

1995 CAPS TRAINING EVALUATION REPORT

by

Marianne Kaiser

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

June, 1995

INTRODUCTION

This report describes an evaluation of Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) training for police officers. Almost all Chicago police officers assigned to district law, a total of 7,491, went through the CAPS training program during the five month period from January 4 to May 31, 1995.

The purpose of the training was to teach them about their changing roles and responsibilities under CAPS, with an emphasis on learning the skills needed to be an effective team member. Each police officer received sixteen hours of training in a two-day training session.

The evaluation team employed three different methods to examine the nature of the training sessions and the performance of the trainers; to describe the background of the training participants and their attitudes towards their jobs, citizens, and CAPS; and to assess trainers' and participants' reactions to the training.

The first evaluation method involved direct observations of training sessions. In cooperation with Chicago Police Department (CPD) personnel, the training observers scheduled observations and developed a format for recording their impressions of training. They observed most of the trainers (28 of 34) at least once, and sat through at least two complete two-day training sessions during each of the three watches. Altogether, observers attended ten sessions during January, February and March, for a total of twenty training days. At each training session, observers took daily field notes describing the setting and content of the training as well as the behavior of the trainers and trainees. They also recorded evaluative comments throughout the session.

The second evaluation method involved a written questionnaire that was completed by trainees at the start of each training session. These questionnaires were distributed by training academy staff with the oversight and support of the evaluation team. The questionnaire contained 93 items including: job assignment descriptive questions, police work questions, neighborhood related questions, program related questions, and demographics.

The third evaluation method involved personal interviews with samples of trainees, trainers and supervisors. Trainees were interviewed at their district station houses, and asked their opinions about the effectiveness of the instructors and the materials, and the usefulness of the training.

Interviews with trainers and supervisors were conducted either at their training sites or at the Chicago Police Academy. They were asked to describe their roles in the training, to give their opinions of the curriculum, materials and methods used, and to evaluate their own effectiveness as well as the receptivity of the trainees.

BACKGROUND

Several activities occurred prior to training: curriculum development, trainer selection and training, acquisition of training sites, and scheduling.

Curriculum Development

A planning committee coordinated by CPD Deputy Superintendent Charles Ramsey developed the curriculum. Its members were: Director Barbara McDonald, Deputy Director Nola Joyce, Kevin Morrison, and Margaret Poethig of CPD's Research and Development Unit; Mary Lou Budnick of the Chicago mayor's office; Executive Director Warren Friedman and Ani Russell of the Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety; and Maureen Hickey, an independent contractor. Other consultants included Steve Gaffigan, Director of the National Community Policing Consortium; Andy Mills of the San Diego Police Department; Tim Oettmeier of the Houston Police Department; and Rana Sampson, an independent consultant. Personnel from Human Synergistics International helped the trainers with the survival section of the training.

Selection and Training of Trainers

The committee also selected the trainers, who were chosen for their teaching ability, job performance, educational background, and favorable attitudes toward CAPS. All of the trainers were Chicago police officers, both from prototype and nonprototype districts.

Twenty-eight held the rank of patrolman and the six supervisors were sergeants. Some of them had been instructors for the supervisors' training in the spring of 1994.

The trainers spent eight weeks in training at the Chicago Police Academy in November and December 1994. The training was comprehensive, including thorough coverage of the CAPS Trainer's Manual, taught by Deputy Superintendent Ramsey, Director McDonald, and Deputy Director Joyce; instruction in and simulation of a survival exercise led by personnel from Human Synergistics International; training in instructional methods by a consultant from Thomas Paget; practice teaching; videotaping and critiquing of trainers; visits to all five prototype districts to observe CAPS; and pilot training.

Training Site Selection and Scheduling

In December, three training sites were identified, trainer partnerships were formed and assignments made, and scheduling was completed. The training facilities were acquired with the assistance of the mayor of Chicago. In addition to the Chicago Police Academy, two city colleges were used: Wright College at 3400 N. Austin Avenue, and Daley College at 7600 S. Pulaski Avenue. Sessions at the city college sites were conducted during the second and third watches, while first watch sessions were held at the academy, two at a time. Training began on January 4, 1995.

