSE training program is designed to provide students with model programs, policies and approaches and a great deal of previously field tested material that, with minor modification, can be implemented once they return to their respective jurisdictions.

The training design team also recognized that it was unrealistic for OJJDP and FVTC to carry out a program that could train every person who may become involved in child sexual exploitation investigations. Many child sexual exploitation incidents occur in smaller, more rural communities that typically do not have specialized units. Typically, training funds are limited and most agencies cannot afford to fly students to an expensive, week-long, highly specialized training program. Therefore, a strategy was developed to provide regional training programs throughout the country on a regular basis. Because students can select a training location that is relatively close to their community and tuition and lodging are waived, OJJDP and FVTC are able to provide training to the individuals most in need.

The level of student proficiency, prior experience and sexual exploitation specialization varies from agency to agency. Therefore, the training was designed to meet the needs of participants from metropolitan as well as rural areas of the country. Regardless of agency and student demographics, the magnitude of the child sexual exploitation problem, coupled with the complexities of investigating delayed reports of sexual abuse, validates the need for pre-planned and well coordinated systems so that a community can properly respond to these events. Therefore, the survey was designed to explore

the extent to which agencies created or expanded upon formalized systems as a result of participation in the training programs.

Students are surveyed six months after they complete the program in order to assess organizational change that is most closely associated with the training received, while allowing a reasonable period of time to initiate the process within a typical governmental agency.

The method selected to evaluate the program's effectiveness was to develop a survey (Attachment #1) that measured:

1. The student's perception of their own investigative ability with respect to cases of child sexual abuse and exploitation.
2. The student's evaluation of their agency's organizational competence with respect to the investigation of child sexual abuse and exploitation.
3. The level to which the program provided students with new, practical, and useful information, ideas and techniques.
4. The effectiveness of the program with respect to improving investigative skills.
5. The effectiveness of the program with respect to motivating positive organizational change.
6. The level of influence the training had upon students once they return to their respective agencies.

7. The students overall opinion of the course.

8. Demographic data regarding the attendees and their level of experience.

FVTC maintains a mailing list of those persons who have attended OJJDP training programs. Training sites were selected involving students who had attended the training at least six months prior to receiving the survey so that they will have an opportunity to influence organizational change as well as try out new information and investigative techniques to determine for themselves their overall effectiveness. In an effort to survey a broad cross section of geographic locations, agency size, investigative resources, and prior access to specialized training, we chose the following four training sites:

Los Angeles, CA ~ San Jose, CA ~ Charleston, SC ~ Nashville, TN

Seventy-three (73) of the 200 students queried, thirty-six percent (36%), returned a completed survey. The results were then entered into a database and the statistical report is enclosed (Attachment #2). An analysis of this information led to the following observations:

- 100% of the respondents felt that the seminar provided them with new information and investigative techniques that has assisted them in cases of child sexual exploitation.
- 81% of the respondents indicated that the training altered their outlook toward the problems of child sexual exploitation.

- 95% of the respondents have a desire to incorporate the information, ideas and investigative techniques learned at the training into their respective agency's activities, responses and/or services.
- 89% of the respondents have attempted to incorporate the new information and ideas into their agency's response to child sexual exploitation.
- 60% of the respondents stated that the leaders within their agency are considering the implementation of the ideas students brought back from the training program.
- 52% of the respondents have actually implemented some of the ideas they formulated as a result of attending the training program.

As a follow-up to the preceding question, students were asked to indicate the level of influence they believe the training program had upon the implementation of these new ideas and investigative responses. The results were as follows:

Much = 24% Some = 74% None = 0%

Specialized Services and Responses to Child Sexual Abuse & Exploitation

In an effort to gauge the level of specialization each agency possessed both prior to and after the training program, students were asked to choose from a list of model approaches and programs related to the investigation of missing and abducted children.

An analysis of the students' responses is listed in the table on the following page.¹

¹It should be noted, that while the number of agencies involved in specialized services or formalized programs increased in every category, it was not possible to determine the extent to which these programs and services have been implemented.

| Specialized Response or Service Type | # Involved Prior to Receiving Training | # Involved After Receiving Training | Net Increase/Decrease |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Child Abuse Unit | 27 | 30 | 11% |
| Child Exploitation Unit | 3 | 5 | 66% |
| Multi-Discip. Team | 32 | 38 | 19% |
| Abuse/Exp. Protocols | 27 | 35 | 30% |
| Inter-Agency Agreement | 26 | 36 | 38% |
| Investigative Checklist | 21 | 31 | 48% |
| Exp. Specific Policies | 15 | 22 | 47% |
| Internet/Porn Tracking | 5 | 9 | 80% |
| Pro-active Pedophile Inv. | 3 | 10 | 233% |
| Teen Prostitution Resp. | 1 | 2 | 100% |
| Other | 6 | 8 | 33% |

When students were asked to indicate the level of influence that they believe the training had upon their agency's creation or expansion of specialized responses to child sexual exploitation, they responded as follows:

Much = 29% Some = 67% None = 0%

Training Conveyed by Students

One method of determining the success or failure of a training program is to determine whether or not the student felt sufficiently motivated by the information received to pass it along to other individuals. Another fundamental goal of training is not only to provide students with the incentive to effect change in their organization, but also to provide them with the information and resources necessary to carry it out. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the respondents indicated that they provided training and information to other individuals when they returned home in an effort to enhance their agency's ability to

investigate cases of child sexual exploitation. When asked to indicate the level of influence they believe the training had upon this outcome, they responded:

Much = 18% Some = 76% None = 4%

Student Evaluation of Individual Training Objectives

A series of evaluation questions were designed to assess the student's level of understanding, pre- and post- training for each of the core training modules. Prior to developing this portion of the student evaluation instrument, the instructors were asked to respond to four questions (see Attachment #3). The identification of each instructor's core training objectives as well as their desired student behavior outcomes served as the basis for the following information provided by the survey questions listed below:

