

Internal Evaluation Report
Family Crisis Intervention
Training Program

September, 1974 to January, 1977

51125^{cl}

Internal Evaluation Report

Family Crisis Intervention Training Program

September, 1974, to January, 1977

Peoria, Illinois

NCJRS

OCT 2 1978

ACQUISITIONS

prepared by

Roy J. Wright

of

Illinois Central College

East Peoria, Illinois

This internal evaluation was supported by grant ILEC #1222 LEAA-74-NI-05-0003 (Family Crisis Intervention Unit) awarded by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	1
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	2
TRAINING DATA	7
POLICE PARTICIPANT DATA	10
POLICE ADMINISTRATOR DATA	11
CITIZEN INTERVIEW SURVEYS	12
REFERRAL SYSTEM	14
TRAINING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	19
CASE STUDIES	21
CRIME IMPACT DATA	24
CONCLUSION	27
APPENDIX	30
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR SEMINAR IN FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION	31
PRE AND POST TEST DATA	34
POLICE PARTICIPANT DATA RESULTS	41
PEORIA CITIZEN SURVEY RESULTS	52
SUMMARY OF FAMILY DISTURBANCE REPORTS HANDLED BY TRAINED OFFICERS	55
SUMMARY OF FAMILY DISTURBANCE REPORTS INVOLVING BOTH TRAINED AND UNTRAINED OFFICERS	57
RECORD OF REFERRALS MADE BY ERS COUNSELORS	58
AGENDA FOR CRISIS INTERVENTION SYMPOSIUM	59

FOREWORD

The subject of this internal evaluation report is the training of 162 police officers from Peoria, Peoria County, and East Peoria, Illinois in Family Crisis Intervention Techniques.

Crisis intervention as a police skill has been developed as a definite result of this grant. The program has demonstrated a definite increase in the effectiveness of the police in handling of family disturbance calls. An auxiliary benefit of the program has been the increasing effectiveness of the police in all areas where the use of interpersonal skills are required.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In January, 1974, representatives of Criminal Justice Associates, Inc., visited Peoria, Illinois in order to determine the feasibility of instituting a Family Crisis Intervention Training Program. After a due amount of review and consideration the city of Peoria deemed it advisable to apply for a grant to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice.

A grant in the amount of \$200,000.00 subsequently was awarded to the city of Peoria, Illinois in April, 1974. The specific purpose of the grant was to train 120 police officers in family crisis intervention techniques. The grant was to expire in September, 1975.

The trainees were from Peoria City, Peoria County and East Peoria Police Departments. The majority of the officers trained were from Peoria; however, it was decided by Chief Allen Andrews, that this project be extended beyond the Peoria Department into the other two departments because of their close proximity to the city of Peoria.

The specific objectives of the program as set forth in the grant application were:

1. To design an effective two week training course for police officers for handling family disturbances.
2. Pay the cost of training approximately one hundred-twenty officers.

3. Design from the Peoria experience a curriculum for family crisis training to be used as the statewide certified police training course in family crisis intervention.
4. Fund the development of expert family crisis training teaching resources within the community so that family crisis training can continue as a regular part of police training after the grant project ends.
5. Develop stronger ties with the social service agencies by providing family crisis training to some social service professionals who work closely with the police officers and violent families.

When developing the grant it was determined that this program would tend to have a tremendous impact upon the nature and the quality of police services within the Peoria area.

The grant application pointed out that some of the immediate areas of impact would be as follows:

1. The sensitive and skillful intervention in family disturbances should serve to reduce the occurrence and the frequency of family assaults and family homicides.
2. The presence of trained police specialists in family crisis intervention may have a positive effect upon police-community relations.
3. The personal safety of police officers can be greatly increased through the use of psychologically sophisticated techniques in dealing with highly charged human conflict situations.
4. The professional identity of police officers can remain intact despite their acquisition of the skills and techniques usually associated with other social service professions.

5. Policemen are in an unusual position for early identification of human behavioral pathology and, if trained, can play a critical role in crime prevention and preventive mental health.
6. Police officers can function as generalists and, at the same time, and according to personal capability, can acquire highly specialized capacities within their law enforcement role.
7. Professionals in law enforcement and in psychology can successfully collaborate, each group can realize its primary mission and yet improve its service to the community.
8. Psychological education directed at specific police functions can enhance law enforcement in general and order maintenance in particular.
9. Develop the ability to measure and analyze the incidence of family disturbances requiring police intervention, assaults on police officers, other assaults and homicides that occur as a result of family strife in the city.

When the F.C.I. Program was developed the city of Peoria decided to follow a Generalist-Specialist mode. This concept calls for a selected group of officers trained in crisis intervention to process all family disturbance calls. When these officers are not engaged in family disturbance related calls, they will provide general patrol services.

It has been discovered that this model has some distinct advantages for a department the size of Peoria. They are:

1. The professional identity of the officer is preserved in both the eyes of his colleagues and the general public.
2. It delivers a needed service without sacrificing general uniformed patrol coverage.
3. The patrolman becomes respected in his area of expertise.

4. Through continued in-service training and recruit training in the area of Crisis Intervention eventually all officers will become recipients of the training.

Because of the limitation of time, more than the lack of funds, it was impossible to train all Peoria Police Officers. The city of Peoria will in the future include family crisis intervention training as a part of its own recruit training curriculum. Thus, the training in this area will become a continuous program for the city of Peoria.

Lieutenant George Shadid of the Peoria Department was appointed Project Director of the grant. The city then entered into a contract with Illinois Central College, a community college serving the Peoria area, located in East Peoria. The contract provided for the college to provide Professor Sam Jones to develop and present the curriculum, the Drama Department to provide actors for the role playing personnel and equipment for videotaping and Roy J. Wright, an Assistant Dean and former Police Science staff member to do an internal evaluation of the program.

The original proposal allowed for ten, 80-hour training sessions and after these were all completed a series of 80 hours of field training would be conducted for each of the ten training sessions. It was soon discovered that in order to promote continuity and cohesiveness to the training program it would be necessary for an officer to begin field training immediately after the termination of the classroom portion of the training. Thus, it became necessary to revise the training schedule.

Professor Jones was originally scheduled to spend one-half of his working hours as his involvement with the training program. As the program progressed and the revisions of the training schedule took place it became obvious that Professor Jones' association with the grant would be a full-time occupation for the duration of the grant. The appropriate budget adjustments were then requested and subsequently made in order to provide for his services.

The original budget allocation called for 75% of the funds to be used to pay for the replacement of an officer who was absent from his duties while attending training. When it became necessary to revise the budget to allow for the changes in the training schedule it became necessary to reduce the number of trainees. The grant was then revised to train up to a maximum of 100 officers.

After several classes had been completed the training experience indicated that 60 hours of field training was adequate to meet the needs of the program. The reduction of the field training hours from 80 to 50 hours resulted in a considerable savings in dollars.

In addition to the above mentioned surplus there was also a savings obtained as a consequence of replacement costs not being charged to the grant in some instances, where replacements for officers in training were not needed. It was also noted that attrition and absences have contributed somewhat to lower training costs. When these savings were noted it was determined that additional officers could be trained. A grant extension until August 31, 1976, was requested and granted.

As the August 31, 1976, deadline approached it was noted that a considerable amount of funds were left in the budget and a total of 135 officers had completed the training. A grant extension was requested and subsequently granted to extend the grant to February 1, 1977. As a result of this extension 27 more officers were trained making a total of 162 officers who had completed the training during 13 class sessions.

During the last two classes the field training was reduced from 50 hours to 30 hours. As the program progressed and the trainers developed more expertise they were able to accomplish their goals with 30 hours of field training rather than the 80 to 50 hours previously expended.

TRAINING DATA

The training offered by Illinois Central College for the Crisis Intervention Program has been divided into two distinct parts.

The first part entitled, "Seminar in Family Crisis Intervention" is 80 hours in length. The topics considered in the seminar include principles of human behavior, interpersonal relations, principles and techniques of human crisis intervention and orientation to the social services system. The classroom activities will tend to be participative rather than lecture and are designed to promote an awareness of interactional dynamics and to sharpen conflict management skills.

The objectives of this particular seminar is to broaden the participants understanding of the dynamics of human behavior, and to

shape, as well as sharpen, the requisite skills of interpersonal conflict management. The student earns five semester hours for this course.

The second portion of the training is entitled, "Field Experience in Family Crisis Intervention." This course provides supervised field experience in family crisis intervention techniques. Participants work with qualified training personnel individually and in groups in the development of skills for handling family crisis intervention situations. The student uses his own case histories as the basis of evaluating his performance in the field. Training sessions include 50 hours of training spread over a five to seven month period.

The objective of this portion of the training is to sharpen through the evaluation of actual experience the student's skill in handling family crisis situations. The student earns three semester hours for this course.

The Peoria Training Program depended upon a small class size, (12 to 14 students). The trainees relied heavily upon group discussion, lecture, and role playing.

Students were taught techniques of intervention including defusing, mediating and interviewing. Videotapes were made of simulated interventions, using professional actors. Afterwards the entire class would critique the methods used by the students.

In some later classes officers who had completed the training and had had considerable opportunity to put the training to use were used as trainers. This proved to be an excellent selling point for new trainees.

Several other factors had a positive effect on the attitude of the officers toward the training. They were:

1. The enthusiasm and motivation of the project director and the training staff.
2. The opportunity to use crisis intervention techniques on disturbance calls.
3. The trainees opportunity to discuss with his peers and the training staff his own personal experiences in the application of crisis intervention techniques.