TRAINING SESSIONS

Training Process

Classes were held during regular working hours on all three watches, Monday through Saturday, in three conveniently located facilities around the city - north, south and central. In general, officers were assigned to a training session at the facility nearest their home or workplace, and each session lasted two days, with an average of 32 officers per class. Since each district sent only one, two or three police officers per watch, police service to the city of Chicago could continue without interruption. Also, prior to the training, most district patrolmen were assigned to a beat or rapid response car on a straight shift, in order to utilize manpower more effectively.

Training Settings

Three of the four rooms were comfortable and well suited to interactive training. These were the rooms at Wright and Daley colleges and Room 223 at the Police Academy, all of which had desks arranged in semicircular formation.

Room 109 at the training academy was uncomfortable, in the opinion of the observer. It was cold and cramped, and lacked sufficient room for participants to regroup as required by some of the exercises. This meant that people from the same district usually ended up in the same discussion group, where they were more likely to engage in small talk than work on the exercise. The configurations of Room 223 at the Academy and the Music Hall at Daley College also made regrouping difficult, but it could be accomplished satisfactorily with prompting from the trainers.

Both trainers and trainees were very positive about the use of off site facilities for training. All agreed that being removed from a police environment and being allowed to wear civilian clothes made them feel more relaxed and freer to express their opinions.

Training Curriculum

The training curriculum consisted of the following nine components:

Day One

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks: included administering the evaluation team's survey questionnaire; introducing trainers and trainees; describing the purpose of the training; and reviewing the workbook and course agenda. Time allotted: 1 hour.
2. Key Elements of CAPS: covered the rationale for the change to CAPS; the key elements of beat knowledge, partnerships, and problem solving through teamwork; and the CAPS Service Request process for enlisting the aid of city services in eliminating disorder problems. Time allotted: 1.5 hours.

3. Human Synergistics Survival Exercise: an exercise designed to give participants experience in teamwork and help them understand the value of a rational approach to problem solving, with an emphasis on group communication skills. Time allotted: 3 hours.
4. Teamwork: understanding what makes an effective team, learning how to communicate through the Daily Watch Assignment Record and reinforcing time management skills. Time allotted: 1 hour.

Day Two

5. CAPS Problem-Solving Model: learning that a problem is a group of related incidents that concerns people in a particular area and which is unlikely to go away on its own; that every crime problem has three sides - offenders, victims and location - the "crime triangle"; that there are many ways to successfully impact a problem; that analysis and development of strategies before action lead to more effective action. Time allotted: 1.5 hours.
6. CAPS Problem-Solving Exercise: learning to identify and prioritize problems and applying the CAPS problem-solving model to a real life crime problem. Time allotted: 2.5 hours.
7. The Beat Plan and Beat Team Meetings: learning how beat plans are used to document problem solving activities, how they are developed, reviewed, and updated at bimonthly meetings of the beat team; and how Beat Plan forms are completed and maintained. Time allotted: 1 hour.
8. Working with the Community: learning how the community plays an active role in all five steps of the CAPS problem-solving process, and how to run an effective beat meeting. Time allotted: 1.5 hours.
9. Course Wrap-up: answering questions, learning about the forthcoming joint police-community training and administering the test and course evaluations. Time allotted: 30 minutes.

The amount of time trainers spent on each segment varied, depending on their pace, the depth of their presentation, the cooperation of the class, the number of questions and digressions, and the length and frequency of breaks. The following excerpts from observers' notes describe variations in how the curriculum was presented:

I thought it was a good idea to cover the Beat Plan before the Problem Solving exercise. The trainer did a good job of presenting it in a usable way.

Another concern was the rushed presentation of the curriculum material on working with the community. The trainer had encouraged the class to discuss their views on working with the community and I thought that it was a very lively discussion. For the first time, many of the officers got a chance to really tell the trainers what they thought about CAPS. This extended discussion, however, limited the amount of time that was available to spend on a detailed discussion of the beat meeting video and the curriculum material on working with the community. Instead, what the officers received was a gripe session and a word for word reading of the nuts and bolts of beat meetings.

I noticed that he didn't discuss the interpersonal skills or rational skills used in the [survival] exercise. They had spent only half the recommended time on the exercise.

I thought the presentation of the material was excellent. The trainers tried to stick very closely to the curriculum while also leaving time and room for a lot of open discussion.