I. Relationship Between Missing Children & Child Exploitation

Thirty-four percent (34%) of the respondents indicated that prior to the training their agency did not fully understand the relationship between runaway children and the likelihood that these children will be sexually exploited while missing. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the respondents believe that the training program has improved their agency's understanding of this relationship. The degree to which they felt the training was responsible for this improved understanding was:

Much = 29% Some = 66% None = 2%

Prior to attending the training program, twenty-nine percent (29%) of the students felt that their agency did not promptly and consistently respond to reports of missing or

runaway children. After attending training, sixty-eight percent (68%) of the students indicated that their agency promptly and consistently responds to these same incidents. The degree to which they believe the training influenced their agency's response to this issue was:

Much = 22% Some = 66% None = 12%

II. Inter-Agency Cooperation in Child Sexual Exploitation Investigations

Prior to attending the training program, thirty-three percent (33%) of the respondents were not satisfied with their agency's ability to work cooperatively with other agencies to conduct child sexual exploitation investigations. After attending training, forty-nine percent (49%) of the respondents indicated that their agency has improved its inter-agency response to these same incidents. The degree to which they felt the training was responsible for their agency's improved inter-agency response was:

Much = 33% Some = 67% None = 0%

III. Proactive Operations Targeting Pedophiles

Prior to attending training, seventy-three percent (73%) of the respondents stated that their agency was not engaged in any proactive operations to seek out and monitor the activities of pedophiles in their jurisdiction. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the students indicated that the training program improved those operations. The degree to which the students believe the training influenced an improved operational response was:

Much = 39% Some = 61% None = 0%

IV. Efforts to Reduce the Incidence of Teenage Prostitution

Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated that prior to attending the training program their agency was not engaged in comprehensive activities designed to reduce the level of teenage prostitution nor did they treat offenders as victims of child sexual exploitation. After receiving the training, eight percent (8%) of the respondents stated that their agency either created or improved their program to reduce the incidence of teenage prostitution and enhance awareness of the fact that offenders are also victims of child sexual exploitation. The degree to which the students believe the training influenced this improved response was:

Much = 83% Some = 17% None = 0%

V. Conducting Interviews With Victims of Child Sexual Exploitation

Eighty-five percent (85%) of the respondents stated that they interview victims of child sexual exploitation as part of their regular duties. Forty-four percent (44%) were not satisfied with their ability to conduct these interviews. Ninety-three percent (93%) stated that the training they received enhanced their skills with respect to conducting interviews with victims of child sexual exploitation. The degree to which the students believe the training was responsible for the improvement in their ability to conduct these interviews was:

Much = 53% Some = 47% None = 0%

VI. Interrogating Suspected Child Sexual Exploitation Offenders

Eighty-four percent (84%) of the respondents stated that they interrogate suspected

child sexual abuse offenders as part of their regular duties. Forty-four percent (44%) were not satisfied with their ability to conduct these interviews. Ninety percent (90%) of the students stated that the training they received enhanced their skills with respect to interrogating offenders. The degree to which the students believe the training was responsible for the improvement in their ability to conduct these interviews was:

Much = 53% Some = 47% None = 0%

VII. Victim Advocate Programs

Forty-eight percent (48%) of the respondents stated that their agencies did not make full use of the services provided by Victim Advocate programs when involved in child sexual exploitation investigations. After attending training, sixty-two percent (62%) of the students indicate that their agency now makes full use of Victim Advocate services. The degree to which the students believe the training influenced their agencies increased use of these services was:

Much = 20% Some = 73% None = 7%

VIII. Legal Issues

Twenty-five percent (25%) of the respondents indicated that their agency did not have an understanding of the issues involved in prosecuting child sexual exploitation cases from the prosecutor's perspective. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the students stated that since attending the training program, they have had less difficulty preparing child sexual exploitation cases for successful prosecution. The degree to which the participants believe the training was responsible for the improvement of case preparation and its

successful prosecution was:

Much = 22% Some = 73% None = 5%

Seventy percent (70%) of the respondents indicated that prior to receiving training, their agency did not make full use of the federal statutes as they pertain to child sexual exploitation investigations. Forty-one percent (41%) of the students stated that their agency now makes full use of federal statutes learned as a result of attending the training program. The degree to which the participants believe the training was responsible for their agency's expanded use of applicable federal statutes was:

Much = 20% Some = 70% None = 7%

IX. Federal Resources

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the federal resources available to assist with the investigation and prosecution of child sexual exploitation cases. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the students indicated that they gained more insight into those resources after attending the training program. The degree to which the participants believe the training was responsible for their agency's improved understanding of federal resources available for CSE investigations was:

Much = 28% Some = 72% None = 0%

X. Obstacles to Implementation

While twenty-three percent (23%) of the respondents indicated that they have had

difficulty implementing the ideas that they brought back to their jurisdictions from the seminar, a higher percentage, sixty-six percent (66%), have not. Eight percent (8%) of the survey participants stated that they have not yet tried to implement any of the ideas they may have brought back from the training program.

Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the students stated that they believed the training they received adequately prepared them to respond to cases of child sexual abuse and exploitation. Only two respondents, three percent (3%), felt the training insufficiently prepared them to investigate child sexual abuse and exploitation. One of these two individuals responded in the narrative section provided in the survey. This student's reason for feeling insufficiently prepared to respond to child sexual exploitation incidents appears to be unrelated to the training program. Rather, it centers upon the student's lack of "experience". A complete list of student comments is included in Attachment #4.

