

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EVALUATION UNIT ACTIVITIES FOR 1977/78:
A Summary Report on Five Evaluation Projects**

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAMMING

57300

NCJRS

APR 10 1979

ACQUISITIONS

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EVALUATION UNIT ACTIVITIES FOR 1977/78: A
Summary Report on Five Evaluation Projects

University Staff

Knowlton W. Johnson, Research Director
Arlen Morris-Doran, Research Associate
Lee Norton, Research Associate

County Staff

Felix Licefi, Criminal Justice Analyst

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAMMING

September, 1978

Preface

This summary report reflects ten (10) months of work conducted by the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU). This unit became operational in 1974 and is comprised of University of Maryland personnel: one faculty member (one-third time), two graduate assistants (one-half time), and student research interns (six University credits). The county's Criminal Justice Analyst coordinates all unit activities. This inter-governmental arrangement structurally links the University's Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology to the County's Office of Budget and Programming. Notably, this innovative model received a National Association of County Government award in 1978.

This report presents an overview of evaluation activities associated with federally funded programs which the county designated as Unit priorities for the 1977/78 contract year. In total, five evaluation reports pertaining to four federally funded programs have been submitted to the County Executive Office. These programs are listed below:

- States Attorney's Office "Roving" Police Legal Advisor program;
- Police Department's Civil Legal Advisor program;
- Police Department's Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (SAFE) program; and,
- Hidden Entrance's Crisis Intervention program (2).

The CJEU staff would like to express its appreciation to a number of people who assisted in one or more of the Unit's 1977/78 evaluation activities. Listed below are these individuals and their affiliations.

"Roving" Police Legal Advisor program:

Tom Blair
Hon. Arthur A. Marshall
Vincent Weigle, Esq.
Cpl. Thomas Mariello

"Roving" PLA
State's Attorney
State's Attorney's Office
University of Maryland Police Dept.

Civil Legal Advisor program:

John Wynes
Delores Glenn
Sgt. Herbert Granger

Civil Legal Advisor
CLA Secretary
Metropolitan Police Department

Project SAFE:

Cpl. Jim Huff
Bess Garcia
Cpl. Clifford Melton

SAFE Director
Department of Aging
Montgomery County Crime Prevention
Unit for Seniors

Presidents and members of the following Senior Citizen Clubs:
Chillum Seniors Club, Mt. Ranier Seniors Club, Colmar Manor-Cottage City
Seniors Club, St. James Happy Seniors Club, Cottage City Towers Seniors
Club, North Brentwood Seniors Club.

Hidden Entrance Crisis Intervention program:

Dick Geldof
Ed Hendrickson
Laurie Brockett
Staff members

Hidden Entrance
Hidden Entrance
Hidden Entrance
Hidden Entrance

In addition, we would like to thank the Prince George's County
Police Department's Planning and Research Division for its assistance.
Appreciation is also extended to Bill Frazier, who was the Criminal
Justice Analyst during the first half of the 1977/78 contract year.

Finally, special thanks is extended to the University of Maryland
student research interns who participated in all evaluation activities
throughout the CJEU 1977/78 contract year. Their contribution is appre-
ciated to the extent that they are designated as collaborating authors in
the technical reports which were disseminated earlier this year. These
research interns are listed below by evaluation project.

"Roving" Police Legal Advisor program: Gregory Ulrick
Kevin Cooper
Nancy Femiano

Civil Legal Advisor program: Stephen Stiles
Helen Taylor

Project SAFE: Michael Trigonoplos

Hidden Entrance Crisis Intervention program: Maureen Epps
Janelle Simms
Julie Tucker

Hidden Entrance Interagency Linkages: John Hunt

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.
Lee Norton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Evaluation Project</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. An Evaluation of a "Roving" Police Legal Advisor.....	1
II. An Evaluation of a Police Civil Legal Advisor.....	5
III. A Second Year Evaluation of The Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (SAFE) Program.....	10
IV. An Evaluation of Hidden Entrance's Linkages with Other Human Service Agencies.....	15
V. An Evaluation of Hidden Entrance's Crisis Intervention Program.....	19

AN EVALUATION OF A
"ROVING" POLICE LEGAL ADVISOR PROGRAM

Evaluation Strategy

In the fall of 1977 the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU) began an evaluation of P.G. County's "roving" police legal advisor (PLA) program, which provides services to police departments functioning at the state, county and municipal levels. The duties of this legal advisor include:

- being available for on-the-spot legal advice to line officers;
- being present to assure that lineups are conducted in accordance with the guidelines dictated by the courts;
- assisting in the preparation of wiretaps and search warrants; and,
- increasing police awareness of changes in the criminal law resulting from recent court decisions.

The primary focus of the evaluation was on examining program activities (processes) in relation to specific measurable program objectives. This evaluation strategy is a process-focused evaluation. Throughout the project year, the CJEU staff maintained contact with the legal advisor and other persons who were associated with this role. Importantly, University of Maryland student interns, who were assigned to this project as part of a two semester evaluation practicum, managed evaluation activities for the CJEU staff and provided a link between the project personnel and the CJEU.

The initial task entailed reviewing and categorizing activities of the legal advisor as recorded in his daily log contained in the quarterly reports prepared by the State's Attorney's Office. A record of all police officers who had been in contact with the legal advisor was maintained in 1977 and in the first three months of 1978. This log provided a 15 month list of contacts from which to draw a sample. Since the legal advisor's services were used predominantly by P.G. County Police, followed by University of Maryland Police, the CJEU decided to include these groups of officers in the evaluation, with officers from other departments designated for pre-testing of the data collection instru-

ments. In turn, the 218 P.G. County officers listed in the log were divided into three groups according to job function and five groups according to job assignment, forming fifteen cells. A 50% sample, yielding 111 names, was randomly drawn from each cell to proportionately represent all ranks and job assignments. The twelve University of Maryland officers from the log were added to the 111 selected P.G. County officers, producing a total sample of 123 officers.