Ninety one percent of the Peoria officers responded in the Police Participant interviews that they felt positive about the training as a result of having used it. The same ninety one percent of these officers felt that the training would help them with their other police duties.

In order to determine whether the F.C.I. training had any effect on the attitudes of the officers the training staff developed a test designed to measure attitudinal changes. This test was administered prior to training and then again just after its completion.

The test itself was divided into three categories: Utility and Need, Knowledge, and Implementation. A complete copy of the test and the test results appears in the appendix to this volume. The results of the test indicate that the training did have some considerable effect upon the attitudes of the participant. In almost every area there was an indication of a positive change in attitude.

POLICE PARTICIPANT DATA

Thirty six officers with the Peoria Police Department cooperated in completing a Police Participant Data Form. The general overall result of the tabulation of this form was that the program gained wide acceptance among the officers.

This questionnaire was developed by Human Resources Research Organization. The questionnaire was to serve several purposes: (1) was to measure the extent of attitude change following the completion of Family Crisis Intervention Training, (2) was to provide a source of documentation on program development and the implementation of the training, and (3) was to obtain background and biographical information on the trainees.

The great majority of the officers interviewed were quick to praise the training. One officer who readily admitted that he quite frequently had problems in some of his personal relationships quickly said, "I don't get my ass kicked anymore on a family trouble call."

Ninety seven percent of the officers interviewed felt that the training would help them deal better with family disputes. Ninety one percent of those interviewed also believed that the program would help them with their other police duties. Twenty five percent of the officers related that the program had a positive effect on their off-duty lives.

Only a very few of the officers interviewed were negative concerning the training. These few officers thought the training would be valuable for those people working in patrol; however, they themselves had no desire to answer family disturbance calls, stating their preference for other types of police work.

Ninety four percent of the Peoria Officers felt that intervention in family disputes was an important part of their job. The data collected indicated that the average officer responded to 4.33 family disturbance calls per week.

One of the measures of success of this program is the attitude of the officers themselves. There seems to be a general feeling among those officers who have completed the training that they are now providing a better service to the public.

A tabulation of the complete results of the police participant data appears in the appendix.

POLICE ADMINISTRATOR DATA

The overall purpose of obtaining data from Police Administrators was to determine their reactions to the implementation of the Family Crisis Intervention Program within the Peoria Police Department.

The Human Resources Research Organization in their evaluation of the program found strong support from captains, lieutenants and sergeants and pointed to this support as one of the more positive aspects of the Peoria Program.

The Police Administrators interviewed in Peoria tended to view the overall effects of the program as somewhat intangible. One of the most noticeable effects seen by the administrators has been a favorable change of attitude among the officers toward the F.C.I. training. They have also noted the development of interpersonal skills among the officers.

Sixty one percent of the officers interviewed in the police participant survey reported that their supervisors were supportative and encouraging in their attitudes. Twenty two percent of the officers reported that their superiors felt the program was important but time consuming. Seventeen percent of the officers reported that they were not certain of their supervisors feelings and none of the officers indicated any negative feeling on the part of their supervisors toward the program.

The officers also indicated that their supervisors did not object to additional time spent on dispute calls and that they were also permitted to consult with the training staff during duty hours.

Command officers at the police department report that there are less complaints being lodged against officers. This is a factor that is difficult to measure for these are the types of complaints where no written charges are filed but where a citizen is not satisfied with the service rendered and wishes to do nothing more than voice his displeasure.

The positive attitude of the Police Administrators toward the program has been a strong reason for the individual officers acceptance of the training and a major factor in the program's success.

CITIZEN INTERVIEW SURVEYS

As a portion of the national evaluation the Human Resources Research Organization conducted two citizen surveys in each city including Peoria.

Names and addresses were identified, of all citizens who had been visited by the police within a three month period as a result of a family dispute.

In the first survey all citizens had been visited by untrained police. In the second survey all citizens had been visited by trained police.

From the list of names a random selection of 50 names was made. Letters were then mailed to those selected briefly explaining the Family Crisis Intervention program and requesting cooperation from them as respondents to the survey.

The purpose of this survey was to measure citizen attitudes towards the police as crisis interveners and to attempt to determine if these attitudes changed after police had received training.

Some of the key questions ask in the citizen survey indicated some very significant changes in the citizens attitudes.

Question: After they arrived, did the officers get everyone to relax?

Answer:

Prior to Training		Subsequent to Training			
Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	? %	Not Appl. %
60	32	81.6	10.2	6.1	2.0

Question: Did the officers seem more interested in keeping you quiet than in helping you solve the problem?

Answer:

Prior to Training		Subsequent to Training			
Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	? %	Not Appl. %
30	58	14.3	77.6	4.1	4.1

Question: Did they (officers) give you the name of a person or a place to contact that would help you with your problem?

Answer:

Prior to Training		Subsequent to Training			
Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	? %	Not Appl. %
50	50	73.5	22.4	2.0	0.0

The majority of questions presented in the citizens interview showed some improvement in citizen attitude. The results tend to indicate that the attitudes of the citizens toward the police have changed and this is having a positive effect on police-community relations. A complete tabulation of the Peoria Citizens Survey appears in the appendix.

REFERRAL SYSTEM

One of the more enhancing developments of the Peoria Crisis Intervention project has been the Emergency Response System. The ERS is funded by a separate grant which has as its objective the reduction of violent crimes. This grant provides for five counselors and one coordinator to work with the police, providing on the spot referral service.

From 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. at least one of the counselors are on duty at all times. They are either in a radio equipped vehicle or in their office at the Allied Agency Center in Peoria. These people respond to a family disturbance call when summoned by a police officer through the police dispatcher.

After 2:00 a.m. and until 8:00 a.m. one counselor is always at home and available if needed and will respond.

From April, 1975, until May, 1976, the ERS system received 470 initial crisis calls. Out of these calls they have developed a total of 867 clients. Fifty six percent of these calls have been police department referrals. The other forty four percent of the referrals come from various social service agencies or direct contacts from clients. Twenty seven percent of the contracts made by ERS are previous referrals who now call the ERS instead of the police.

The disturbance calls to which the police respond are classified into two categories. The first category is the type of situation involving persons who normally can handle their own problems, but suddenly because of some intervening force or forces lose control of a particular situation. In this instance a properly trained officer can come upon the scene and resolve the conflict without any difficulty or fear of reoccurrence, or additional service being needed.

The second category involves the types of persons who seem to be highly emotional. In this instance prevention is not the way to solve the problem. More attention is needed to the situation. After the officer arrives on the scene and calms the situation he must make a determination as to whether further service is needed. If he decides in favor of additional service, he then calls for the ERS counselor. The majority of crisis calls to which the police respond involve the latter type of client.

A critical point in the intervention then is the assessment the police officer makes of the situation.

He must decide whether he can calm the situation himself and leave assured that there will be no reoccurrence or whether to call an ERS counselor. This is where the officers training becomes important. As to whether the correct decisions are being made it is difficult to determine for certain. The coordinator of the ERS program is extremely pleased with the actions of the police officers thus far.

An examination of referrals made to date reveals some interesting facts. The calls seem to begin to pick up about noon and peak during late afternoon and taper off by 8:00 p.m.

The skill of the ERS counselor is extremely important. The counselor is not supposed to carry a case load himself. His job is to assess the situation and determine the proper referral and follow up to see that the service is received.

Things do not always work this way. Often the counselor must work with a family for a period of time, gaining their trust, before they will accept a referral to another agency. Often the counselor goes as far as providing the transportation, sometimes he assumes the role of advocate.

On other occasions the counselor discovers that the family is already receiving service from some social service agency. At times a referral to an ERS counselor may result in the counselor making as high as five referrals from the one case. For example, the counselor may find an alcoholic husband, mentally ill wife, neglected children or some other problem that could cause several separate agencies to become involved with the family. Counselors then do a follow up on all cases.

A great majority of the referrals are made to the Peoria Mental Health Clinic and to the Zeller Zone Center, a mental health treatment facility.

Two types of referrals have been made to the ERS people by the police. One is the right-now referral made while the police officer is still on the scene. The other is an after-the-fact referral where the ERS counselor first received a copy of the report and then visits the family.

For a short period of time early in the program counselors worked only 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. taking referrals after-the-fact. This approach was abandoned when it was found that clients were more reluctant to follow advice of the counselor after first meeting him the following day. He often was regarded as an intruder and "old wounds" forgotten from the night before were reopened. The highest degree of success has been achieved from the right-now referral.

When an officer requests assistance from the ERS counselor they are later informed of the nature of the referral made and the disposition of the case. Approximately 48 hours after the referral is made another disposition report is made by the counselor. A second follow up report is made 30 to 45 days later.

From April, 1975, to April, 1976, a total of 606 reports were made to the ERS personnel by the Police Department. In the majority of these cases the ERS after an initial examination of the circumstances, made a referral to one of the numerous community service agencies. In 106 of these cases the case was closed by ERS personnel and no referral was necessary. The largest number of referrals (102) were made to the Zeller Zone Center, a state operated mental health treatment center.

Seventy one referrals were made to the Peoria Mental Health Clinic. Other agencies that were used frequently were, local hospitals, the Y.M.C.A., an alcoholic treatment center, the legal aid society, the South Side Mission, the Department of Children and Family Services, among others. A complete tabulation of the referrals made appears in the appendix.

A study has been made involving a total of 681 family disturbance calls involving the police from September, 1974, through April, 1976. Out of this total number of calls police have responded to the same location more than one time on only 40 occasions. In 32 of these instances police have returned to the location two times, in six instances they have returned three times, one four times and one five times.