The respondents were asked to suggest any improvements in the seminar methods or the training arrangements. While student comments are listed under question number thirty-nine (39) in Attachment #4, a majority of the suggestions centered around a desire for more time to be spent in several instructional topics.

XI. Student Demographic Information

A breakdown of demographic data supplied by respondents is

Agency Affiliation

- 90% Law Enforcement Agency
- 7% Protective/Social Services
- 0% Prosecution
- 0% Judicial

- 0% Probation
- 0% Medical Services
- 0% Community Service Organization
- 1% Private/Non-profit Organization
- 0% Victim Advocate
- 1% Other

Rank

- 0% Agency Head
- 3% Senior Manager
- 10% Mid-Manager
- 88% Investigator/Field Practitioner
- 0% Other

Years of Experience

- 16% Have less than 5 years experience
- 29% Have 6-10 years experience
- 21% Have 11-15 years experience
- 14% Have 16-20 years experience
- 16% Have 21-25 years experience
- 4% Have over 25 years experience

Number of Child Sexual Exploitation Cases Investigated

- 3% Have never investigated a case
- 23% Have investigated between 1-10 cases
- 27% Have investigated between 11-50 cases
- 19% Have investigated between 51-100 cases

27% Have investigated over 100 cases

Number of Child Sexual Exploitation Interviews Conducted With Victims

- 4% Have never conducted an interview
- 25% Have conducted between 1-10 interviews
- 30% Have conducted between 11-50 interviews
- 18% Have conducted between 51-100 interviews
- 23% Have conducted over 100 interviews

XII. Participation in Other OJJDP Training Programs

The breakdown of the participants having attended other OJJDP training programs is as follows:

- 1% POLICY
- 1% POLICY II
- 3% Managing Juvenile Operations
- 3% Safe POLICY
- 0% Gang/Drug POLICY
- 30% Missing & Exploited Children Investigative Techniques
- 10% Child Abuse Team Investigative Process
- 5% Responding to Missing and Abducted Children Cases (REMAC)
- 0% Missing & Exploited Children Chief Executive Officer Seminar

XIII. Technical Assistance

Twelve percent (12%) of the respondents indicated that their agency has received technical assistance from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in the past.

XIV. Observations

The survey results are overwhelmingly positive with respect to achieving the training objectives set forth at the outset of this report. Students were unanimous in their belief that the training provided them with new information and investigative techniques to assist them in cases of sexually exploited children. Equally remarkable was the fact that ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents indicated a desire to not only utilize this information as part of their own investigations, but they also saw the need for change in their agency's response to the issues highlighted in the course. While twenty-three percent (23%) of the respondents have encountered some form of resistance, over half (52%) have actually succeeded in implementing some of the ideas formulated as a result of attending the training program.

Throughout the training program, instructors stress the need for students to return to their jurisdictions and provide other investigators and their agencies with the benefit of the information and materials conveyed during the seminar. Remarkably, sixty-eight percent (68%) of the respondents did just that.

With respect to demonstrated results, the author is particularly impressed by the reported increase in specialized services and responses to sexually exploited children. The creation or expansion of internal programs and community-based systems formalizes inter-agency response patterns, thereby improving effectiveness and ensuring long-term viability. The creation or expansion of child exploitation units and multi-disciplinary teams provides communities with the ability to continually refine their approach and improve its response to child protection issues. Formalized policies and investigative protocols and checklists help ensure that each individual or agency that

becomes involved during an investigation follows a procedure that complements the desired outcome. The increased use of proactive approaches to target those persons who sexually exploit children will inevitably reduce levels of victimization.

As expected, the survey results for the individual instructional components were varied. Understandably, some training modules target high profile situations and evoke more interest or concern because of the emotions generated by the topic. Despite this fact, students indicated that in all subject areas, their misperceptions were clarified and valuable information was provided. It was clear that both the participants and their agencies have benefited from their training experience.

The survey results regarding individual training modules indicated impressive gains in virtually every category. A few notable examples follow. Knowledge regarding the relationship between missing children and sexual exploitation victimization increased by one hundred and fifty percent (150%). Proactive methods to interdict persons who sexually exploit children increased by one hundred and twenty-two percent (122%). Ninety-three percent (93%) of the respondents stated that their interviewing skills for sexual exploitation victims were enhanced, while ninety percent (90%) expressed similar satisfaction regarding their ability to interrogate offenders. One hundred and twenty-four percent (124%) stated that they have a better understanding of the applicable legal issues in these cases and eighty-eight percent (88%) have an increased awareness of the federal resources available to assist with these cases.

Not surprisingly, the level to which the training influenced the outcomes once the participants returned home was varied. In an effort to reduce the subjectivity of this portion of the survey, the author simplified the typical graduated scales (such as "on a scale of 1 to 10...") and opted instead for a system where students were given three

choices: much, some or none. In eleven separate training components, the average response was that thirty-five (35%) of the respondents believe the training was primarily responsible for influencing changes in attitudes, responses and programs regarding sexually exploited children. Sixty-two percent (62%) felt the training was somewhat responsible for those changes while only three percent (3%) believe the changes were inevitable in spite of the training.

The student demographic information revealed some interesting information. Perhaps some of the resistance to change cited at the beginning of this report is due to the fact that only three percent (3%) of the students were either agency heads or senior managers. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the respondents were either line or field investigative personnel who typically lack the authority to change policy or implement new initiatives without approval from several supervisory levels.

Given the high personnel turnover in child abuse and exploitation units, it was interesting to note that fifty five percent (55%) of the participants had over ten years of experience. Forty-six percent (46%) have investigated over fifty (50) cases of child sexual exploitation and forty-one percent (41%) have conducted over fifty (50) child sexual exploitation interviews. This appears to indicate that the respondents work in larger jurisdictions and have above average levels of experience.