In the data generation phase of the evaluation, important data elements were operationalized, collected and processed for computer analysis. Since the evaluation of the police legal advisor occurred after the program had been in operation for a year, a one-shot, post-hoc research design was selected, involving only those police officers who had had contact with the legal advisor during the 15 month period under study. The data collection instruments (a telephone interview and a questionnaire which were developed by the CJEU in collaboration with the State's Attorney's Office) were pre-tested on six municipal police officers. This served to establish face validity, train interviewers, and allow for minor changes in wording. Data were collected by four trained interviewers during the months of February, March and April, 1978. Of the possible 123 county and university officers in the study sample, 92 responded to both the telephone interview and the questionnaire, constituting a 78% response rate. The officers sampled were relatively young (71% were under 35 years of age) and educated (86% working toward or having already earned a college degree). Related to the collective youth of the officers are data showing that 71% of those sampled were privates or PFC's, and 72% had been police officers for one to nine years.

Evaluation Results

The analysis strategy entailed a description of the activities of the legal advisor, construction of composite outcome measures reflecting program objectives, and uncovering statistically significant relationships between outcome and process measures while controlling for other data elements.

Police officers were questioned concerning legal advisor services and the manner in which they were provided. Respondents reported a great deal of contact with the PLA, with 96% having **been advised** about proper charges in an arrest situation and 56-58% having been advised **in case** or warrant preparation. Over 90% found the PLA easily accessible; three-fourths of the officers had attempted to contact him off-duty and 86% were successful most or all of the time. Most officers found the PLA attentive, interested, patient and respectful. Over 90% said the PLA generally or always presents himself in a businesslike manner and generally or always goes out of his way to assist them. Most officers also found him to be clear, concise and understandable.

Using factor analysis, reliable and valid indices were built for outcomes which were identified as important policy concern. Extent of utilization of PLA services included the extent to which officers consulted the PLA in the following situations: uncertain legal interpretations; general questions of law; and, current legal decisions. Also, the extent to which fellow officers seek PLA advice, and extent of PLA direction to other needed sources of information were included. Advocacy of PLA services concerned officer communication with fellow officers and people in other criminal justice agencies about using PLA services, and whether conversation with fellow officers about PLA services was positive. The measure of utilization ranged from 1 (little use) to 9 (extensive use), with slightly more officers indicating above average use. The distributions of scores on advocacy, ranging from 0 (no advocacy) to 6 (high advocacy), was similar to that of utilization. Two additional outcomes showed the majority of officers reporting high levels of satisfaction with, and credibility of, PLA services.

A valid and reliable measure for a fifth outcome, officer's mistakes, did not materialize during factor analysis; however, information concerning types of problems encountered when taking a case before the Felony Complaint Screening Unit (FCSU) is insightful. Eighty percent of the officers had done so, and 45% of these had had problems of some type. The chief sources of problems in terms of the cases themselves were incomplete or inaccurate information and inappropriate charges. Over 25% of the officers had problems with the FCSU itself, including red tape, unavailability of personnel, and extended waiting time.

The final analysis stage entailed searching for associations between program processes and outcomes. Of the five outcomes initially conceptualized, only utilization and advocacy were satisfactory in this stage. The distributions of satisfaction and advocacy did not provide sufficient variation, and factor analysis of items concerning problems encountered with the FCSU was unsuccessful.

Four program process variables were included in the final analysis which entailed checking for association with utilization of PLA services, two of which were found to be important. Utilization was significantly higher when the quality of interaction between officers and the PLA was better, i.e. the PLA was viewed as easy to communicate with, interested, respectful, assisting, understandable, and concise. Utilization was also higher among officers who used PLA services extensively off-duty. Interestingly, visibility, and on-duty availability were not related to use of PLA services. In addition, type of assistance provided, e.g., case preparation, warrant preparation, was not associated with use of PLA services.

Four process variables were also included in the final check for association with advocacy, three of which proved to be important. Advocacy was higher among officers who had been assisted in case preparation as opposed to their types of PLA assistance. In addition, advocacy was higher among officers who had had off-duty, non-job related contacts with the PLA, and among those who had frequently seen the PLA in the station out of which they work.

Implications and Recommendations

Potential use of the findings from process evaluation is the most important phase of the evaluation strategy. The findings could either support the present direction, suggest program modification or development, or state a need for future research. Implications of the results generated by this evaluation are as follows.

Justification for Future Funding

Examination of the Police-Legal Advisor (PLA) program activities and efforts during 1977 and the first quarter of 1978 show that Prince George's County and University of Maryland police officers' exposure to the PLA has been favorable. In addition, those officers who have utilized the PLA services report them to be satisfactory. Officers also indicate that the PLA's credibility is high. This empirical evidence provides a sound basis for funding of this program in subsequent years. Importantly, however, the quality of services of a "good program" can be improved. With this purpose in mind, following are several suggestions for program modification which stem from the evaluation of the PLA program.

Suggestions for Program Improvement

The importance of PLA - police officer interaction cannot be overemphasized when getting officers to utilize the assistance of a legal advisor. In this evaluation, certain behavior was found to be important while other activity was not as important. For example, officers who reported above average use of the PLA also tended to indicate that the PLA was very easy to communicate with, was interested in officers' questions, had respect for officers, went out of his way to assist, was understandable and concise. Conversely, whether the PLA was critical or commended them on a good job appears to be relatively unimportant. As reported above, the current PLA appears to be emphasizing communication, however, a significant number of officers reported that the quality of interaction was okay, but not above average or excellent. Possibly, awareness of the importance of the six behavior traits discussed will be useful, especially when interacting with police officers who do not appreciate the importance of legal advice. More importantly, the State's Attorney's Office should consider these behavior characteristics as selection criteria in the event the PLA program is expanded to include

additional attorneys. Correspondingly, if the current PLA is transferred to a different role in the State's Attorney's Office, it is important to consider these traits as screening criteria for his replacement.