Although there is no way to make a comparison of records prior to the F.C.I. program it is the general feeling of those involved with the program that the incidence of repeat calls has been reduced drastically. Two factors have caused this reduction. One factor is the better resolution of family disturbance calls due to the training. The second factor is a result of the efforts of ERS. Many families having trouble at some later time call direct to ERS and bypass the Police Department.

The Emergency Response System seems to be extremely successful. There is a tremendous difference between the Criminal Justice Agencies and the Social Service Agencies. The difference exists in both the type of personnel and the methods of delivery of service. The ERS has been successful in helping each system understand the other and in coordinating the efforts of the systems toward common goals.

TRAINING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

The National Institute, from the very beginning of the program has been extremely interested in the transfer of technology.

The entire Peoria program was developed and presented by local people. The model that was developed relies heavily upon the expertise of the people involved in the program. This program was developed to satisfy the particular needs of the city of Peoria.

A program that is developed by basing its design upon local conditions and needs is difficult to transfer; therefore, there is no complete package available to transfer to another unit. Despite this handicap there has been a large amount of technology transfer that has taken place.

On April 1 and 2, 1976, a two day seminar was conducted at the Peoria Hilton Hotel in Peoria. This seminar was attended by 33 law enforcement officials and training directors from throughout the state of Illinois.

The program included the following activities:

1. The Function of the Police in Crisis Intervention and Conflict Management, presented by Dr. Morton Bard, Professor of Psychology - Graduate Center, City University of New York.
2. A discussion of the Peoria Project on Crisis Intervention and Conflict Management, presented by Lt. George Shadid, Peoria Police Department, the Project Director, and Professor Sam Jones, Director of Project Curriculum, Illinois Central College.
3. A presentation by Allen Andrews on "The Changing Role of the Police."

4. Videotape presentations were made demonstrating role playing situations in Crisis Intervention and Conflict Management Simulation.
5. A panel discussion was presented concerning the evaluation of the Peoria Project. Participants in the project were Jim Zerban, Coordinator of the Emergency Response System; Peter Wylie, Director of the National Evaluation, Human Resources Research Organization and Roy J. Wright, Local Project Evaluator.

Participants of the program generally rated the information presented as very helpful to extremely helpful.

As a result of the seminar several of the Criminal Justice planning regions in Illinois are seeking funds in order to develop programs of their own. Many written inquiries have been received from the Chicago suburban area requesting information on the development of similar programs.

Observers from numerous cities have come to Peoria to visit and observe the Peoria project. Among some of the visitors have been representatives of Champaign-Urbana, Illinois; Belleville, Illinois; Evanston, Illinois; Portland, Maine; Chesapeake-Portsmouth, Virginia; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Bloomington, Indiana.

Training has been provided upon request to a number of agencies. Those agencies requesting and receiving training were The Southwestern Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, Belleville, Illinois; and The Indiana Center for Criminal Justice Training, Bloomington, Indiana.

Three 3-day seminars were presented, training was provided for the Emergency Response System personnel in Peoria, training was provided for the personnel of the Peoria County Juvenile Detention Center, and for counselors at the Peoria Mental Health Association.

The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has requested that we provide five one-hour videotapes dealing with crisis intervention and conflict management. These tapes will be used in other training programs.

In order to continue Family Crisis Intervention training in the Peoria area Illinois Central College has made application to the State of Illinois Board of Higher Education for funding to provide additional training under the name of Crisis Intervention - Conflict Management Training Project.

The purpose of this project is to extend crisis intervention and conflict management training to law enforcement and social service agencies within the College District. It is anticipated that a total of 84 persons will be trained under this project which will run from July 1, 1977, to June 30, 1978.

CASE STUDIES

An extremely large number of cases are resolved by trained police officers at the scene of a family dispute. Successful resolutions are achieved without resorting to an arrest. Arrests are currently being made in family disturbance cases in less than one percent of all occurrences.

In those instances where the officers determine that some sort of referral and/or follow up is necessary the Emergency Response System is then relied upon. In an effort to demonstrate the relationship between the police and ERS six cases have been summarized.

Not all of the cases show successful conclusions; however the original police problem has been removed from the police and placed into the hands of the Social Service agency where they belong.

Case Study #1

Police had responded to Dan and Shelia X's residence 3 times within a two week period. Both of the disputants were 32 years of age. The trouble stemmed from Dan's heavy drinking and his inability to control family finances. On one occasion Dan had caused physical injury to his wife after which she left home with the couple's two children. Dan called the police the 4th time to ask how he could keep his wife from removing articles from their home but at the same time admitted that he wanted a reconciliation with his wife. Although Dan refused referral services he did agree to talk with an ERS counselor. After meeting with ERS the X's were able to make an adjustment. In a follow up report made some 6 months later by ERS, Dan had given up drinking and Shelia was assisting with the family finances. No further fighting or disagreements had taken place.

Case Study #2

Mr. X, age 19, while despondent told a friend that he was going to jump off the Murray Baker bridge in Peoria. The friend called the police who responded and found X on the bridge. The officer coaxed X into accompanying him to the police station. ERS was called and X was turned over to the ERS counselor for referral. ERS determined that X had no job, could not read or write, was not getting along with his mother and had become very despondent as a result of his problems. The ERS counselor transported the subject to the local mental health treatment center but it was determined by employees there that X was not a serious threat to himself so he was not admitted. ERS then referred X and his entire family to the neighborhood service center for counseling. No further contact with the police or ERS was ever necessary.

Case Study #3

Mr. & Mrs. B, age 22 and 20 had an argument and Mrs. B left home and went to the residence of her parents. Mr. B arrived, forced Mrs. B to leave with him and forced her into auto. Mr. B during the course of the affair struck both of Mrs. B's parents. When he left he threatened to come back with a gun and kill everyone. The parents desired to sign warrants.

This case was referred to ERS. A needs assessment was completed and it was determined that marital counseling was necessary to deal with, (1) Mrs. B's domineering parents, (2) Mrs. B's care of herself and a baby she was expecting shortly. The ERS arranged for the couple to seek marriage counseling and after talking to Mrs. B's parents were successful in having them agree not to interfere with the B's.

Case Study #4

Mr. Y was found parked in his automobile in a highly intoxicated condition. After appealing to the officers for help with a drinking problem he was referred to ERS. Mrs. Y agreed to help Mr. Y attend long-term therapy and marriage counseling. Instead Mr. Y committed himself to the Oakwood Manor Alcoholic Treatment Center. Mr. Y then signed himself out of the center. ERS continued to follow up and encouraged him to attend counseling at the Mental Health Clinic. His wife committed him to Oakwood again. He was released and began attending AA meetings and his wife participated in Al Anon. ERS closed the case. Shortly after police again were called to the Y residence as a result of Y's drinking. ERS convinced Y to return to Oakwood. The next incident to occur was when the police picked up Mrs. Y on the street highly intoxicated. Mrs. Y refused help and Mr. Y who had been released from Oakwood began drinking again. In a period of 6 months police were involved with the Y's three times and ERS made 6 contacts and attempts to assist; however, the case was closed by ERS when both parties refused help for their alcoholic problem. In the next 6 months there were no further contacts with the police or ERS. The exact results of the police and the ERS must really be said to be undetermined in these circumstances.

Case Study #5

Mr. & Mrs. H were referred to ERS after a family disturbance complaint to the police. The ERS assessment indicated a continuing battle as a result of no communication taking place between husband and wife. Marriage counseling was suggested and the H's agreed but failed to appear. The ERS initial contact and follow up provided a moderate amount of counseling but the couple refused to take part in marriage counseling. Mrs. H felt that the ERS assistance was extremely helpful and that was all that was needed.

Case Study #6

Police had responded to the home of Mr. & Mrs. C on two separate occasions because of family problems. On the 2nd occasion the disturbance had reached a point where both parties were physically attacking each other. The officers defused the situation and suggested counseling as an alternative to court action. The couple readily agreed and was referred to ERS. The ERS counselor determined that both marital and alcohol counseling was needed. Referral was made to the Mental Health Clinic and the follow up report indicated a successful conclusion.

CRIME IMPACT DATA

Crime statistics have been studied in an effort to determine if the Family Crisis Intervention program has had any effect upon the crime rate in Peoria. The overall results of this study has indicated that no statistically significant differences have occurred. It should be noted; however, that it was never anticipated that this program would have a direct effect upon the crime rate.

There have been some favorable results noted in a number of areas of the study. No certain relationship can be determined between these changes in statistics and conditions and the F.C.I. training, however, they are those things upon which F.C.I. training was supposed to have some effect.

As an illustration, in 1974 seven officers lost a total of 88 days due to family disturbance related injuries. In 1975 only three officers lost a total of 14 days as a result of family disturbance related injuries. In either year the experience was not great enough to be significant; however, the reduction of lost time is encouraging.

Since the F.C.I. program has been operational the State's Attorney's office has reported a decline in the number of requests for warrants for family and crisis related problems. Since the State's Attorney's office does not as a usual course maintain records of this nature, it is difficult to make a before and after comparison of requests for warrants in such cases.

One of the more positive phenomena noticed in the study was a relationship between the police and persons involved in person-to-person type crimes and instances where the officer was either assaulted, resisted, or obstructed in some significant way. The crimes studied were murder, aggravated assault, aggravated battery, assault, and battery. First a one year period prior to F.C.I. was picked. This period ran from April, 1973, to April, 1974. During this period there was a total of 3,207 crimes that fell into this category. In 257 of these instances the officers involved reported that they were assaulted, resisted, or obstructed in the performance of their duty.