Demographics aside, the survey results demonstrate that the participants understand that significant challenges confront both their agency and their community. While the child sexual exploitation issues raised during the training have no easy answers, both OJJDP and FVTC can be proud of the fact that ninety-seven percent (97%) of the participants believe the training they received has prepared them to respond appropriately to cases of sexually exploited children.

CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION TRAINING PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT SURVEY

NAME: _____ POSITION/
CLASSIFICATION: _____

AGENCY: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY PLACING AN 'X' NEXT TO YOUR RESPONSE.

1. Did your experience at the seminar provide you with new information and techniques about the investigation of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

2. Did the seminar alter your outlook toward the problems of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

3. Do you wish to incorporate any of the information, ideas and techniques that you brought back into your agency's activities, responses or services?

Yes _____ No _____

4. Have you attempted to incorporate any of the ideas that you brought back from the seminar into your agency's activities, responses or services?

Yes _____ No _____

5. Have the leaders of your agency considered implementing any of the ideas that you brought back from the seminar?

Yes _____ No _____

6. Has your agency implemented any of the ideas that you brought back from the seminar?

Yes _____ No _____

- 6(a). If the answer to question 6 is 'Yes', what level of influence do you believe the information you brought back from the seminar has upon your agency's decision to implement those changes?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

7. Before you attended the seminar, did your agency provide any special services or responses to sexually abused, missing or exploited children?

Yes _____ No _____

- 7(a). If the answer to question 7 is 'Yes', please specify by placing an 'X' next to the program or service that most closely describes your situation.

7(a). Type of program or service:

- 0 () Child Abuse Unit
- 1 () Child Exploitation Unit
- 2 () Multi-disciplinary or Inter-agency Team Based Investigations
- 3 () Child Abuse/Exploitation Protocols
- 4 () Inter-agency Agreements
- 5 () Investigative Checklist
- 6 () Child Exploitation Specific Policies and Procedures
- 7 () Internet/Child Pornography Tracking
- 8 () Proactive Investigative Operations to Profile/Track Pedophiles
- 9 () Dedicated efforts to work with Teen Prostitutes
- 10 () Other _____

8. After you attended the seminar, did your agency make changes or plans to make changes in its response to sexually abused, missing or exploited children?

Yes _____ No _____

8(a). If the answer to question 8 is 'Yes', please specify by placing an 'X' next to the programs or services.

Type of program or service:

- 0 () Child Abuse Unit
- 1 () Child Exploitation Unit
- 2 () Multi-disciplinary or Inter-agency Team Based Investigations
- 3 () Child Abuse/Exploitation Protocols
- 4 () Inter-agency Agreements
- 5 () Investigative Checklist
- 6 () Child Exploitation Specific Policies and Procedures
- 7 () Internet/Child Pornography Tracking
- 8 () Proactive Investigative Operations to Profile/Track Pedophiles
- 9 () Dedicated efforts to work with Teen Prostitutes
- 10 () Other _____

9. If the answer to question 8 is 'Yes', what influence did the seminar have on your agency's decision to make changes or plans to make changes in its response to sexually abused, missing or exploited children?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

10. Before you attended the program, did your agency designate someone to conduct child sexual exploitation investigations?

Yes _____ No _____

11. After attending the seminar, did your agency designate an individual to conduct specialized child sexual exploitation investigations?

Yes _____ No _____

11(a). If the answer to question 11 is 'Yes', what influence did the seminar have on your agency's decision to designate an individual to conduct specialized child sexual exploitation investigations?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

12. After attending the seminar, did you provide information or training to individuals to enhance your agency's overall ability to appropriately respond to child sexual exploitation issues?

Yes _____ No _____

12(a). If the answer to question 12 is 'Yes', what influence did the training program have upon this outcome?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

13. Before attending the seminar, did your agency understand the relationship between missing children and child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

14. After attending the seminar, did your agency gain a better understanding of the relationship between missing children and child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

14(a). If the answer to question 14 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on your agency's understanding of the relationship?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

15. Before attending the seminar, did your agency promptly respond to missing and runaway children in a consistent and comprehensive manner?

Yes _____ No _____

16. After attending the seminar, does your agency promptly respond to missing and runaway children in a more consistent and comprehensive manner?

Yes _____ No _____

16(a). If the answer to question 16 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on your agency's response to missing and runaway children?

Much _____ Some _____ No _____

17. Before attending the seminar, were you satisfied with your agency's ability to work cooperatively with other agencies to conduct child exploitation investigations?

Yes _____ No _____

18. After attending the seminar, did your agency improve its inter-agency response to child exploitation investigations?

Yes _____ No _____

18(a). If the answer to question 18 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on your agency's improved inter-agency response?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

19. Before attending the seminar, did your agency have a plan in place for responding to non-family abduction cases?

Yes _____ No _____

20. After attending the seminar, has your agency either implemented or is in the process of implementing a plan for responding to non-family abductions?

Yes _____ No _____

20(a). If the answer to question 20 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have upon the development of a non-family abduction response plan?

Much _____ Some _____ No _____

21. Before attending the seminar, did your agency engage in proactive operations to seek out and monitor the activities of Pedophiles operating in your jurisdiction?

Yes _____ No _____

22. After attending the seminar, did your agency improve its proactive operations to seek out and monitor the activities of Pedophiles operating in your jurisdiction?

Yes _____ No _____

22(a). If the answer to question 22 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on your agency's improved proactive operations to seek out and monitor the activities of Pedophiles operating in your jurisdiction?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

23. Before attending the seminar, did your agency engage in a comprehensive program to reduce the incidence of teenage prostitution while treating offenders as victims of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

24. After attending the seminar, did your agency create or make improvements in its program to reduce the incidence of teenage prostitution by treating offenders as victims of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

24(a). If the answer to question 24 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on your agency's program to reduce the incidence of teenage prostitution by treating offenders as victims of child sexual exploitation?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

25. Do you interview victims of child sexual exploitation as part of your regular duties?

Yes _____ No _____

25(a). If the answer to question 25 is 'Yes', were you satisfied with your level of interviewing competency before attending the training?