Another evaluation finding which suggests policy implications concerns availability of the PLA off-duty. It was found that indicators of availability while on-duty were not associated with use of the PLA, e.g., length of time it took PLA to get back to officers, extent to which PLA is available when needed. Conversely, the extent to which officers attempted to contact the PLA off-duty was found to be associated with use of services. In discussions with the PLA, the research interns ascertained that a number of alternatives for legal assistance have been considered or used in the past. Given the importance of providing legal service to police officers, it is suggested that the State's Attorney's Office explore new ways of providing coverage for the PLA during his off-duty hours. Whatever alternatives are considered, it is important that officers are alerted to the available services vis-a-vis central dispatch.

Finally, if it is important for uniformed officers to utilize the legal advisor, this evaluation suggests the PLA should consider spending more time assisting them in case preparation. First, the data presented strongly suggest that a significant number of officers are not adequately preparing cases for the Felony Complaint Screening Unity. Second, case preparation was the only type of assistance which was associated with advocacy of PLA services (police behavior which may get other officers to utilize the legal advisor).

Since uniformed officers must request the PLA's assistance in case preparation, such use has to be stimulated. It is suggested that a meeting be convened to discuss how to persuade officers who really need such legal assistance to request the services of the PLA. This meeting may involve representatives from the various police departments and the State's Attorney's Office. Possibly, the PLA could assist uniformed officers by becoming more actively involved in the basic and in-service police training program. The evaluation showed that only a small proportion of the officers had been assisted vis-a-vis training. In conjunction with a training function, the PLA, in collaboration with FCSU staff, should consider developing case preparation guidelines which highlight the most frequent mistakes made. In a liaison capacity, the PLA could stimulate officers to use such guidelines in preparing cases. Importantly, the PLA should involve those officers with whom he has off-duty contact, for they were found to be strong advocates of PLA services.

The suggestions offered above illustrated how process evaluation data can serve as a basis for program improvement. The decision to consider these suggestions is, however, contingent upon the State's Attorney's Office.

II

AN EVALUATION OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT'S CIVIL LEGAL ADVISOR PROGRAM

Evaluation Strategy

In the fall of 1977, the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU) began an evaluation of the Civil Legal Advisor program, which provides the Prince George's County Police Department with the services of a fulltime civil attorney. This attorney acts as an advisor to the Chief and the Administration Hearing Board in matters pertaining to the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights, and as a representative of the Chief and the Department in litigation resulting from official actions enforcing departmental rules and regulations. He also reviews proposed departmental procedures to ensure legal sufficiency, and court decisions to OK their impact on operation and administrative policy. In addition, he assists in the development and presentation of relevant training programs in cooperation with the Training and Education Division, and provides input to the Department concerning proposed legislation and its potential effects on law enforcement.

The primary focus of the evaluation was on examining program activities (processes) in relation to specific measurable program objectives. This evaluation strategy is referred to as "process focused evaluation". Throughout the project year, the CJEU staff maintained contact with the legal advisor and other persons associated with this role. University of Maryland student interns, who were assigned to this project as part of a two semester evaluation practicum, managed evaluation activities for the CJEU staff and provided a link between the project personnel and the CJEU.

In the data generation phase of the evaluation, important data elements were operationalized, collected and processed for computer analysis. Since the evaluation of the civil legal advisor occurred after the program had been in operation, a one-shot, post-hoc research design was selected. The data collection instrument (a questionnaire, developed over a four month period by the CJEU with the assistance of the legal advisor) was pre-tested on six Washington Metropolitan Police Officers (minimum rank of Captain) who had utilized the assistance of the legal counsel provided by their department. This served to establish face validity and allow for minor changes in wording. Data were collected in February and March, 1978. Questionnaires were disseminated to 95 departmental personnel, with a total of 92 returned constituting a 97% response rate.

All of the departmental staff sampled had been members of the Prince George's County Police Department for at least two years. Twenty-

six percent had been with the department from 2 to 10 years, while 64% had been with the department from 10 to 20 years. Ninety-four percent of the respondents were male; 99% were white; 42% had completed some college work; and, 36% had BA or BS degrees. Fifty-three percent of the respondents had knowledge of the legal advisor prior to his appointment.

Evaluation Results

The analysis strategy entailed a description of the activities of the legal advisor, construction of composite outcome measures reflecting program objectives, and uncovering statistically significant relationships between outcome and process measures while controlling for other data elements.

Departmental staff personnel were asked a wide range of questions. Forty-six percent of the staff had had several or many contacts with the CLA in the past month. Twenty-nine percent had attended 1 or 2 CLA lectures or presentations; 76% had participated in at least one meeting which the CLA had also attended; 73% had contacted the CLA by phone several times; and, 89% had contacted the CLA at least 1 or 2 times on an informal basis. In terms of four types of contact (advice, legal opinion, procedure review, and policy formation), 38% of the respondents had used all four, 13% had used three, 22% had used two, 18% had used one, and 9% had not used any.

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents said the CLA was usually or always available; 42% said he was usually available for conversation when they saw him, and 81% said he was usually or always available to talk with when telephoned. Eighty-one and 66% respectively found the CLA very easy to communicate with and very interested and concerned with their questions. Three-fourths felt the CLA never attempted to impose value judgements and 88% said the CLA had never rushed them during consultation. Eighty-seven percent reported that the CLA generally or always went out of his way to assist them. Ninety-percent felt the CLA was generally or always clear when giving advice and 94% said he had never "said one thing and done another." Ninety-two percent said the CLA did not have to be contacted repeatedly in order to be understood, and that he had never used too much legal terminology.

Using factor analysis, reliable and valid indices were built for two outcomes which were identified as important policy concerns. Utilization of CLA services concerned such types of use as direction to other sources of information, a source of legal decisions and opinions, and possible legal ramifications of a planned action, as well as coordinating activities, reviewing procedures and assisting in policy formation. Satisfaction with CLA services involved adequacy, promptness and concern of the CLA and the services he provided, as well as the extent to which he facilitated and cooperated in performing one's job. Utilization was

generally distributed over the entire range of possible scores, while slightly more departmental staff reported high satisfaction. Three additional outcomes, too skewed to be utilized in the analysis, showed the majority of staff members reporting high levels of credibility and advocacy of, and no hesitation to use, CLA services.