A similar period was chosen to study that was entirely within the period after the F.C.I. program had begun. This period covered the period of time from April, 1975, to April, 1976.

During this period there was a total of 4,148 crimes reported that were of a similar category as those studied previously.

The officers involved with the investigation of these type of offenses reported that they were assaulted, resisted, or otherwise obstructed in only 237 instances. These figures present some very significant comparisons. The category of crimes studied rose by 23% from one period to another while instances of assault, resistance or obstruction declined by 8%.

When officers are investigating the type of person-to-person offenses that were studied they are often times faced with explosive situations. The fact that these types of offenses have increased while instances of assault, resistance, or obstructions of officers has declined tends to imply the success of the F.C.I. training. There are two very plausible reasons that could have been responsible for this phenomena. One is that the officers because of their F.C.I. training are much more capable of defusing an explosive situation and the other reason being that even though the officers meet with hostility they are, because of their training, more tolerant of such action on the part of a disputant. The officers seem to be concentrating more upon using their expertise to defuse and seem to be ignoring some instances of obstruction or resistance to their efforts and are directing their efforts in favor of a satisfactory resolution to the situation.

Further examination of the period of April, 1973, to April, 1974, reveals that police records record a total of 244 family disturbance reports. During the period of time from April, 1975, to April, 1976; however, a total of 442 family disturbance calls were recorded. This is an 81% increase in family disturbance calls over a two year period.

This increase is actually not as large as it appears on the surface. Prior to the F.C.I. program family disturbance calls had very little special significance and were at the reporting officers discretion either recorded as a family disturbance or as a general trouble call. It was not until after the implementation of the F.C.I. program that family disturbance reports held any special significance and a special effort was made to record them as such. Thus it is impossible to make an accurate before and after comparison of these statistics.

CONCLUSION

The Peoria Family Crisis Intervention Program must be termed a success. A total of 162 officers were eventually trained under the grant, whereas original estimates only indicated 122 officers would be trained.

Family crisis training will continue in the Peoria area by virtue of a grant from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Expert family crisis teaching resources have been developed in the area so that the program can be perpetuated.

One of the outstanding aspects of the program has been the development of stronger ties between the police department and the area social service agencies. Much credit must go to the Emergency Response System for this.

The program also had as one of its objectives the development of a statewide certified police training program in family crisis intervention. To date no statewide application of the program has developed; however, numerous agencies have made inquiries or are attempting to develop programs on their own.

The program has had no apparent effect on the crime rate. It has however had a tremendous effect on officers attitudes and some effect on the attitude of the public as evidenced by the studies completed in conjunction with the program.

There are few arrests as a result of family disturbances, only in about one percent of the cases. Obviously, there is much time saved as a result of less prisoner processing and court appearances which although unmeasurable can be thought of as dollars saved.

The program seems to have achieved its desired effect. Police involvement with a family in a continuous sequence of family disturbance situations has diminished, family related disturbances are being removed from the courts and the prosecutors office. The families involved in crisis situations are now receiving services directed towards alleviating their problems without resorting to the Criminal Justice System.

The Peoria program has recently been expanded. The ERS component now provides services to both Peoria City and Peoria County. This expansion took place after a large number of Peoria County Deputies had been trained.

There is reason for caution. Now that the training program has been completed in Peoria the F.C.I. program is in danger of being institutionalized and demphasized.

During the life of the training program, field training sessions constantly reinforced the officers interests in the F.C.I. program. Sam Jones, the trainer, is no longer providing this reinforcement. George Shadid, the Project Director is now Peoria County Sheriff.

It may not necessarily happen but without reinforcement of some sort the importance of the F.C.I. program may in time dwindle.

A P P E N D I X

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR
SEMINAR IN FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION

Background and Rationale:

In our society pressures associated with rapid social change, alienation, increasing population density, and the complexities of economic competition, subject the individual and the family to stresses which, at times, may be overwhelming. For all classes of people the resulting frustration often makes a volatile, aggressive mixture which erupts in family or neighborhood conflict or violence. These crisis situations often deteriorate to the point that third-party intervention becomes necessary - and the police are the usual third-party.

It has become apparent that this intervention is a role which requires the skills of interpersonal conflict management, especially if the crisis situation has reached the point where violence may be an outcome. Studies demonstrate that there is a strong relationship between family violence and crime, particularly homicide. Therefore, it seems advisable, if not imperative, (if for no other reason than personal safety) that police officers in the role of intervenor be equipped with conflict management skills that will enable them to deal effectively with family crisis disputants.

Following this line of reasoning the U.S. Department of Justice conducted a demonstration training project in New York City during the late 1960's. The project was designed and directed by Dr. Morton Bard, a psychologist and former policeman. The overall objective of the program was to improve police officers' skills in the handling of family crisis situations. The participants were given four weeks of intensive classroom instruction by a behavioral science staff. This training was followed by a period of supervised field experience. Evaluation of the project's effectiveness revealed that the intensive training enhanced significantly officers conflict management skills.

Subsequently, the U.S. Department of Justice through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration allocated two million dollars for the purpose of conducting comparable training programs for the police in select cities across the country. The Police Department of Peoria submitted a grant proposal for training funds. In April of 1974 they were awarded \$200,000 from LEAA to train 100 police officers in family crisis intervention techniques. The grant covers the time period of April, 1974, to September, 1975. This training project is one of six being conducted. If successful, Peoria may become the police training center in the State of Illinois for family crisis intervention.

According to the grant proposal, Illinois Central College (the behavioral science staff in particular) has been designated as the training agent in this project. After the grant expires the training will be a part of the new recruit training program presently required for new officers.

The training will consist of two major stages: 1) 80 hours of formal, intensive classroom instruction and, 2) 80 hours of supervised in-service field training. (This training model is patterned after the one used in New York City and capitalizes on the benefits of the cognitive and experiential aspects of learning.) The participants will be trained in small groups (10-15 each) beginning in the Fall of 1974 and continuing until all of the participants have completed the two-week seminars. The formal classroom training is anticipated as being completed in February, 1975. Thereafter, the training staff will work with the policemen in the field. The staff of Illinois Central College that will be involved in this project include: Samuel C. Jones, Professor of Psychology, who will be coordinating and providing the instruction for the policemen and, Dr. Roy Wright, Assistant Dean of Instruction, whose function will be to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the program. Lt. George Shadid of the Peoria Police Department will be coordinating the overall project grant.

Course Descriptions:

PSY 286 - 5 Seminar in Family Crisis Intervention

Prerequisite: Division approval

Topics to be considered in the seminar include principles of human behavior, interpersonal relations, principles and techniques of human crisis intervention and orientation to the social services system. The classroom activities will tend to be participative rather than lecture and are designed to promote an awareness of interactional dynamics and to sharpen conflict management skills.

Hours per week: By division assignment

Credit: Five semester hours

Objectives: The objectives are to broaden participants understanding of the dynamics of human behavior, and to shape, as well as sharpen, the requisite skills for interpersonal conflict management.

Materials of Instruction: The materials of instructions include selected articles, films, and videotapes provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Evaluation: Participants will be evaluated on the basis of criteria established by the training staff and seminar participants. Emphasis will be placed on self-evaluation and evaluation via group feedback. Rating scales appear to be the likely format.

PSY 287 - 3 Field Experience in Family Crisis Intervention

Prerequisite: PSY 286 - 5, and Divisional approval

This course provided supervised field experience in family crisis intervention techniques. Participants will work with qualified training personnel individually and as groups in the development of skills for handling family crisis intervention situations. The student will use his own case histories as the basis of evaluating his performance in the field.

Hours per week: By division assignment
Credit: Three semester hours

Objectives: The objective is to sharpen through the evaluation of actual experience the student's skill in handling family crisis situations.

Materials of Instruction: The materials of instruction will be actual case histories provided by the student.

Evaluation: Participants will be evaluated on the basis of criteria established by the training staff and seminar participants. Emphasis will be placed on self-evaluation and evaluation via group feedback. Rating scales appear to be the likely format.

The following attachment contains the results of a pre and post test that was administered to all of the officers who were enrolled in the Crisis Intervention Training. The purpose of administering this test was to determine and measure the attitude changes of the officers that were involved with the program.