Yes _____ No _____

26. After you attended the seminar, do you believe your interviewing skills were enhanced by the information you received?

Yes _____ No _____

26(a). If the answer to question 26 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on enhancing your interviewing skills?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

27. Do you interview interrogate suspects of child sexual exploitation as part of your regular duties?

Yes _____ No _____

27(a). If the answer to question 27 is 'Yes', were you satisfied with your level of interrogation competency before attending the training?

Yes _____ No _____

28. After you attended the seminar, do you believe your interrogation skills were enhanced by the information you received?

Yes _____ No _____

28(a). If the answer to question 28 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on enhancing your interrogation skills?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

29. Before attending the seminar, did your agency make full use of the services provided by Victim Advocates for sexually exploited children and their supportive family members?

Yes _____ No _____

30. After attending the seminar, does your agency now make full use of the services provided by Victim Advocates for sexually exploited children and their supportive family members?

Yes _____ No _____

30(a). If the answer to question 30 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on improving the use of Victim Advocates for sexually exploited children and their supportive family members?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

31. Before attending the seminar, did your agency understand the issues involved in the prosecution of child abuse cases from the prosecutor's perspective?

Yes _____ No _____

32. After attending the seminar, has your agency had less difficulty properly preparing and prosecuting child sexual exploitation cases?

Yes _____ No _____

32(a). If the answer to question 32 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have on the improvement of case preparation and successfully carrying a case through the legal process?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

33. Before attending the seminar, did your agency make full use of the latest federal statutes as they pertain to child sexual exploitation cases?

Yes _____ No _____

34. After attending the seminar, did your agency begin to make full use of the latest federal statutes as they pertain to child sexual exploitation cases?

Yes _____ No _____

34(a). If the answer to question 34 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have upon your agency's improved use of available federal statutes with respect to child sexual exploitation investigations?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

35. Before attending the seminar, was your agency aware of the federal resources available to enhance the investigation of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

36. After attending the seminar, did your agency gain more insight into the federal resources available to enhance child sexual exploitation investigations?

Yes _____ No _____

36(a). If the answer to question 36 is 'Yes', what influence did the program have upon your agency's improved understanding of the federal resources available to enhance child sexual exploitation investigations?

Much _____ Some _____ None _____

37. Have you experienced difficulty in implementing any of the ideas that you brought back from the seminar?

Yes _____ No _____ Have Not Tried _____

38. Was the information, techniques and ideas of the seminar sufficient to adequately prepare you for appropriately responding to cases of child sexual exploitation?

Yes _____ No _____

38(a). If the answer to question 38 is 'No', what was left out?

39. What improvements would you suggest in the seminar methods and arrangements?

40. Please complete the following by placing an 'X' next to the one (1) selection in each category which most closely corresponds.

40(a). **PROFESSION**

- 1 () Community Service Organization
- 2 () Private/Non-profit Organization
- 3 () Law Enforcement Agency
- 4 () Prosecution
- 5 () Judicial
- 6 () Protective/Social Services
- 7 () Probation
- 8 () Medical Services
- 9 () Victim/Advocate
- 10 () Other _____

- 40(b). **RANK**
- 1 () Agency Head
 - 2 () Senior Management
 - 3 () Mid-manager
 - 4 () Investigator/Field Practitioner
 - 5 () Other _____

- 40(c). **YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**
- 1 () 0 - 5
 - 2 () 6 - 10
 - 3 () 11 - 15
 - 4 () 16 - 20
 - 5 () 21 - 25
 - 6 () Over 25

- 40(d). **NUMBER OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION CASES YOU HAVE INVESTIGATED**
- 1 () 0
 - 2 () 1 - 10
 - 3 () 11 - 50
 - 4 () 51 - 100
 - 5 () Over 100

- 40(e). **NUMBER OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION INTERVIEWS YOU HAVE CONDUCTED WITH VICTIMS**
- 1 () 0
 - 2 () 1 - 10
 - 3 () 11 - 50
 - 4 () 51 - 100
 - 5 () Over 100

41. If you have attended other OJJDP Programs, please place an 'X' next to all that apply.

- 1 () POLICY
- 2 () POLICY II
- 3 () Managing Juvenile Operations
- 4 () Safe POLICY
- 5 () Gang/Drug POLICY
- 6 () Child Abuse and Exploitation Investigative Techniques (CAE)
- 7 () Child Abuse and Exploitation Team Investigative Process (CAETIP)
- 8 () Responding to Missing and Abducted Children (REMAC)
- 9 () Missing & Exploited Children Chief Executive Officer Seminar

42. Have you or your agency ever received technical assistance from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention?

Yes _____ No _____

43. Please describe training or technical assistance which you believe would assist your Department with improved responses to juvenile justice issues?

We would like to document and possibly share any improvement your agency made in its response to Child Sexual Exploitation which may be attributed, in part, to our training. If you have developed or revised any policies and procedures or created a new program or approach to enhance your response, please enclose a copy of same with your completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation!