Three program processes were included in the final analysis to check for their association with utilization of CLA services. Utilization was found to be significantly higher among: staff who had attended more meetings, lectures or presentations by the CLA; staff whose fellow workers frequently advocated the CLA; and, staff who reported medium to high availability of the CLA. Three processes included in the check for association with satisfaction also proved important. Satisfaction was significantly higher among: staff who perceived the CLA as available; staff who perceived greater levels of clarity on the part of the CLA; and, staff who were sometimes or often contacted by fellow workers regarding CLA services.

Implications and Recommendations

Potential use of the findings from process evaluation is the most important phase of the evaluation strategy. The findings could either support the present direction, suggest program modification or development, or state a need for future research. Implications of the results generated by this evaluation are as follows.

Justification for Future Funding

Examination of the civil-legal advisor's activities and efforts over the past year strongly suggests that departmental staff's exposure to legal advisor services has been favorable. The majority of departmental staff highly advocate the CLA and the services he provides and, moreover, feel that the position of civil-legal advisor should become permanently established within the department. Most departmental staff who have used CLA services during the past year feel that the program provides a needed service.

This empirical evidence provides a sound basis for funding of this program in subsequent years. Importantly, however, the quality of service of a "good program" can be improved. With this purpose in mind, following are several suggestions for program modification, which stem from the evaluation of the CLA program.

Suggestions for Program Improvement

The evaluation results show that the extent of utilization is mainly the result of informed awareness. Those departmental staff members who had attended lectures, meetings or presentations given by the CLA, and those who had been positively informed by fellow workers about

CLA services showed a much higher degree of utilization than those staff members who had not. This finding tends to indicate that CLA services need to be broadened to facilitate utilization by a greater number of the departmental staff.

In July, the Prince George's County Police Department will initiate both basic and in-service training sessions department-wide. It is strongly suggested that the civil-legal advisor be involved in those sessions for the following purposes:

- to give exposure of the CLA position and the services available to a wide range of departmental staff in a relatively short period of time. This would impart to the participants a meaningful conception of his role in the department and his usefulness to their individual functions.
- to counter the routinization of concentration of CLA activities in only the Chief's office. If it is possible, the CLA services should be made available to all staff personnel.
- to provide much needed information to departmental staff members on a wide scale as to current civil matters and what is required of officers and the department in order to meet this challenge. This is an area of particular concern in view of recent court decisions which severely limit official actions when dealing with employees. The training sessions would be an ideal vehicle for providing alternatives to methods which are presently used.

Should these sessions prove successful, it is highly recommended that a basis for educational use of the CLA be permanently established with the intent of long-range commitment to this role. Considering the necessity of the positions within the department, it is important that the legal advisor be utilized to the greatest degree possible by the greatest number of people. Such utilization should allow the department to deal effectively with its environment in a positive and enlightened way.

Availability was also found to be an important consideration in regard to utilization of CLA services and satisfaction with such services. Seemingly, personnel in a variety of job assignments want the CLA to be available for assistance. It appears that CLA services are important to a number of staff and command personnel; consequently, making such services available to more police personnel appears to be desirable.

III

AN EVALUATION OF THE SENIORS AGAINST A FEARFUL ENVIRONMENT (SAFE) PROGRAM

Evaluation Strategy

In the fall of 1977 the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU) began a second year evaluation of the Seniors Against a Fearful Environment Program (Project SAFE), which was designed to focus on crime prevention/control services for senior citizens of a particular target area. Project SAFE is a special crime prevention unit comprised of a director, a Prince George's County Corporal, and three uniformed officers, with headquarters established in the target area.

To fulfill the educational component of the program, Project SAFE personnel conduct crime prevention presentations including films, slide shows, question and answer periods and distribution of crime prevention pamphlets. The second component involves Project SAFE personnel walking "a beat" in certain locales, and riding motor scooters in certain locales of the six-town area. Together, these components were designed to reduce the actual crime rate, decrease the senior citizens' fear of crime, improve the quality of services and improve citizens' attitudes toward police.

This second year evaluation follows an intensive evaluation of program impact on citizens' fear of crime and security consciousness which stemmed from the first eight months of SAFE's operations. In general, this first year evaluation suggested that crime had been reduced in the impact area; however, interview data which were obtained from 131 seniors showed that the program had no impact on fear of crime and security consciousness. The second year evaluation is intended to supplement the first year's findings in order to determine the feasibility of future funding and to determine the future direction of the program.

The primary focus of the evaluation was on examining program activities (processes) in relation to specific measurable program objectives. This evaluation strategy is referred to as "process focused evaluation." Throughout the project year, the CJEU staff maintained contact with police personnel and senior citizens who were associated with Project SAFE. A University of Maryland student intern, who was assigned to this project as part of a two semester evaluation practicum, managed evaluation activities for the CJEU staff and provided a link between the project personnel and the CJEU.

In the data generation phase of the evaluation, important data elements were operationalized, collected and processed for computer analysis. Since the evaluation of Project SAFE occurred after the program had been in operation, a one-shot, post-hoc research design was selected, involving only those senior citizens who had been exposed to Project SAFE. The data collection instrument (a questionnaire, developed by the CJEU and Pro-

ject SAFE personnel over a five month period) was pre-tested on a small sample of senior citizens in Montgomery County, who had had contact with the Crime Prevention Unit for Seniors. This target population had similar characteristics to the population in Prince George's County. Data were collected by four trained student interviewers from all senior citizens (152) attending six separate club meetings at six different clubs in the target area, during a three week period in March, 1978.