CATERGORY: UTILITY & NEED

PRETEST N = 162

POST TEST N = 158

A POLICEMAN WITH STREET EXPERIENCE DOESN'T NEED SOCIAL TRAINING TO EFFECTIVELY HANDLE VIOLENT OR MENTALLY UPSET PEOPLE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	2	4	7	63	24
POST %	0	4	6	58	32

TRAINING SITUATIONS WHICH REQUIRE THE POLICEMAN TO VERBALLY DEFEND HIS DECISIONS IN HANDLING SIMULATED CRISIS EVENTS ARE OF LITTLE VALUE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	1	6	15	68	10
POST %	1	4	4	66	25

POLICE COULD BENEFIT FROM ANALYZING THEIR ACTIONS IN FRONT OF OTHERS MUCH AS IS DONE BY PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL PLAYERS, WHO DISCUSS FILMS OF THEIR PRACTICE SESSIONS.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	14	74	7	4	1
POST %	37	57	4	1	1

THE POLICE COULD PROBABLY PREVENT A LOT OF ASSULTS AND HOMICIDES IF THEY WERE MORE EFFECTIVE IN DEALING WITH FAMILY DIFFICULTIES.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	17	55	14	13	1
POST %	23	70	5	2	0

THE USUAL ROLE OF THE POLICEMAN IS ONE WHICH LEADS NATURALLY TO HIS BECOMING INVOLVED AS A THIRD PARTY IN INTERPERSONAL CONFLICTS.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	12	70	4	4	1
POST %	17	71	3	8	1

THE FCI PROJECT, IN YOUR COMMUNITY WILL HELP IMPROVE POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS MORE THAN REDUCING THE AMOUNT OF CRIME

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	3	47	30	20	0
POST %	12	42	15	30	1

CATERGORY: KNOWLEDGE

PRETEST N = 162

POST TEST N = 158

EXCESSIVE DRINKING IS USUALLY THE CAUSE OF MOST FAMILY DISTRUBANCES.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	11	46	10	27	6
POST %	2	35	8	44	11

PERSONS IN A HOSTILE ARGUMENT CAN ALWAYS BE QUIETED DOWN BY A THREAT OF ARREST.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	1	2	67	30
POST %	0	0	3	66	31

IT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH SOUND POLICE PRACTICE AND, PERHAPS ILLEGAL, FOR A POLICE OFFICER TO SUGGEST REMEDIES TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN A FAMILY DISTURBANCE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	1	3	4	69	23
POST %	1	2	1	70	26

MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS ARE OF NO CONCERN TO POLICE UNTIL A CRIME IS COMMITTED.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	1	5	69	25
POST %	1	1	1	60	37

CATERGORY: IMPLEMENTATION

PRETEST N = 162

POST TEST N = 158

THE FCI OFFICER WILL BE BETTER ACCEPTED BY THE COMMUNITY IF HE PERFORMS NORMAL POLICE DUTIES AS WELL AS FAMILY CRISIS FUNCTIONS.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	18	66	10	5	1
POST %	16	72	8	3	1

IT IS PROBABLY TRUE THAT YOUR FELLOW POLICE OFFICERS WILL LAUGH AT YOU WHEN YOU TELL THEM THAT SPECIAL BEHAVIOR SCIENCE TRAINING WILL HELP TO PROTECT THEM AT FAMILY DISTURBANCE CALLS.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	1	24	14	57	4
POST %	2	25	17	53	3

THE POLICE SERGEANT WHO REPRIMANDED AN OFFICER FOR SPENDING 45 MINUTES OFF HIS BEAT ON A FAMILY DISTURBANCE CALL WAS CORRECT IN HIS ACTION.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	4	9	12	54	21
POST %	2	1	6	50	41

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLOSE, SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES WILL BE AN EASY TASK.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	IMDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	9	24	60	7
POST %	1	8	14	66	11

POLICE OFFICERS WILL READILY ACCEPT THE FCI PSYCHOLOGIST AS A MEMBER OF THEIR TEAM.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	1	28	37	33	1
POST %	12	40	29	18	1

MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR DEPARTMENT WILL VIEW AN ASSIGNMENT TO FCI AS A STEP TOWARD PROMOTION.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	14	25	58	3
POST %	1	12	31	54	2

THE BLACK COMMUNITY WILL NOT ACCEPT WHITE OFFICERS AS FAMILY COUNSELORS.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	2	17	21	58	2
POST %	1	8	16	66	9

THE FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION PROJECT IN YOUR COMMUNITY WILL STAND A GREATER CHANCE OF BEING SUCCESSFUL IF THE CHIEF OF POLICE AND OTHER TOP COMMAND STAFF ARE ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THE SPECIAL TRAINING IN BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	29	61	5	4	1
POST %	47	47	4	2	0

POLICE ARE ALREADY TOO BUSY TO BEGIN PROVIDING CRISIS INTERVENTION AND COUNSELING SERVICES TO PEOPLE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	2	13	16	57	12
POST %	0	4	9	64	23

MOST POLICE PREFER LECTURE-TYPE TRAINING AND WILL BE TURNED OFF BY GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND ROLE PLAYING.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	12	15	56	17
POST %	2	2	3	41	52

THE BEST THING TO DO IF A FELLOW POLICE OFFICER MAKES CRACKS ABOUT FCI IS TO ACT AS IF YOU AGREE.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
PRE %	0	1	13	71	15
POST %	0	0	4	67	29

POLICE PARTICIPANT DATA FORM

WORK DATA FORM

41

ITEM	RESPONSE	DATA	
		Peoria	Overall
2a. City			
4a. Full-time and part-time jobs before joining force; time at any one type of job.	No previous jobs	1 (2.8) ¹	11 (3.9) ¹
	Less than five years	25 (69.4)	207 (72.6)
	Five or more years	10 (27.8)	66 (23.2)
5a & 6a. Armed Services Branch.	No Armed Services	15 (41.7)	120 (42.0)
	Army	11 (30.6)	64 (22.4)
	Navy	3 (8.3)	36 (12.6)
	Marines	1 (2.8)	15 (5.2)
	Air Force	1 (2.8)	31 (10.8)
	Coast Guard	1 (2.8)	1 (0.3)
	National Guard	1 (2.8)	13 (4.5)
	Other	3 (8.3)	6 (2.1)
9a. Total time active duty (months) (99=any time more than 98 months)	Mean	25.90	37.45
	Standard deviation	15.79	22.84
	Range	5-60	1-99+
10a. Highest rank	E3 or below, non-rated	4 (19.0)	32 (19.8)
	E4 or E5, NCO	15 (71.4)	118 (72.8)
	E6-E9, Staff NCO	1 (4.8)	9 (5.6)
	Above E9	1 (4.8)	3 (1.9)
11a. In combat?	Yes	6 (28.6)	48 (29.3)
	No	15 (41.7)	116 (70.7)
12a. Awards	Bronze Star, Silver Star, Congressional Medal of Honor	0 (0.0)	7 (4.3)
	Other or none	21 (100.0)	156 (95.7)
4b. Number of months on Police Force	Mean	81.67	71.83
	Standard Deviation	53.06	69.09
	Range	14-222	5-60
6b. Present Rank	Patrolman	27 (75.0)	237 (84.6)
	Sergeant	9 (25.0)	38 (13.6)
	Lieutenant	0 (0.0)	3 (1.1)
	Captain	0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)
7b. Number of months at this rank.	Mean	60.64	49.83
	Standard deviation	42.73	47.63
	Range	2-222	1-276
8b. What do you like best about working in law enforcement? (Officer's first response)	Helping people	13 (38.2)	149 (52.7)
	Variety, excitement	14 (41.2)	79 (27.9)
	Reducing chaos, enforcing the law	2 (5.9)	22 (7.8)
	Job security, benefits, pay	4 (11.8)	22 (7.8)
	Responsibility, authority	1 (2.9)	7 (2.5)
	Other	0 (0.0)	4 (1.4)

¹On categorical variables, entries represent frequencies, and percents adjusted for missing values, respectively.

(Officer's second response)	Helping people	9 (33.3)	34 (24.6)	
	Variety, Excitement	8 (29.6)	52 (37.7)	
	Reducing chaos, enforcing law	6 (22.2)	33 (23.9)	
	Job security, benefits, pay	0 (0.0)	9 (6.5)	
	Responsibility, authority	4 (14.8)	7 (5.1)	
	Other	0 (0.0)	3 (2.2)	
(Officer's third response)	Helping people	3 (33.3)	6 (17.1)	
	Variety, Excitement	0 (0.0)	3 (8.6)	
	Reducing chaos, enforcing law	1 (11.1)	4 (11.4)	
	Job security, benefits, pay	0 (0.0)	11 (31.4)	
	Responsibility, authority	4 (44.4)	9 (25.7)	
	Other	1 (11.1)	2 (5.7)	
Total frequency of each response	Helping people	25 (69.5)	189 (66.0)	
	Variety, excitement	22 (61.1)	134 (47.0)	
	Reducing chaos, enforcing law	9 (25.0)	59 (20.6)	
	Job security, benefits, pay	4 (11.1)	42 (14.7)	
	Responsibility, authority	9 (25.0)	23 (8.1)	
	Other	1 (2.8)	9 (3.2)	
9b. What do you dislike most about it? (Officer's first response)	Low pay, poor benefits	0 (0.0)	30 (11.8)	
	Dead end, can't advance	1 (3.1)	5 (2.0)	
	Paper work, red tape	0 (0.0)	21 (8.2)	
	Negative public image	2 (6.3)	23 (9.0)	
	Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies	17 (53.1)	75 (29.5)	
	Frustration on job, inability to help	3 (9.4)	30 (11.8)	
	Discrimination toward women, minorities	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)	
	Some assignments and duties, shift work	3 (9.4)	45 (17.6)	
	Other	6 (18.8)	24 (9.4)	
	(Officer's second response)	Low pay, poor benefits	1 (20.0)	9 (13.8)
		Dead end, can't advance	0 (0.0)	2 (3.1)
Paper work, red tape		0 (0.0)	5 (7.7)	
Negative public image		0 (0.0)	4 (6.2)	
Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies		1 (20.0)	13 (20.0)	
Frustration on job, inability to help		1 (20.0)	14 (21.5)	
Discrimination toward women, minorities		1 (20.0)	3 (4.6)	
Some assignments and duties, shift work		0 (0.0)	8 (12.3)	
Other		1 (20.0)	7 (10.8)	