CSETP SURVEY ANALYSIS

| QUESTION# | TOTAL RESPONSES | % | SUM OF RESPONSES PER/QUES. |
|------------|-----------------|------|----------------------------|
| | | | SUM OF % |
| 1 Yes | 73 | 100% | 73 |
| 1 No | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 2 Yes | 59 | 81% | 73 |
| 2 No | 14 | 19% | 100% |
| 3 Yes | 69 | 95% | 71 |
| 3 No | 2 | 3% | 97% |
| 4 Yes | 65 | 89% | 72 |
| 4 No | 7 | 10% | 99% |
| 5 Yes | 44 | 60% | 69 |
| 5 No | 25 | 34% | 95% |
| 6 Yes | 38 | 52% | 73 |
| 6 No | 35 | 48% | 100% |
| 6(a) Much | 9 | 24% | |
| 6(a) Some | 28 | 74% | 37 |
| 6(a) None | 0 | 0% | 97% |
| 7 Yes | 61 | 84% | 73 |
| 7 No | 12 | 16% | 100% |
| 7(a) 0 | 27 | 44% | |
| 7(a) 1 | 3 | 5% | |
| 7(a) 2 | 32 | 52% | |
| 7(a) 3 | 27 | 44% | |
| 7(a) 4 | 26 | 43% | |
| 7(a) 5 | 21 | 34% | |
| 7(a) 6 | 15 | 25% | |
| 7(a) 7 | 5 | 8% | |
| 7(a) 8 | 3 | 5% | |
| 7(a) 9 | 1 | 2% | |
| 7(a) 10 | 6 | 10% | |
| 8 Yes | 24 | 33% | 71 |
| 8 No | 47 | 64% | 97% |
| 8(a) 0 | 3 | 13% | |
| 8(a) 1 | 2 | 8% | |
| 8(a) 2 | 6 | 25% | |
| 8(a) 3 | 8 | 33% | |
| 8(a) 4 | 10 | 42% | |
| 8(a) 5 | 10 | 42% | |
| 8(a) 6 | 7 | 29% | |
| 8(a) 7 | 4 | 17% | |
| 8(a) 8 | 7 | 29% | |
| 8(a) 9 | 1 | 4% | |
| 8(a) 10 | 2 | 8% | |
| 9 Much | 7 | 29% | |
| 9 Some | 16 | 67% | 23 |
| 9 None | 0 | 0% | 96% |
| 10 Yes | 58 | 79% | 72 |
| 10 No | 14 | 19% | 99% |
| 11 Yes | 35 | 48% | 65 |
| 11 No | 30 | 41% | 89% |
| 11(a) Much | 7 | 20% | |
| 11(a) Some | 19 | 54% | 35 |

CSETP SURVEY ANALYSIS

| QUESTION# | TOTAL RESPONSES | % | SUM OF RESPONSES PER/QUES. |
|------------|--------------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| | | | SUM OF % |
| 11(a) None | 9 | 26% | 100% |
| 12 Yes | 50 | 68% | 72 |
| 12 No | 22 | 30% | 99% |
| 12(a) Much | 9 | 18% | |
| 12(a) Some | 38 | 76% | 49 |
| 12(a) None | 2 | 4% | 98% |
| 13 Yes | 47 | 64% | 72 |
| 13 No | 25 | 34% | 99% |
| 14 Yes | 62 | 85% | 70 |
| 14 No | 8 | 11% | 96% |
| 14(a) Much | 18 | 29% | |
| 14(a) Some | 41 | 66% | 60 |
| 14(a) None | 1 | 2% | 97% |
| 15 Yes | 47 | 64% | 68 |
| 15 No | 21 | 29% | 93% |
| 16 Yes | 50 | 68% | 66 |
| 16 No | 16 | 22% | 90% |
| 16(a) Much | 11 | 22% | |
| 16(a) Some | 33 | 66% | 50 |
| 16(a) None | 6 | 12% | 100% |
| 17 Yes | 49 | 67% | 73 |
| 17 No | 24 | 33% | 100% |
| 18 Yes | 36 | 49% | 68 |
| 18 No | 32 | 44% | 93% |
| 18(a) Much | 12 | 33% | |
| 18(a) Some | 24 | 67% | 36 |
| 18(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 19 Yes | 29 | 40% | 69 |
| 19 No | 40 | 55% | 95% |
| 20 Yes | 28 | 38% | 65 |
| 20 No | 37 | 51% | 89% |
| 20(a) Much | 9 | 32% | |
| 20(a) Some | 16 | 57% | 28 |
| 20(a) None | 3 | 11% | 100% |
| 21 Yes | 19 | 26% | 72 |
| 21 No | 53 | 73% | 99% |
| 22 Yes | 23 | 32% | 70 |
| 22 No | 47 | 64% | 96% |
| 22(a) Much | 9 | 39% | |
| 22(a) Some | 14 | 61% | 23 |
| 22(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 23 Yes | 4 | 5% | 71 |
| 23 No | 67 | 92% | 97% |
| 24 Yes | 6 | 8% | 68 |
| 24 No | 62 | 85% | 93% |
| 24(a) Much | 5 | 83% | |
| 24(a) Some | 1 | 17% | 6 |
| 24(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 25 Yes | 62 | 85% | 72 |
| 25 No | 10 | 14% | 99% |