Trainers' Reactions to the Curriculum

Most trainers felt that sufficient time was allotted for the curriculum, per se, and that it adequately covered all the elements of CAPS without being redundant. Several, however, expressed the view that the segment on Working With the Community be expanded. It was commonly suggested that one or more exercises be included, such as a mock community meeting and mock beat team meeting held by class participants. Trainers also

thought that films of actual, not staged, meetings should be shown. One training supervisor had given this subject a great deal of thought:

I don't think it [the beat community meeting video] ever adequately explains the roles of everyone on the beat team. What's the sergeant's role? They should have a video about it showing that the sergeant will actually be a facilitator or coach rather than a supervisor. Then have a video of the sector team meeting, with the beat sergeants and sector lieutenant, so the police officers can see how this will work; how all the sergeants from the various sector teams will be competing for resources from the lieutenant. Then show it district-wide, with the district commander meeting with his watch commanders (lieutenants) and field lieutenants and determining how resources will be allocated. They should have a three part video, so the police officers can see how decisions are made.

Others said:

I wish we had a film of a real beat meeting, and not a staged one, and not one that was well-organized, so they could see the real chaos; and then go back every month and film the progression. When you go to the real meetings, the first five are hell. It would have hit home more if they had seen an actual meeting and actually seen those same real people in the neighborhood and see how they change. Even if we could show meeting 1 and meeting 6, it would have been a better deliverance.

Working With the Community should be a whole day, not an hour and a half.

Segments of the curriculum that trainers found easiest to teach were the Human Synergistics Survival Exercise, Teamwork, and the CAPS Problem-Solving Model. They commented:

Human synergistics was easy. It does itself, almost.

I think the easiest to teach was Teamwork, because it's a concept everyone's familiar with; and because of the tools, such as the survival exercise, it was easy to get the point across.

The problem-solving model was very easy to teach because of the visual aids [posters].

Segments they found most difficult to teach were the rationale for change, the Beat Plan, and the CAPS Problem Solving Exercise. A sample of the reasons follows:

The hardest to teach was the rationale for change in the beginning, because it was more conceptual than hands-on.

The Beat Plan was harder to teach because it's a new thing. It hasn't been used in the prototype districts, so it hasn't been tested. So, some of the questions were hard to answer, about how things happen.

Beat Planning was the most difficult to teach. The police officers in the audience were afraid of it; they don't like paperwork. If not taught right, it sounded more difficult than it was.

The Problem Solving Exercise was a bit more difficult to facilitate because they were hit with so much information at once. They had just been given the five steps and then had to use them.

The hardest one to teach was definitely the Problem Solving. It made it easier to include the Beat Plan forms while we were doing the exercise because they had something to relate to. Once they got into it, they saw it wasn't that bad. I think they were afraid there was more to it than there was; it seemed overwhelming at first.

Although trainers found the Problem Solving exercise difficult to teach, they also thought it was one of the most well received segments of the curriculum. They observed:

Problem Solving was well received because they realized this is the way things are going all over the country and they'll be expected to do it.

They liked the problem solving exercise because it was down to earth.

Problem Solving would rank as the best because they could relate to it, even though it was quasi-new material for them.

Almost unanimously, trainers felt that the segment most well received by trainees was the survival exercise. The two trainers who had reservations about it admitted that they had difficulty comprehending the mathematical analysis. Some trainers' observations follow:

I think the thing that stood out the most was the survival exercise. That would be the thing people would talk to us about the most after class.

The survival exercise was very well received because they could participate, but in a smaller group where they weren't so conspicuous. It relaxed a lot of inhibitions.

They liked the Human Synergistics. It was non-threatening because it wasn't police related. They complained about getting up and moving, initially, but once you explain it as teamwork, they accept it.

Beat Planning was the segment trainers viewed as being least well received. Reasons given were that police officers objected to the additional paperwork and also that the presentation -- reading from the book -- was boring without having a film or exercise to make it entertaining.

They had mixed views about how the segment on Working With the Community was received:

Working With the Community: they liked the movies and we got good feedback (positive and negative) from officers who had gone to meetings, so we had good discussions going.

Beat Community meetings were not well received because of fear of the unknown. You'd hear some negatives from police officers from prototype districts about police bashing.

Many didn't like Working With the Community. They don't want to talk to these people. There's some resentment. I don't know if it's because they're shy or what.