Of those seniors sampled, 85% were white, 15% were black, 83% were female, 50% were between 65 and 74, 30% between 75 and 90, and 20% between 55 and 64. Forty-seven percent had some high school or a high school degree, while 15% had some college. Eighty-six percent did not hold a job. More than 70% of the seniors had lived in their neighborhoods longer than 10 years. Sixty percent lived in single family dwellings and 39% in apartments. Most senior citizens indicated they leave their homes or apartments at least twice a week, with 50% indicating they visit their friends at least weekly. The major mode of transportation used by seniors was automobile, either as drivers or passengers. Forty-two percent of the seniors reported that they had been victimized at least once while living at their current address. The three crimes claiming the most victims were burglary, theft and automobile vandalism.

Evaluation Results

The analysis strategy entailed a description of the services provided by Project SAFE, construction of composite outcome measures reflecting program objectives, and uncovering statistically significant relationships between outcome and process measures while controlling for other data elements.

Seniors were asked a wide range of questions pertaining to their exposure to SAFE activities. Less than half (45%) had heard of SAFE, and 83% reported no association with the SAFE program. Elderly who were exposed to the program did so by attending meetings. Almost 80% of the seniors who viewed slide shows and crime prevention presentations were stimulated to think of ways to protect themselves or suggest precautions to others.

Only 24% had seen a policeman walking a beat and almost half of these reported that this occurred once a week or less. Thirty-seven percent had seen a policeman on a motor scooter at least once a week. Eighty percent reported never having conversed with a police officer and had never seen the police breaking up a disturbance or making an arrest, although 41% had seen police talking with others. Thirty percent reported having been helped in some way by police, and 40% had seen police helping others.

In terms of seniors' use of social agencies, more than 83% reported no use of three of the agencies (i.e., P.G. Hotline, Social Services Administration, and Senior Citizens Legal Aid). Forty-four and 40% respectively reported use of Senior Transportation and Information and Assistance to Seniors.

Factor analysis was used to build a reliable and valid scale for the outcome, fear of crime. The items summed to form the scale involved feeling safe when walking in one's neighborhood in daylight and at night, feeling safe in one's home and neighborhood, and fear of burglary, vandalism, assault, robbery, and housebreaking related to them or their property, as well as the extent to which their fear of crime limits their activities.

In addition, seniors reported on protective measures taken to make their residences more secure. They were asked to state whether the measures had been taken since the last spring, the period in which SAFE personnel were active. Fifty-six percent of the seniors had insured their property, although only 15% of these had done so since last spring. On the other hand, 22% had marked their property and almost half of these had done so since the spring. Another frequent security measure taken since the spring was installing security locks.

Several questions were asked of victims regarding their satisfaction with police assistance. Victims who had reported crimes to the police (42% of all victims) tended to indicate high satisfaction with police response, behavior, and help (46%, 56%, and 49% respectively). Only 14% reported any dissatisfaction with these aspects of police assistance.

The final phase of the analysis involved an attempt to determine whether exposure to SAFE activities was associated with seniors' fear of crime. Six measurable processes were evaluated in terms of such association. Fear of crime was slightly lower among seniors with some knowledge of Project SAFE, lower among seniors who had not seen the slide shows or presentations, and lower among those with whom the police had initiated conversations. There was virtually no difference in fear of crime between seniors who had seen a walking policeman and/or a motorscooter policeman, and those who had not seen either. Finally, seniors who had been victimized reported significantly higher levels of fear of crime than non-victims.

Implications and Recommendations

Potential use of the findings from process evaluation is the most important phase of the evaluation strategy. The findings could either support the present direction, suggest program modification or development, or state a need for future research. The results being reported are primarily useful for program modification. Implications of the results are as follows.

On the one hand, an inspection of crime data that appear in the quarterly reports on Project SAFE suggest that crime is being reduced in the target area. Of course, this reduction may simply reflect displacement to an adjacent area. Moreover, the CJEU evaluation found that the crime prevention presentations appear to have stimulated discussion among

seniors regarding how to better protect themselves; and, possibly, a few seniors may have actually installed protective measures discussed in the presentations.

On the other hand, the data revealed that senior citizens' fear of crime is a problem in Prince George's County. With this problem area in mind, the evaluation also uncovered little or no association between SAFE activities and fear of crime among the elderly. When weak relationships were found, the results suggested that particular SAFE activities (e.g., crime prevention presentation) may be contributing to fear of crime rather than reducing it. In short, visibility of police (vis-a-vis walking and scooter patrol) and crime prevention education appear to be inappropriate policing strategies for reducing the fear of crime.

The evaluation results suggest that if Project SAFE is to have significant impact on seniors' fear of crime, direction of the current program must be re-examined. It is strongly suggested that Project SAFE personnel meet with the senior citizen club presidents and/or appropriate personnel in the Department of Aging to discuss ideas for combatting the fear of crime among the elderly. In these meetings it is important to emphasize that increasing the number of police officers will not deal with the fear of crime. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of apprehensions within the target area will affect citizens' fear of crime. The evaluation data found in this report may be helpful in generating new program ideas. For example, a finding which may provide a basis for change is that citizens who reported that police had initiated conversations with them also reported lower levels of fear of crime. This finding provides evidence suggesting that SAFE personnel consider redefining their roles so that they initiate more supportive activities (e.g., initiating conversations with seniors) rather than focus primarily on crime control. Another supportive activity which may be considered is involving SAFE personnel in directing seniors who are in need of assistance to the appropriate social service agencies. The study found that, although there are numerous social services available for the elderly, the sample of citizens who participated in this evaluation were not using such services.

Victims of crime should also receive special attention. The study revealed that this subgroup is significantly more fearful than non-victims. A program component which involves SAFE personnel in providing assistance to crime victims should definitely be a subject for discussion at the meetings involving SAFE personnel and senior citizens representatives.

Finally, how to involve seniors in Project SAFE is an important subject for discussion. The evaluation did not find involved seniors to be less fearful; however, this may have been due to the nature of the involvement, i.e., of the 26 seniors (17%) who reported being involved,

19 of them indicated meeting attendance as the only type of involvement. One suggestion is to involve seniors in activities which can be designed to reduce the fear of crime, e.g., revamping the crime prevention education program.