CSETP SURVEY ANALYSIS

| QUESTION# | TOTAL RESPONSES | % | SUM OF RESPONSES PER/QUES. |
|------------|-----------------|-----|----------------------------|
| | | | SUM OF % |
| 25(a) Yes | 35 | 56% | 62 |
| 25(a) No | 27 | 44% | 100% |
| 26 Yes | 68 | 93% | 72 |
| 26 No | 4 | 5% | 99% |
| 26(a) Much | 36 | 53% | |
| 26(a) Some | 32 | 47% | 68 |
| 26(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 27 Yes | 61 | 84% | 73 |
| 27 No | 12 | 16% | 100% |
| 27(a) Yes | 34 | 56% | 61 |
| 27(a) No | 27 | 44% | 100% |
| 28 Yes | 66 | 90% | 70 |
| 28 No | 4 | 5% | 96% |
| 28(a) Much | 35 | 53% | |
| 28(a) Some | 31 | 47% | 66 |
| 28(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 29 Yes | 38 | 52% | 73 |
| 29 No | 35 | 48% | 100% |
| 30 Yes | 45 | 62% | 64 |
| 30 No | 19 | 26% | 88% |
| 30(a) Much | 9 | 20% | |
| 30(a) Some | 33 | 73% | 45 |
| 30(a) None | 3 | 7% | 100% |
| 31 Yes | 54 | 74% | 72 |
| 31 No | 18 | 25% | 99% |
| 32 Yes | 41 | 56% | 68 |
| 32 No | 27 | 37% | 93% |
| 32(a) Much | 9 | 22% | |
| 32(a) Some | 30 | 73% | 41 |
| 32(a) None | 2 | 5% | 100% |
| 33 Yes | 21 | 29% | 72 |
| 33 No | 51 | 70% | 99% |
| 34 Yes | 30 | 41% | 67 |
| 34 No | 37 | 51% | 92% |
| 34(a) Much | 6 | 20% | |
| 34(a) Some | 21 | 70% | 29 |
| 34(a) None | 2 | 7% | 97% |
| 35 Yes | 31 | 42% | 73 |
| 35 No | 42 | 58% | 100% |
| 36 Yes | 58 | 79% | 68 |
| 36 No | 10 | 14% | 93% |
| 36(a) Much | 16 | 28% | |
| 36(a) Some | 42 | 72% | 58 |
| 36(a) None | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 37 Yes | 17 | 23% | |
| 37 No | 48 | 66% | 71 |
| 37 N'Tried | 6 | 8% | 97% |
| 38 Yes | 71 | 97% | 73 |
| 38 No | 2 | 3% | 100% |
| 40(a)1 | 0 | 0% | |

CSETP SURVEY ANALYSIS

| QUESTION# | TOTAL | | SUM OF |
|-----------|-----------|-----|------------------------------------|
| | RESPONSES | % | RESPONSES PER/QUES. SUM OF % |
| 40(a)2 | 1 | 1% | |
| 40(a)3 | 66 | 90% | |
| 40(a)4 | 0 | 0% | |
| 40(a)5 | 0 | 0% | |
| 40(a)6 | 5 | 7% | |
| 40(a)7 | 0 | 0% | |
| 40(a)8 | 0 | 0% | |
| 40(a)9 | 0 | 0% | 73 |
| 40(a)10 | 1 | 1% | 100% |
| 40(b)1 | 0 | 0% | |
| 40(b)2 | 2 | 3% | |
| 40(b)3 | 7 | 10% | |
| 40(b)4 | 64 | 88% | 73 |
| 40(b)5 | 0 | 0% | 100% |
| 40(c)1 | 12 | 16% | |
| 40(c)2 | 21 | 29% | |
| 40(c)3 | 15 | 21% | |
| 40(c)4 | 10 | 14% | |
| 40(c)5 | 12 | 16% | 73 |
| 40(c)6 | 3 | 4% | 100% |
| 40(d)1 | 2 | 3% | |
| 40(d)2 | 17 | 23% | |
| 40(d)3 | 20 | 27% | |
| 40(d)4 | 14 | 19% | 73 |
| 40(d)5 | 20 | 27% | 100% |
| 40(e)1 | 3 | 4% | |
| 40(e)2 | 18 | 25% | |
| 40(e)3 | 22 | 30% | |
| 40(e)4 | 13 | 18% | 73 |
| 40(e)5 | 17 | 23% | 100% |
| 41 (1) | 1 | 1% | |
| 41 (2) | 1 | 1% | |
| 41 (3) | 2 | 3% | |
| 41 (4) | 2 | 3% | |
| 41 (5) | 0 | 0% | |
| 41 (6) | 22 | 30% | |
| 41 (7) | 7 | 10% | |
| 41 (8) | 4 | 5% | |
| 41 (9) | 0 | 0% | |
| 42 Yes | 9 | 12% | 64 |
| 42 No | 55 | 75% | 88% |



September 16, 1997

TO: All CSE and REMAC Lead Instructors

FROM: Brad Russ

RE: Post Training Evaluations

1825 N. Bluemound Drive
P.O. Box 2277
Appleton, WI 54913-2277
Telephone 800-648-4966
TDD 920-735-2497
FAX No. 920-735-4757

OJJDP and FVTC have requested that the CSE and REMAC training programs be evaluated to determine the long term effectiveness of our training programs. To accomplish this objective, we plan to send a survey to graduates of our training programs requesting their feedback. This survey differs from the one filled out by students at the end of the training program by asking them to comment on the role our training may have had upon effecting organizational changes. The implementation of model policies and procedures, the development of a community-based response to child abduction and/or exploitation issues, and the creation or expansion of a specialized unit are just a few of the examples being discussed as survey questions.

So that the survey accurately reflects the type of organizational change your training module advocates, we need your assistance. We need to complete this project by the end of 1997. ***Please respond to the questions listed on the following pages and return the attached document to Cammy in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by October 3, 1997.***

Thank you for your time and assistance. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at 603-427-1500 ext. 403.

cc: Pat Finley
Phil Condu
Cammy Newell

CSE

Child Sexual Exploitation - Nick Battaglia
Missing Children - Gary O'Connor
Child Prostitution - Joe Canibano
Interviewing the Victim - Brad Russ
Suspect Interrogation - Bob Farley
Federal Agencies Roles and Resources - Phil Condu
Prosecution - Dan Armagh
Federal Statutes - Dan Armagh
Case Enhancement/Victim Services - Kristy Brodeur
Managing the Child Exploitation Problem - Bill Walsh

REMAC

Missing Children: An Issue Overview - Gary O'Connor
Investigative Case Management - Brad Russ
Family Abduction - David Peery
Nonfamily Abduction - Wayne Promisel/Charlie Masino
Infant Abduction - Stephen Steidel
Reunification of Missing Children - Stephen Steidel
Crisis Media Relations - Hugh Munn
The Runaway Child - Joe Canibano
Victim Impact - Patty Wetterling
Case Enhancement Resources - Phil Condu
Practical Exercises - Phil Condu

Training Program: REMAC

Instructional Module: Investigative Case Management

Instructor: Brad Russ

Please list the primary terminal objectives of your training module. What are the outcomes you hope to achieve as a result of your presentation? (Please list at least 3).