Other elements of the program they felt were not well received were the Daily Watch Assignment Record and less frequently, the CAPS Service Request form. A sample of their comments follows:

The Daily Watch Assignment Record, they don't like, because they feel it's a way to account for all their time to supervisors.

The Daily Watch Assignment Record: I think that once they understand the concept of sharing information and helping someone, and that it's not for having to be accountable for your time... No one likes the bean counting line on it; they think it will be used against them.

The CAPS Service Request: Sometimes you get a negative, sometimes a positive reaction, depending on their experiences with city services (how they write the narrative determines priority), and how supervisors have used it, whether they give them a quota to write three, etc.

All trainers interviewed were very comfortable with the material they presented, as is evident from the following remarks:

I think it makes very good sense.

The layout was excellent. You could tell it was put together by people with teaching experience. It answered a lot of the officers' questions.

The information was simple to understand and to relate, for the most part. I believed in the objective, and once I internalized it, I had no problem relating it.

It was much more down to earth and realistic than when they were teaching the prototypes. Then, it was much more theoretical and conceptual. Police officers couldn't relate.

Training Materials and Methods

Training materials included a binder for each participant, containing a workbook, training bulletins, and other resources; the trainer's manual; four videos; sets of eight posters; survival exercise booklets and films; various handouts; optional flip charts and overheads; and student tests.

The videos included: a 1937 recruiting film about traditional policing called *Crime Fighters*; a recently made video titled *Cops Talk CAPS*, featuring Chicago police officers from prototype districts; a film showing a progression of staged community beat meetings; and a video demonstration of ICAM (Information Collection for Automated Mapping), the new computerized information system that is currently being installed in all the district station houses.

Methods trainers were taught to use included the "parking lot," a flip chart for questions they were unable to answer immediately; survival exercises; overheads and flip charts. The only method they discarded was the use of overheads, which they found distracting and redundant. The training observers confirmed this, noting that some of the overheads were copies of workbook pages and in other cases, a blackboard or flip chart were preferable alternatives for displaying variable information.

Aside from the "parking lot," few trainers used flip charts in their presentations. They were used more often as aids for recording participants' answers during the exercises. One who did integrate it into her presentation used it well, as described by an observer:

The flip chart was a good tool for helping the trainer to stay on track and remember all of the information she wanted to impart. Information was very neatly written in two colors of marker and could be read easily from the back of the room. It was done in outline form, containing key points.

Trainers' Reactions to Training Materials and Methods

Overall, the trainers liked the materials, notably the workbook, trainer's manual, and posters; also, the survival exercise materials except for the jungle exercise, which did not include a film. Generally, they liked the videos and reported that trainees wanted more of

them. They thought that they were good introductions to particular segments and were instructional in an entertaining way.

The films also gave them a break from lecturing or facilitating discussion. The ones they thought were the most well received were the 1937 recruitment film, Crime Fighters, on traditional policing and the one about community beat meetings. They had mixed feelings about Cops Talk CAPS, and they thought the ICAM film contained some valuable information but was too unrealistic. Here are some of their comments:

The 1937 film was a good way to start the class to ease tension, but it also made a valid point and was the building block for the whole session.

I thought "Cops Talk CAPS" was lame, because it seemed staged. The police officers didn't believe that these were their honest opinions.

"Cops Talk CAPS": 75% listened. A small portion recognized officers in it, and said, "He's a dog!" So there was a lack of credibility. This film needs to be updated. For example, Rocco says, when he wants to get a car towed, "This is a community policing program." We're trying to get away from the term "community policing" and call it alternative policing. CAPS has changed, too. Maybe they could get some information from District 024, and show police problem solving in the film.

"Cops Talk CAPS" was good because it addressed everyone in the room -- both young and old officers. Seeing these officers talk about it (in the film) touched everyone.

They really don't like the ICAM video. It's too hokey; the actors are too young, un-police looking, they sound 10 years old.

The films, they enjoyed for the most part, except for the ICAM film. The ending was too unrealistic, and the presentation of how to use the computer was below the mentality of the audience.

Trainers thought that testing trainees at the end of the session was a good idea for several reasons: it conveyed the importance of the program, it motivated trainees to pay attention, and it served as a measure of their success, as described by a trainer:

It made them realize that they learned something and gave them the confidence to go out and use it.