In conclusion, Project SAFE focuses on the problems of senior citizens in Prince George's County, residents who, without question, deserve special consideration. The evaluation data produced through this project suggest that service to these residents may be improved by adopting the suggestions offered in this report. The County's Criminal Justice Evaluation staff will be available to assist in any program development activities which are desired.

IV

AN EVALUATION OF HIDDEN ENTRANCE'S LINKAGES WITH OTHER HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES

Evaluation Strategy

In the fall of 1977, the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU), conducted an evaluation of the Hidden Entrance Crisis Outreach Program in P.G. County. The program is designed primarily to alleviate family and individual crisis situations through the use of counseling techniques. Ultimately, Hidden Entrance hopes to reduce high levels of tension, anxiety, and conflict which exist within some families in the community. The evaluation entails an examination of program operations as related to clients and other human service agencies. This report pertains specifically to the evaluation efforts which were associated with Hidden Entrance's linkages with other agencies which are essential sources of referrals. The purpose of looking at interagency relationships which involve Hidden Entrance stemmed from the need to increase or maintain a steady flow of referrals from agencies that need crisis intervention services. A separate report concerns evaluation findings that pertain to Hidden Entrance's program-client relationships.

The primary focus of the evaluation was on examining program activities (processes) in relation to specific measurable program objectives. This evaluation strategy is referred to as "process focused evaluation." Throughout the project year, the CJEU staff maintained contact with personnel of Hidden Entrance. A University of Maryland student intern, who was assigned to this project as part of a two semester evaluation practicum, managed evaluation activities for the CJEU staff and provided a link between the project personnel and the CJEU.

In the data generation phase of the evaluation, important data elements were operationalized, collected and processed for computer analysis. Since the evaluation focused on program processes and occurred after the program had been in operation, a one-shot, post-hoc research design was selected, involving only those agency personnel who had made at least one referral to Hidden Entrance. The data collection instruments (a short telephone interview for demographic data and a questionnaire, developed over a four month period by CJEU staff with the assistance of Hidden Entrance personnel) were pre-tested on five agency personnel who had had previous contact with Hidden Entrance staff, but no longer worked for agencies involved in the study. The instruments were pre-tested in order to establish face validity, train interviewers, and allow for minor changes in wording. Data were collected by three trained student interviewers during the months of February and March, 1978. From a total of 114 agency personnel who had been identified through a review of the program case files as having used the agency's services during the first year of the LEAA grant, 104 were contacted by the interviewers, and of these 104 who were sent a questionnaire, 75 individuals (72%) responded.

Of the outside agency personnel sampled, 92% were white, 59% were female, 64% were under thirty years of age, and 65% had attained at least a bachelor's degree, with 13% having attained a master's degree. Personnel from over eighteen agencies provided information, with P.G. County Hotline (32%), Police Department (13%, Second Mile and Juvenile Services Administration (8% each) most heavily represented in the data. Fifty-one percent of the agency personnel had one to three years experience in their present positions, 26% had less than one year and 23% had four or more years. Fifty-two percent had worked for at least one social service agency prior to their current employment. Sixty-three percent of the agency personnel had last contacted or referred a client to Hidden Entrance as recently as the first quarter of 1978.

Evaluation Results

The analysis strategy entailed a description of the internal operations of Hidden Entrance, construction of composite measures reflecting program objectives, and uncovering statistically significant relationships between outcome and process measures while controlling for other data elements.

Hidden Entrance had initiated contact regarding work related matters at least once with 77% of the agency personnel, the majority of whom were contacted by phone. Forty-seven percent of the agency personnel were also contacted in person. Three-fourths had been asked for feedback about the program by Hidden Entrance staff. Forty-four, 23 and 56% respectively stated that they had participated in Hidden Entrance training/orientation sessions, Hidden Entrance's open house, and meetings with Hidden Entrance staff.

A majority of agency personnel (82%) had been made aware of Hidden Entrance by their co-workers at least once. Only 9% felt somewhat negative about the appearance of Hidden Entrance staff. Most personnel indicated that the staff was helpful and understanding. Only 5% said Hidden Entrance staff were not at all clear in stating their purpose, while 87% felt Hidden Entrance staff were sure of themselves and professional. After initial impressions of Hidden Entrance, 45% changed their views in a positive way, whereas only 7% changed their views in a negative way. A third of the agency personnel reported at least one bad experience with Hidden Entrance.

The overwhelming majority (97%) felt Hidden Entrance staff were usually or always available, and only 19% felt that Hidden Entrance policies such as confidentiality and voluntary acceptance hindered utilization of their services. Forty-three percent of the agency personnel had read something about Hidden Entrance in the newspaper.

Using factor analysis, reliable and valid indices were built for three outcomes which were identified as important policy concerns. Extent of Utilization of services involved the frequency of request for advice concerning a client, assistance concerning job problems, and, information regarding other social service agencies, as well as the approximate number

of clients referred to Hidden Entrance since April, 1977. Appraisal of impact consisted of views of Hidden Entrance as a viable alternative to the system, comparison of Hidden Entrance with other prevention programs, expectation of Hidden Entrance's ability to help an agency or its clients, and, the extent to which Hidden Entrance facilitated and assisted in channeling clients into appropriate services. Advocacy of services included discussing with co-workers the use of Hidden Entrance in times of crisis, suggesting that co-workers refer clients to Hidden Entrance, and calling Hidden Entrance for assistance.

It was found that advocacy of Hidden Entrance was generally distributed over the range of possible scores, while a few more agency personnel reported lower utilization and higher appraisal of Hidden Entrance impact. Specifically, a majority (71%) of agency personnel rated the Hidden Entrance program superior to other available programs and 89% felt Hidden Entrance had helped make their jobs easier. Also, 93% were at least somewhat confident that Hidden Entrance could help their clients. Sixty percent felt that Hidden Entrance had had from "some" to "great" impact in reducing the number of clients referred to court.