What individual behavioral changes do you hope to affect with your students?

If there were no funding limitations, political issues, bureaucratic barriers or other restrictions adversely affecting your desired outcome for each student, what would you hope they would go back to their agency and accomplish?

What other questions, if any, would like included in the survey?

CSETP STUDENT COMMENTS

| Question # | Respondent # | Response |
|------------|--------------|--|
| 7 a | 14 | Parole - Training Division. |
| 7 a | 22 | Mental health. |
| 7 a | 37 | 290's. |
| 7 a | 39 | #2 was already in place but importance of using CPS etc. has been prioritized for assistance. |
| 7 a | 55 | Beginning to investigate some types of child abuse. |
| 8 a | 17 | To include all runaway reports and crimes by children. |
| 8 a | 57 | Training fellow officers. |
| 38 a | 5 | Experience. |
| 38 a | 14 | Always need more. |
| 39 | 8 | More pro-active training in regards to internet investigations. |
| 39 | 9 | More information and time needed. Most of subject areas appeared to be rushed. |
| 39 | 19 | As presented in a seminar are very informational but need more specific instructional presentations. |
| 39 | 20 | In talking with other investigators attending these classes, it was agreed that it would be great if we could have just one afternoon off to enjoy the city we are visiting. |
| 39 | 22 | Your victim advocate person was more advertisement for Children's Advocacy Center. Improve that portion. Incorporate M.H. utilization to the benefit of L.E. |
| 39 | 24 | Nothing, it's the best training that I have received in 22 years of law enforcement. |
| 39 | 32 | Longer sessions on interviewing victims and perp's. |
| 39 | 37 | More actual case scenarios. |
| 39 | 40 | Maybe one or two more instructors. |
| 39 | 45 | Smaller classes. |
| 39 | 46 | I have been to three schools provided by OJJDP. I would like to see additional seminars provided on school security and related topics. |
| 39 | 47 | As with all schools, more time is always needed. |
| 39 | 48 | More time "like 2 or 3 weeks". |
| 39 | 49 | More student involvement to better network with other agencies. |
| 39 | 53 | Need more training on interviewing victims and suspects. |
| 39 | 63 | More on suspect interviewing techniques, etc. |
| 40 a | 14 | State Parole. |
| 43 | 3 | Child abuse, sexual abuse and child rape. |
| 43 | 6 | Sending several people to the Child Abuse and Exploitation Investigative Techniques class, specifically ranking officers in detectives. |
| 43 | 7 | The training provided by Fox Valley was fantastic. I am hoping that you will provide another program in or near Charleston, SC so that investigative supervisors and some command staff can attend. This quality information needs the attention of my command staff so that these programs can be implemented. Or maybe consider a supervisor's course in Child Sexual Exploitation Investigations. |
| 43 | 8 | My main concern has been to find pro-active ways to stop pedophiles. A multi-agency task force is one way to track predators when time and resources are limited. |
| 43 | 12 | Responding to missing; abducted children. |
| 43 | 22 | Interview Techniques. Multidisciplinary (particularly at PPD). Case Management/enhancement. Custodial issues. |

CSETP STUDENT COMMENTS

| Question # | Respondent # | Response |
|------------|--------------|---|
| 43 | 24 | I can't think of any improvements because I learned so much to use and implement on our Dept. that I had not known of before. I have attended numerous seminars in the past and never obtained the training and information that I have received from your training. I've taken nine cases to the grand jury and received true bills and am preparing for prosecutions in court trials on sexual abuse cases and feel so much more prepared and confident since I've received your training. Thank you! |
| 43 | 29 | Robert Farley did an "in-house" training in interviewing, etc. |
| 43 | 38 | Training would certainly assist us with new workers who become members of our CPI Team (inter-agency). |
| 43 | 39 | Supervisor's training in area of child sexual exploitations. |
| 43 | 40 | Printed updates. |
| 43 | 50 | I have some experience with child abuse cases but my department doesn't have that many cases. The class I attended taught me a lot of new ideas. I believe Fox Valley puts on very informative classes and I would like to attend more than just the one I have attended. I would like to see a class with more <i>in-depth</i> training on interrogation of suspects. I think a class with lesser people but with hands on training with other, more experienced, investigators that maybe are part of a task force. More hands on in the field type training. |
| 43 | 52 | Send us to all your training sessions. |
| 43 | 55 | I cannot speak for my department. Right now there is one other officer and myself who conduct these type of investigations in our area. Most incidents we investigate occur other than on state property, thus getting the primary investigative agency to complete the investigation is difficult. On top of that, the District Attorney considers us traffic officers and rarely prosecutes our criminal cases. |
| 43 | 62 | Our dept. is small but our juvenile problem is large so all of our officers would benefit from the training. |
| 43 | 67 | I am the only child abuse investigator in my dept. I need more help so that I can be more productive in my job. I have had great training but I need to be able to put my training to better use by being able to work more on my cases. |
| 43 | 70 | Additional training for both field admin. staff and developments and implementations of multi-disciplinary teams. |
| 43 | 73 | Combining everything that deals with juveniles into one unit. |