(Officer's third response)	Paper work, red tape	0	1 (12.5)
	Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies	0	2 (25.0)
	Frustration on job, inability to help	0	2 (25.0)
	Some assignments and duties, shift work	0	2 (25.0)
	Other	0	1 (12.5)
Total frequency of each response	Low pay, poor benefits	1 (2.8)	39 (13.6)
	Dead end, can't advance	1 (2.8)	7 (2.4)
	Paper work, red tape	0 (0.0)	27 (9.5)
	Negative public image	2 (5.6)	27 (9.5)
	Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies	18 (50.0)	90 (32.0)
	Frustration on job, inability to help	4 (11.1)	46 (16.1)
	Discrimination toward women, minorities	1 (2.8)	5 (1.7)
	Some assignments and duties, shift work	3 (8.3)	55 (19.2)
	Other	7 (19.5)	32 (11.2)
10b. How satisfies are you with your job, on a scale of 1 to 10? (10=most satisfied)	Scale values: 1	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)
	2	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	3	1 (2.8)	3 (1.0)
	4	0 (0.0)	5 (1.7)
	5	1 (2.8)	17 (5.9)
	6	2 (5.6)	14 (4.9)
	7	4 (11.1)	36 (12.6)
	8	9 (25.0)	92 (32.2)
	9	8 (22.2)	45 (15.7)
	10	11 (30.6)	73 (25.5)
	Mean	8.39	8.12
	Standard deviation	1.63	1.66
	Median	9	8
	Mode	10	8
11b. Why do you say that? (Officer's first response)	Thoroughly enjoy job	21 (58.3)	116 (40.6)
	Good outweighs bad	5 (13.9)	104 (36.4)
	Poor pay, benefits	0 (0.0)	8 (2.8)
	Dead end, can't advance	0 (0.0)	7 (2.4)
	Dissatisfies with some assignments, duties, shift work	0 (0.0)	12 (4.2)
	Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies	5 (13.9)	21 (7.3)
	Other	5 (13.9)	18 (6.3)

(Officer's second response)	Thoroughly enjoy job	0	1 (2.0)	
	Good outweighs bad	0	1 (2.0)	
	Poor pay, benefits	0	9 (18.0)	
	Dead end, can't advance	0	4 (8.0)	
	Dissatisfied with some assignments, duties, shift work	1	7 (14.0)	
	Paper work, red tape	0	4 (8.0)	
	Frustration from superiors, courts, city agencies	0	11 (22.0)	
	Other	2	13 (26.0)	
	Total frequency of each response	21 (58.2)	117 (41.0)	
		5 (13.9)	105 (36.6)	
	0 (0.0)	17 (6.0)		
	0 (0.0)	11 (3.8)		
	1 (2.8)	19 (6.7)		
	0 (0.0)	7 (2.4)		
	5 (13.9)	34 (11.9)		
	7 (19.5)	32 (11.2)		
12b.	How does your family about you being in this kind of work?	Positive, think it's great	12 (36.4)	93 (33.6)
		Neutral, just a job	8 (24.2)	69 (24.9)
		Negative, worried but tolerate, some positive and some negative	8 (24.2)	88 (31.8)
13b.	What effect, then, does your police work have on your family/ personal life?	Positive, they're enthusiastic	4 (12.1)	30 (10.7)
		Neutral, no effect	17 (51.5)	135 (48.0)
		Negative, disruptive, emotional strain	6 (18.2)	103 (36.0)
		Mixed	6 (18.2)	13 (4.5)
14b-16b.	Do you have any other employment in your off-duty time? How many hours per week?	None	31 (86.1)	193 (67.5)
		Sporadic, seasonal, on-call	0 (0.0)	19 (6.6)
		Regular, less than 10 hrs/wk	2 (5.6)	27 (9.4)
		Regular, 10-20 hrs/wk	2 (5.6)	39 (13.6)
		Regular, over 20 hrs/wk	1 (2.8)	8 (2.8)
19b.	Is there any shift you like best?	None, no favorite	9 (25.0)	30 (10.5)
		Night	11 (30.6)	70 (24.5)
		Day	10 (27.8)	82 (28.7)
		Evening	6 (16.7)	104 (36.4)
21b.	Is there any shift you like least?	None	10 (27.8)	35 (12.2)
		Night	10 (27.8)	103 (36.0)
		Day	3 (8.3)	93 (32.5)
		Evening	13 (36.1)	55 (19.2)
24b.	How many hours per week do you work in overtime?	Mean	5.00	9.18
		Standard deviation	6.32	6.74
		Range	0-20	0-44

25b-26b. Have you ever been wounded or assaulted while on duty?	No	9 (25.9)	88 (30.9)
	Never in family incident	17 (48.2)	132 (46.3)
	In family incident	9 (25.9)	65 (22.8)
28b. On the average, how times a week do you respond to family dispute calls?	Mean	4.33	9.18
	Standard deviation	4.62	9.61
	Range	0-15	0-65
29b. There is some controversy about whether or not police officers should be called upon to intervene in family disputes. How do you feel about this issue?	Should intervene, very important part of job	27 (75.0)	132 (46.2)
	Don't like to, but have to, have to prevent injury	7 (19.4)	130 (45.5)
	Should not intervene in civil matters	1 (2.8)	21 (7.3)
	Other	1 (2.8)	3 (1.0)
30b. How do you think the other officers on the force feel about this issue?	Should intervene, very important part of job	18 (51.4)	81 (28.9)
	Don't like to, but have to, have to prevent injury	6 (17.1)	125 (44.6)
	Should not intervene in civil matters	6 (17.1)	52 (18.6)
	Other	5 (14.3)	22 (7.9)
31b. How important do you believe intervening in family disputes is compared to your other duties?	Most important, first responsibility	6 (17.1)	37 (13.0)
	Same as any call, in the middle	27 (77.1)	181 (63.5)
	Less important, not really our job	2 (5.7)	67 (23.5)
32b. When a police officer is being evaluated or considered for promotion, how much consideration does the department give to his record in dealing with family disputes?	A lot, high consideration	2 (5.6)	4 (1.4)
	Some, part of overall performance	3 (8.3)	33 (11.5)
	None, no records, not important	22 (61.1)	158 (55.2)
	Don't know	9 (25.0)	91 (31.8)
33b. How much consideration do you feel the department should give to his record in dealing with family disputes?	A lot, high consideration	10 (27.8)	46 (16.1)
	Some, part of overall performance	24 (66.7)	194 (67.8)
	None, not important	1 (2.8)	40 (14.0)
	Don't know	1 (2.8)	6 (2.1)
34b. Do you plan to remain in law enforcement?	Yes	34 (94.4)	261 (91.4)
	Usure	1 (2.8)	18 (6.4)
	No	1 (2.8)	6 (2.2)
36b. Do you plan to stay on this force? What type work?	Patrol	21 (58.3)	122 (45.2)
	Other (Investigation, Homicide, Juvenile)	9 (25.0)	94 (34.9)
	Unsure	5 (13.9)	28 (10.4)
	No on this force	1 (2.8)	26 (9.6)

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD

FAMILY CRISIS TRAINING

4c. Had you had any previous family crisis intervention training?	Yes	2 (5.6)	58 (20.3)
	No	34 (94.4)	228 (79.7)
13c-15c. Do you feel that the FCI training will help you deal better with family disputes?	Yes	35 (97.2)	236 (83.1)
	Maybe, qualified, in some areas	1 (2.8)	23 (8.1)
	No	0 (0.0)	25 (8.8)
16c-18c. Do you feel that it will help you with your other police duties?	Yes	33 (91.7)	217 (76.1)
	Maybe, qualified, in some areas	2 (5.6)	25 (8.8)
	No	1 (2.8)	43 (15.1)
19c. How does your participation in the program affect your off-duty activities?	Very negative, completely disruptive	0 (0.0)	30 (10.6)
	Somewhat negative	1 (2.8)	47 (16.5)
	No effect	26 (72.2)	174 (61.3)
	Positive, break in routine, helped me at home	9 (25.0)	33 (11.6)
20c. How do you think your supervisors feel about your participation in this program?	Positive, supportive, encouraging	22 (61.1)	101 (35.7)
	Mixed, skeptical, important but time-consuming	8 (22.2)	40 (14.1)
	Negative, waste of time	0 (0.0)	43 (15.2)
	Don't know	6 (16.7)	99 (35.0)
21c. How do you think those officers not participating feel about this program?	Positive, want to go	3 (8.3)	21 (9.1)
	Neutral, don't care, not interested	3 (8.3)	25 (10.8)
	Negative, waste of time	19 (52.8)	132 (56.9)
	Mixed, some want to go, others don't	9 (25.0)	31 (13.4)
	Don't know	2 (5.6)	23 (9.9)
22c. How do you think those officers who are participating feel about this program?	Positive, learned a lot	29 (80.6)	135 (47.4)
	Neutral	0 (0.0)	8 (2.8)
	Negative, boring, taught the wrong things	1 (2.8)	49 (17.2)
	Mixed, some liked it, some didn't	6 (16.7)	38 (30.9)
	Don't know	0 (0.0)	5 (1.8)