Two of the four process variables, included in the final analysis to check for their association with extent of utilization of Hidden Entrance services, were uncovered as important. Utilization increased as Hidden Entrance staff were reported to have increased initiated contacts with agency personnel and when agency personnel reported being made aware of Hidden Entrance by their co-workers "many times".

Four program processes were included in the check for association with appraisal of Hidden Entrance's impact. The appraisal of impact was higher when Hidden Entrance staff were viewed as clear in purpose, had initiated extensive contact with agency personnel, and when respondents reported feeling comfortable with staff appearance. Availability of staff was only slightly associated with appraisal of impact.

Five processes were included in the final analysis checking for association with advocacy of Hidden Entrance. In general, advocacy increased as staff were reported to have increased initiated contacts with agency personnel, among agency personnel who had read about Hidden Entrance in the newspaper, and when Hidden Entrance staff were viewed as being clear in purpose.

Implications and Recommendations

Potential use of the findings from process evaluation is the most important phase of the evaluation strategy. The findings could either support the present direction, suggest program modification or development, or state a need for future research. Implications of the results generated by this evaluation are as follows.

Justification for Future Funding

Examination of Hidden Entrance's activities and efforts over the past year strongly suggest that the exposure of other agency personnel to Hidden Entrance has been, in general, favorable. Moreover, it appears that this program has made efforts to establish linkages with agencies that are in need of its services, for example, holding an open house, training sessions, etc. In addition, a majority of the study participants (users of Hidden Entrance's services) reported that Hidden Entrance's program was better than other available programs, and is, to some degree, a viable alternative to placing a client in the formal criminal justice system. In essence, most agency personnel who have used Hidden Entrance services during the past year feel that the program provides a needed service.

Suggestions for Program Improvement

The evaluation results also offer guidance for strengthening Hidden Entrance's linkages with other agencies. Of particular importance was the finding that staff-initiated contact was associated with the three outcomes. An implication of this finding is that Hidden Entrance should devise a plan which first identifies all potential sources of referral of Children in Need of Supervision. Second, systematic contact should be established with these agencies and maintained. Third, this plan should include a well-thought-out statement of purpose, for the study found that clarity of purpose during interagency interaction was associated with agencies' favorable appraisals of Hidden Entrance and high levels of advocacy of the program's services. Fourth, the finding that extensive interagency support is associated with high use of Hidden Entrance's services suggests that Hidden Entrance attempt to establish advocates in agencies needing crisis intervention assistance. It is anticipated that Hidden Entrance could hold several workshops specifically for these advocates. The fifth and final aspect of the plan to strengthen interagency linkage should entail expanding media coverage of Hidden Entrance's program. This suggestion stems from the study's finding that personnel who reported reading something about Hidden Entrance's program also indicated higher advocacy for Hidden Entrance's services. Importantly, personnel should read any pamphlet or flyer which provides information about Hidden Entrance. Possibly, arrangements could be made to disseminate material about Hidden Entrance at agency staff meetings or briefings.

It is important to note that the above plan has not been tested under controlled conditions, therefore there is no certainty that its component parts will stimulate utilization and advocacy of Hidden Entrance's services. It is suggested that the Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit undertake the development and testing of this plan in the Fall of 1978. The purpose of piloting such a plan under experimental conditions is to determine the most effective method of getting human service agencies to utilize available crisis intervention services for children. Notably, this project could have implications for strengthening interagency linkages of other criminal justice agencies located in Prince George's County (e.g., Family Law Division of Circuit Court).

AN EVALUATION OF HIDDEN ENTRANCE'S CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAM

Evaluation Strategy

In the fall of 1977, the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit (CJEU) undertook an evaluation of the Hidden Entrance Crisis Outreach Program in P.G. County. The program is designed primarily to alleviate family and individual crisis situations through the use of counseling techniques. Ultimately, Hidden Entrance hopes to reduce high levels of tension, anxiety, and conflict which exist within some families in the community. The evaluation entailed an examination of program operations as they relate to clients and other human service agencies. This report pertains specifically to the evaluation efforts which were associated with Hidden Entrance's program-client relationships. The purpose of looking at the Hidden Entrance program-client relationship was to discover how Hidden Entrance could better respond to the specific needs of their clients. A separate report includes evaluation findings that pertain to Hidden Entrance's linkages with other agencies.

The primary focus of the evaluation was on examining program activities (processes) in relation to specific measurable program objectives. This evaluation strategy is referred to as "process focused evaluation." Throughout the project year, the CJEU staff maintained contact with personnel of Hidden Entrance. University of Maryland student interns, who were assigned to this project as part of a two semester evaluation practicum, managed evaluation activities for the CJEU staff and provided a link between the project personnel and the CJEU.

In the data generation phase of the evaluation, important data elements were operationalized, collected and processed for computer analysis. Since the evaluation focused on program processes, and occurred after the program had been in operation, a one-shot, post-hoc research design was selected. The data collection instruments (a short client demographic questionnaire, completed on each client by a staff member of Hidden Entrance and a telephone interview, developed over a four month period by CJEU staff with the assistance of Hidden Entrance personnel) were pre-tested on five youths who had received assistance during the first month of the program's operation. The instruments were pre-tested in order to establish face validity, train interviewers, and allow for minor changes in wording. Data were collected by three trained student interviewers during the months of February and March, 1977. From a total of 247 children in need of supervision (CINS) under 18 years of age identified by Hidden Entrance staff members, 71 were successfully interviewed. Unfortunately, a 29% response rate will restrict generalizations to the target population. The results of this evaluation, however, will be applicable to other populations which are similar to the sample under study.

Of the clients interviewed: 61% were female; 70% were between the ages of 13 and 15; 63% were white and 36% were black; and, 83% were currently in school. Clients tended to report residence in central (47%) or southern (39%) Prince George's County. Thirty-four percent of the clients reported living with their mothers; 30% lived with both parents. The majority of parents (mother - 70%; father - 89%) were employed. Juvenile Services Administration (51%), Hotline (14%), and the Police Department (11%) were the major referring agencies. Eighty-seven percent of the clients reported experiencing family problems when they contacted or were referred to Hidden Entrance.

Evaluation Results

The analysis strategy entailed a description of the internal operations of the Hidden Entrance program, construction of composite outcome measures reflecting program objectives, and uncovering statistically significant relationships between outcome and process measures while controlling for other data elements.

Former clients were asked a wide range of questions concerning aspects of their intervention with Hidden Entrance counselors. Fifty-nine percent of the clients reported that 15 minutes or less were required to contact Hidden Entrance, while another 32% said that it took from 16 minutes to one hour. Over three-fourths reported that counselors reached their homes in less than an hour. Most clients (65%) viewed the counselors as sure of themselves, and a majority of these (89%) retained their first impressions. Almost all (99%) liked having both male and female counselors.

During the intervention, 95% felt the counselors were polite, and all clients reported that the counselors either didn't break in while they were talking, or interrupted in a helpful manner. Ninety-nine and 95% respectively reported that the counselors were interested in them "most" or "all of the time," and that they took "most" or "all" of what the clients said seriously. Eighty-three percent reported the counselors "generally" or "always" made them feel comfortable, and only 3% didn't feel comfortable enough to say anything other than to answer questions. Eighty percent stated they would tell the counselor if they disagreed. None of the clients felt the counselors had stayed too long, and 23% felt a longer stay would have been helpful. Only 1% each saw the counselors as being in a hurry, or felt the counselors did not understand them. Of clients with family problems, the majority (over 90%) felt that the counselors listened equally to all family members. Sixty-one percent of the clients felt the counselors had been very helpful, and only 4% said the intervention did not change things.

Regarding post-intervention, 97% of the clients felt they could call on the counselors again, and 53% reported that they had heard from the counselor subsequent to the intervention, all of whom indicated the contact was at least a "little bit" helpful. Seventy-six percent stated they would have liked the counselors to contact them again.

Using factor analysis, reliable and valid indices were built for two outcomes which were identified as important policy concerns. Family anxiety concerned feeling relaxed with and trusting one's family; voicing one's opinion as well as listening to advice from family members; the extent to which a friend would feel welcome in one's family; and, how one would react if upset. Coping ability consisted of items concerning the frequency of problem recurrence after having seen Hidden Entrance counselors and the rapidity of recurrence. Slightly more clients reported lower family anxiety and higher coping ability.

A third outcome, satisfaction with intervention, was too skewed to be used in the analysis, but is policy relevant. Most of the clients (93%) reported progress with their problems, while a similar majority felt the counselors had helped them come to a decision about their problems, and felt something positive had been accomplished once the counselors had left. Three-fourths of the clients felt the counselors were working with them "all the time," 54% felt they would be better able to handle a similar situation to that which caused their problem, and 30% felt much better able to handle the problem than before contact with the counselors. Only 9% stated they were not better able to handle similar problems.

The final stage of analysis involved an attempt to uncover significant relationships between program activities and the outcome measures. Contrary to expectations, no program processes were found to be related to the outcomes under study. However, there was a trend for family anxiety to be lower among clients who felt comfortable enough to say anything around the counselors and also lower among clients who felt it would have been helpful if the counselors had stayed longer.

Implications and Recommendations

Potential use of the findings from process evaluation is the most important phase of the evaluation strategy. The findings could either support the present direction, suggest program modification or development, or state a need for future research. Implications of the results generated by this evaluation are as follows.

Examination of the Hidden Entrance's program-client relationships over the past year strongly suggests that clients, in general, are happy with the services provided by the agency. Importantly, Hidden Entrance counselors seem to take their time during the intervention and try to understand what is going on in the family. A clear majority of the clients felt the counselors understood the situation and took them seriously. Moreover, the results show that counselors conducted themselves in a professional manner.

Although the evaluation results show that Hidden Entrance staff efforts have been well received, study results also show little or no association between staff efforts and long-term objectives, including increasing clients' coping ability and reducing the level of anxiety in the family.

This suggests that program components and the objectives are incompatible. That is, current program activities may be having an immediate impact, but the activities may not be sufficiently intense to have a lasting effect. Consequently, if it is desirable to reduce family anxiety and reduce recurrences of the problem, then Hidden Entrance should build in additional program components which are designed to achieve these long-term objectives. Such expansion should be based on existing knowledge regarding activities which have been found to impact family anxiety and coping ability.

Conversely, it may not be the program itself which requires primary attention, but rather, the objectives of the program. Possibly, crisis intervention should be viewed as a temporary relief, without concern for lasting effects. If this is to be the purpose of a crisis intervention program, then it is imperative to combine this immediate relief with a program that is designed to provide services over an extended period of time.

With regard to suggestions for improving the existing program, the data offer some guidance. Of particular importance is the notion of "call-backs" after the intervention. Of those clients who were called back, all (100%) felt it was at least somewhat useful. A majority (76%) stated they would have liked the counselors to contact them. Implications of these findings are that Hidden Entrance should consider instituting a policy of follow-up on all clients.

The evaluation was able to uncover several weak relationships between program effort and clients' levels of family anxiety, which may be policy relevant. It was found that clients who were able to say anything they wanted around the counselors tended to have lower family anxiety. Additionally, those clients who had lower family anxiety indicated that it would have been more helpful if the counselors had stayed longer. In future interventions the detection of such client feelings may be a cue that the family anxiety level is sufficiently high to warrant more intense follow-up assistance.

The final consideration for program change is linked to the companion evaluation of Hidden Entrance's interagency linkages. Although no cost effective analysis was conducted in conjunction with this evaluation, it appears that a staff size of 15 full-time and part-time members could handle more clients. Recognizing that increased services are primarily a function of referrals, it is proposed that new ways of increasing the number of referrals be piloted during the second year of the program. The assessment of such changes can be conducted by the Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit. A discussion of this plan to increase referrals is discussed in Evaluation Project IV of this summary report.

END