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF TRAINING

4d. Do you feel that this program is being offered at a convenient time?	Yes	35 (97.2)	205 (71.9)	
	As convenient as possible	0 (0.0)	19 (6.7)	
	No	1 (2.8)	61 (21.4)	
6d. What would be a better time?	Before going on duty	1	6 (7.9)	
	During duty hours	0	31 (40.8)	
	After coming off duty	0	2 (2.6)	
	Other	2	37 (48.7)	
	(Spontaneous comment: class should be shorter)	1	40 (14.0)	
7d. What types of instruction, if any, are especially effective in teaching you about how to intervene in family crisis? (Officer's first response)	Staff lectures and discussion	1 (2.8)	58 (20.3)	
	Guest lectures and discussion	0 (0.0)	16 (5.6)	
	Small group discussion	21 (58.3)	91 (31.8)	
	Class roleplays and videotape	12 (33.3)	79 (27.6)	
	Films, Videotapes from other cities and programs	0 (0.0)	13 (4.5)	
	Field Trips	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
	Other	0 (0.0)	13 (4.5)	
	All	2 (5.6)	2 (0.7)	
	None	0 (0.0)	13 (4.5)	
	(Officer's second response)	Staff lectures and discussion	3 (25.0)	17 (12.7)
		Guest lectures and discussion	0 (0.0)	34 (25.4)
		Small group discussion	5 (41.7)	22 (16.4)
		Class roleplays and videotape	4 (33.0)	38 (28.4)
		Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	0 (0.0)	19 (14.2)
		Other	0 (0.0)	4 (3.0)
	(Officer's third response)	Staff lectures and discussion	1	7 (14.6)
		Guest lectures and discussion	2	9 (18.8)
		Small group discussion	0	12 (25.0)
		Class roleplays and videotape	1	8 (16.7)
		Films, Videotapes from other cities and programs	0	10 (20.8)
Other		0	2 (4.2)	
(Officer's fourth response)	Small group discussion	0	1 (16.7)	
	Class roleplays and videotape	0	1 (16.7)	
	Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	0	2 (33.3)	
	Other	0	2 (33.3)	
	Total frequency of each response.			
	Staff lectures and discussion	5 (13.9)	82 (28.7)	
	Guest lectures and discussion	2 (5.6)	59 (20.6)	
	Small group discussion	26 (72.3)	126 (44.1)	
	Class roleplays and videotape	17 (47.4)	126 (44.1)	
	Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	0 (0.0)	44 (15.4)	
	Field Trips	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
	Other	0 (0.0)	21 (7.3)	
	All	2 (5.6)	2 (0.7)	
	None	0 (0.0)	13 (4.5)	

8d. What types of instruction, if any, did you find especially ineffective? (Officer's first response)	Staff lectures and discussion	2 (5.6)	81 (28.3)	
	Guest lectures and discussion	2 (5.6)	9 (3.1)	
	Small group discussion	2 (5.6)	14 (4.9)	
	Class roleplays and videotape	5 (13.9)	72 (25.2)	
	Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	2 (5.6)	8 (2.8)	
	Field Trips	0 (0.0)	4 (1.4)	
	Other	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
	All	0 (0.0)	18 (6.3)	
	None	23 (63.9)	79 (27.6)	
	(Officer's second response)	Staff lectures and discussion	0	3 (6.0)
		Guest lectures and discussion	1	39 (78.0)
		Class roleplays and videotape	0	4 (8.0)
		Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	0	3 (6.0)
		Other	0	1 (2.0)
(Officer's third response)	Guest lectures and discussion	0	1	
	Class roleplays and videotape	0	2	
	Total frequency of each response	Staff lectures and discussion 2 (5.6)	84 (29.5)	
9d. What kind of feedback did you get about how well you were doing in the program? (Officer's first response)	Guest lectures and discussion	3 (8.3)	49 (17.1)	
	Small group discussions	2 (5.6)	14 (4.9)	
	Class roleplays and videotape	5 (13.9)	78 (27.3)	
	Films, videotapes from other cities and programs	2 (5.6)	11 (3.8)	
	Field Trips	0 (0.0)	4 (1.4)	
	Other	0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)	
	All	0 (0.0)	18 (6.3)	
	None	23 (63.9)	79 (27.6)	
	(Officer's second response)	Instructors	8 (22.2)	75 (26.2)
		Other officers	5 (13.9)	19 (6.6)
Tests		0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)	
None		23 (63.9)	190 (66.4)	
Total frequency of each response		Instructors 9 (25.0)	78 (27.3)	
10d. Do you find these helpful?	Other officers 7 (19.5)	47 (16.4)		
	Tests 0 (0.0)	5 (1.7)		
	None 23 (63.9)	190 (66.8)		
	Yes 10 (90.9)	70 (76.9)		
	No 1 (9.1)	21 (23.1)		

12d.	What opportunities did you have to see yourself perform in a simulated family crisis situation?	Only as disputant	0 (0.0)	7 (2.4)
		As officer (only as officer or both as officer and as disputant)	36 (100.0)	170 (59.4)
		Other	0 (0.0)	14 (4.9)
		None	0 (0.0)	95 (33.2)
		Was this helpful?	Was helpful, would have been helpful	31 (88.6)
	Was not helpful, would not have been helpful	4 (11.4)	55 (30.1)	
13d.	When do you feel this type of training would be most valuable to a police officer?	Before beginning police duties	7 (20.0)	136 (48.1)
		After some police experience	27 (77.2)	121 (42.8)
		Both - two-part program	1 (2.8)	26 (9.2)
15d-16d.	How do you feel about the training as a result of using it?	Positive, it works	33 (91.7)	186 (65.3)
		Mixed, sometimes it works	0 (0.0)	39 (13.7)
		Negative, it doesn't work	1 (2.8)	14 (4.9)
		Haven't used it	2 (5.6)	46 (16.1)
17d.	Do you think this type of training should be required for all patrolmen, or should it be available on a voluntary basis?	Required	29 (80.6)	215 (75.8)
		Required for recruits	3 (8.3)	17 (6.0)
		Available on a voluntary basis	4 (11.1)	48 (16.9)
		Should not be offered at all	0 (0.0)	4 (1.4)
18d.	Do you think that both new and experienced officers should be together in the same class?	Together	33 (91.7)	232 (82.5)
		Separate	3 (8.3)	49 (17.5)
19d.	Do you think that both men and women officers should be together in the same class?	Together	36 (100.0)	269 (95.3)
		Separate	0 (0.0)	10 (3.6)
		Don't train women	0 (0.0)	3 (1.1)
20d.	Do you think that patrolmen and rank should be together in the same class?	Together	25 (69.4)	220 (79.1)
			11 (30.6)	58 (20.9)
21d.	What do you feel is the ideal size for a single class?	Less than 15	26 (72.2)	78 (27.4)
		15-19	7 (19.4)	50 (17.5)
		20-24	2 (5.6)	68 (23.9)
		25-29	0 (0.0)	48 (16.8)
		30 or more	1 (2.8)	41 (14.4)
		Median	Less than 15	20-24
		Mode	Less than 15	Less than 15
24d.	What experience should an instructor have had?	Must be (have been) police	6 (17.6)	75 (27.6)
		Need not be police	12 (35.3)	38 (14.0)
		Some street experience, at least as observer	16 (47.1)	159 (58.5)

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

50

4e. Age	Mean	32.61	30.76
	Standard deviation	6.54	7.08
	Range	24-51	20-54
5e. Weight	Mean	177.25	184.15
	Standard deviation	25.94	25.46
	Range	116-220	116-285
6e. Height (inches)	Mean	70.25	70.85
	Standard deviation	2.74	2.38
	Range	63-74	63-76
7e. Sex	Male	31 (86.1)	275 (96.2)
	Female	5 (13.9)	11 (3.8)
8e. Race	White/Caucasian	34 (94.4)	247 (86.4)
	Black/Negro	2 (5.6)	36 (12.6)
	Spanish American	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)
	Other	0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)
9e. Religion	Protestant	17 (47.2)	180 (62.9)
	Catholic	10 (27.8)	81 (28.3)
	Jewish	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)
	Other	4 (11.1)	9 (3.1)
	None	5 (13.9)	15 (5.2)
11e. Current marital status	Single	7 (20.0)	45 (15.8)
	Married	25 (71.4)	211 (74.0)
	Divorced	3 (8.6)	22 (7.7)
	Separated	0 (0.0)	7 (2.5)
12e. Number of years married	Mean	10.46	8.94
	Standard deviation	7.94	7.62
	Range	1-26	1-48
13e. Number of children (if not single)	Mean	2.17	1.81
	Standard deviation	1.34	1.44
	Range	0-5	0-7
14e. Highest grade in school before joining police force.	Mean	13.36	12.72
	Standard deviation	2.02	1.48
	Range	12-21	8-21
15e. Highest grade in school to date	Mean	14.26	13.56
	Standard deviation	2.20	1.58
	Range	12-22	10-22
16e. Plan to earn college	Yes	20 (55.6)	185 (65.3)
	No	7 (19.4)	55 (19.5)
	Already have degree	9 (25.0)	43 (15.2)
17e. Participated in other programs since joining force?	Yes	34 (94.4)	207 (72.6)
	No	2 (5.6)	78 (27.4)

18e.	Earned any certificates from law enforcement agencies (not academy)	Yes	1 (2.8)	62 (21.7)
		No	35 (97.2)	224 (78.3)
19e.	Participation in following activities:	Little League	2 (5.6)	31
		Fraternal Organizations	6 (16.7)	145
		Community Organizations	1 (2.8)	41
		Organized Athletics	11 (30.6)	83
		Other	9 (25.0)	81
20e.	Are there any other police officers in your family?	Yes	27 (77.1)	171 (60.2)
		No	8 (22.9)	113 (39.8)



PEORIA CITIZEN SURVEY

	PRIOR TO TRAINING		SUBSEQUENT TO TRAINING			
	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>?%</u>	<u>NOT APPL.%</u>
1. Did the officers ask for permission to enter before they came into your home?	48.0	32.0	30.6	18.0	22.4	28.6
2. Did the officers ask if they could sit down and talk to you about your problem?	26.0	62.0	20.4	55.1	10.2	14.3
3. Did they seem angry about having to come to your home?	14.0	84.0	8.2	91.8	0.0	0.0
4. Did the officers seem to shout and yell most of the time?	6.0	94.0	6.1	93.9	0.0	0.0
5. Did the police officers threaten to arrest you?	18.0	82.0	16.3	83.7	0.0	0.0
6. Did they stand up most of the time they were in your home?	78.0	18.0	79.6	10.2	0.0	10.2
7. After they arrived, did the officers get everyone to relax?	60.0	32.0	81.6	10.2	6.1	2.0
8. When the officers spoke to you, were they polite and courteous?	94.0	6.0	87.8	12.2	0.0	0.0
9. Did the officers seem very upset with you?	12.0	88.0	16.3	81.6	2.0	0.0
10. Did they insult you?	2.0	98.0	8.2	89.8	2.0	0.0
11. Did they seem to be in a hurry to leave?	14.0	84.0	12.2	85.7	2.0	0.0
12. Did they listen to all sides of the story?	78.0	16.0	83.7	10.2	0.0	6.1
13. Did the officers try to find out what really happened?	79.6	16.3	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0

	PRIOR TO TRAINING		SUBSEQUENT TO TRAINING			
	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>?%</u>	<u>NOT APPL.%</u>
14. Did the officers act as though they wanted to help you?	78.0	14.0	83.7	16.3	0.0	0.0
15. Did they listen to your story without criticizing you?	78.0	16.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0
16. Did you get the impression that they felt they were better than you?	12.0	86.0	12.2	87.8	0.0	0.0
17. Did the officers seem more interested in keeping you quiet than in helping you solve the problem?	30.0	58.0	14.3	77.6	4.1	4.1
18. Did the officers give you enough time to tell them what happened?	82.0	18.0	83.7	16.3	0.0	0.0
19. Did the officers interrupt you much while you were trying to tell them what happened?	18.0	82.0	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0
20. Did you get the feeling that the police officers were not really trying to help you?	22.0	72.0	18.4	81.6	0.0	0.0
21. Did they seem to feel that your problem was important?	72.0	22.0	69.4	26.5	4.1	0.0
22. Did the officers seem to understand what really happened?	66.0	22.0	75.5	20.4	4.1	0.0
23. Did the officers do most of the talking?	20.4	77.6	16.3	83.7	0.0	0.0
24. Did they seem to be confused about what was really going on?	24.0	72.0	12.2	79.6	8.2	0.0
25. Did the officers seem to disagree with each other about what should be done?	10.0	80.0	2.0	75.5	6.1	16.3
26. Did you feel worse off after the officers came than you were before?	18.0	80.0	18.4	71.4	10.2	0.0

	PRIOR TO TRAINING		SUBSEQUENT TO TRAINING			
	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>YES%</u>	<u>NO%</u>	<u>?%</u>	<u>NOT APPL.%</u>
27. Did the officers make any helpful suggestions for solving the problem?	80.0	20.0	75.5	20.4	4.1	0.0
28. Did they advise you to make an affidavit?	38.0	60.0	18.4	73.5	4.1	4.1
29. Did the officers stay until everyone understood what they were to do to help solve the problem?	80.0	16.0	79.6	14.3	4.1	2.0
30. Did they give you the name of a person or a place to contact that would help you with your problem?	50.0	50.0	73.5	22.4	2.0	0.0
31. When the officers left, did they threaten to have you arrested if they were called back?	16.0	82.0	12.2	85.7	0.0	2.0
32. Were the officers friendly and encouraging when they finally left your home?	83.7	14.3	83.7	12.2	4.1	0.0

FAMILY DISTURBANCE REPORT

55

Summary of family disturbance incidents
which were handled by officers trained
in Family Crisis Intervention Techniques.

1. When you arrived the disputants were:				
a. in a physical struggle				<u>29</u>
b. arguing				<u>127</u>
c. not talking				<u>87</u>
d. engaged in quiet discussion				<u>26</u>
e. other				<u>140</u>
2. Was there a weapon involved?				
a. yes				<u>78</u>
b. no				<u>303</u>
3. Who called or reported this incident?				
a. disputant				<u>275</u>
b. others				<u>106</u>
4. What was the behavior of the disputants upon your arrival on the scene?				
	#3	#1	#4	#2
a. was explosive, couldn't control temper	<u>1</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>36</u>
b. agitated, very emotional	<u>1</u>	<u>159</u>		<u>87</u>
c. insulting, nagging the other	<u>1</u>	<u>68</u>		<u>68</u>
d. indifferent to the other/to the situation	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>		<u>44</u>
e. calm		<u>49</u>		<u>70</u>
f. cooperative		<u>77</u>		<u>65</u>
g. kind, understanding of the other		<u>13</u>		<u>7</u>
h. other	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>28</u>

6. Action(s) taken:

a. physically separated disputants	<u>14</u>
b. warned disputants to stop dispute/fight	<u>52</u>
c. tried to mediate dispute	<u>188</u>
d. tried to verify truthfulness of disputants' statements	<u>117</u>
e. observed injuries allegedly inflicted by other disputant	<u>49</u>
f. accompanied disputant to destination	<u>17</u>
g. made arrest	<u>23</u>
h. made referral	<u>195</u>
i. complaint filed	<u>33</u>
j. other	<u>86</u>

7. Were there any children below the age of 16 present during the dispute?

a. yes	<u>111</u>
b. no	<u>132</u>

8. How satisfied do you think the 2 principal disputants were with the way you handled the situation?

	#3	#1	#4	#2
a. very satisfied	<u>1</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>66</u>
b. satisfied	<u>1</u>	<u>203</u>		<u>175</u>
c. dissatisfied		<u>28</u>		<u>33</u>
d. very dissatisfied	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>		<u>12</u>

9. What do you think was the effect of your intervention?

a. dispute not resolved, likely to recur	<u>98</u>
b. dispute not resolved, but disputants cooled off	<u>157</u>
c. dispute resolved, some understanding on both parts	<u>81</u>
d. dispute resolved, issues settled	<u>12</u>

FAMILY DISTURBANCE REPORTS

April 1975 - April 1976

NUMBER OF REPORTS 606

Summary of family disturbance reports involving both trained and untrained officers.

<u>REASON FOR REFERRAL</u>	<u>REFERRAL</u>	<u>NON-REFERRAL</u>
Alcoholism	61	15
Anxiety	5	
Depression	2	
Drugs	7	1
Employment		
Family Disputes	95	26
Financial	2	2
Information	1	1
Legal		2
Marital Disputes	132	45
Mental Disability	51	12
Physical Disability	7	1
Overdose	10	1
Pregnancy	2	1
School	2	1
Suicidal	41	5
Child Custody	8	2
Child Abuse	4	4
Transportation	4	
Shelter	4	
Other	32	10
<u>FOLLOW UP AND SUPPLEMENTAL CONTACTS</u>		
Appointment kept	250	
Appointment failed	59	
Additional referral	19	
Other	56	

REFERRAL REPORTS

April 1975 - April 1976NUMBER OF REPORTS 606

Record of referrals made by Emergency
Response System Counselors after reviewing
initial report from the Police Department.

AGENCY TO WHICH REFERRAL WAS MADE:

Mental Health Clinic	71
Zeller	102
St. Francis Hospital	22
Proctor Hospital	3
Oakwood Manor	18
Family and Friends	10
Dept. of Children & Family Ser.	8
Salvation Army	
South Side Mission	5
Outpatient Counseling - ZMHC	6
Other Mental Health Clinics	4
Guardian Angel	1
Peoria Health Department	2
YMCA	13
County Jail	7
Counseling & Family Services	2
Lutheran Welfare Services	
Gave information	4
School Counselor	2
Legal Aid Society	7
Private Lawyer	3
Neighborhood House	2
Family Doctor	2
ERS	47
No Referral (resolved by ERS counselors)	106
Other	28

PROGRAM
CRISIS INTERVENTION SYMPOSIUM
Peoria Hilton
April 1-2, 1976

59

April 1, 1976

- 9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Registration
10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Welcome and Orientation
10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. "The Function of the Police in Crisis Intervention
and Conflict Management"
Dr. Morton Bard
Professor of Psychology-Graduate Center
City University of New York
- 12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. Lunch
1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. "Will It Play in Peoria?"
The Peoria Project on Crisis Intervention and
Conflict Management
Lt. George Shadid, Project Director
Peoria Police Department
- Professor Samuel Jones
Director of Project Curriculum
Illinois Central College
- 5:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m. "Crisis Stimulation" - Open Bar
Compliments of the Peoria Police Benevolent Association
- 7:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Dinner - Delux Continental Buffet
"The Changing Role of the Police"
Allen Andrews
Chief of Police
City of Peoria
- 9:00 p.m. - ??? "Crisis Resolution" - Open Bar
Compliments of the Peoria Police Benevolent Association

April 2, 1976

- 8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Feedback and Discussion
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Demonstration: Crisis Intervention and Conflict
Management Simulation
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. Small Group Discussions
- 12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Evaluation of the Peoria Project
Dr. Roy Wright, Local Project Evaluator
Illinois Central College
- Dr. Peter Wylie, Director of National Evaluation
Human Resources Research Organization
- Mr. Jim Zerban, Coordinator
Emergency Response System
- 4:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Concluding Remarks and Symposium Evaluation



END