For the most part, they also liked the methods they were trained to use, especially the "parking lot" and the survival exercises. Trainers described the "parking lot" as an excellent tool that enabled them to provide timely responses to questions. They explained its usefulness:

The "parking lot" shows them you're sincere about trying to get information for them ;and for future sessions, you're gaining more information for them.

The fact that "parking lot" questions could be called in and asked on Saturday was good.

I flipped it over and read comments from other classes and that generated discussion.

The method trainers rated as most successful was the Human Synergistics survival exercise. They observed that it stimulated interaction and was effective in teaching the concept of teamwork. Here is how two trainers described it:

*I was extremely pleased with the survival exercise. It was **dynamic**. That's where we really bonded with the groups. It put them at ease and warmed them up.*

To make this program fly, participation is the key. These exercises do it.

TRAINERS

Training Teams

There were five training teams, each comprised of a sergeant and five to seven police officers. Usually classes were taught by two police officers and a sergeant, but there could be as many as five police officers and a sergeant teaching on any given day. Observers concluded that the combination of two police officers and a sergeant per session was sufficient. More than that was a waste of manpower, and trainers who had a lot of idle time appeared bored.

The police officers were the primary teachers, presenting the material, answering questions, and facilitating discussion. The sergeant had multiple roles, serving as administrator, supervisor of the instructors, disciplinarian, and authority figure. Their responsibilities were described by one sergeant as follows:

It was to set the tone at the beginning of the session; to let the police officers know what our expectations were, and theirs were of us. I was also there for insuring that trainers taught the key elements, that the facts presented were accurate; for maintaining a learning atmosphere; and for scheduling instructors and evaluating their performance. I also served as an intermediary between R&D and the trainers to answer questions, and as a counselor for the trainers when things got out of hand.

The amount of time sergeants spent in the classroom daily varied from thirty minutes to almost the entire session. The sergeant's presence appeared to have an impact on trainees' behavior as noted by the observers:

During the break, the trainer told me that she felt the class had "picked up on" the fact that the sergeant wasn't present; that explained their disruptive behavior.

The presence of the sergeant throughout the entire class surprised me. She sat right up in front of the room. I am not sure what impact this had on the officers' willingness to speak their minds, but I did notice that many of the older male officers were less hostile in their tone than they were the morning before.

Overall, supervisors felt effective and rewarded by the training experience. They measured their success by the quality of the relationship that developed between them and the trainers, and their ability to maintain morale. They commented:

I thought I did a fine job. I was very pleased with the camaraderie that developed between my trainers and myself. I think they liked the support I gave them in setting the tone in the beginning. They were comfortable coming to me with questions. I was fortunate to work with very good people.

It was my responsibility to keep their morale up. I think I was successful at it because of the way I treated them. If there's a problem with them, then there's a problem with the whole program; it would come out negative.

Only one supervisor reported not feeling very effective:

Once this got underway, there wasn't too much supervision to do. The trainers got to the point where they didn't need supervision of the material. I was only the bogeyman to keep people in line, which isn't a very satisfying job. I feel like I could do more.

Most trainers described their relationships with their teaching partners and supervisors as cooperative and mutually respectful. In a few cases, there was some friction between partners, stemming from a difference of opinion over the presentation of part of the curriculum. Some trainers expressed the view that they would like to present all of the material themselves. The following excerpts from observers' notes describe how they worked together:

[The trainers] complemented one another nicely. They took turns presenting the material to the class.

I was impressed with the teamwork that the trainers exhibited in helping one another out of difficult situations.

One concern of mine was the apparent split among the trainers and lack of teamwork. [Two of the trainers] acted like a team. They helped one another out and worked well together. [The other trainer], on the other hand, was a lone

ranger. He presented the entire section on Working With the Community by himself. When his discussion seemed to become long winded or got off track, neither [of the other two trainers] stepped in. The sergeant also failed to comment or encourage either of the other two officers to join in and assist [the trainer]. They simply sat in the back of the classroom. However, they did seem to be paying attention to his presentation. I was sure that the class was aware of the tension between the trainers.

Teaching Styles and Skills

Teaching styles and skills of the individual trainers varied greatly, and directly affected the success of a training session. Training sessions that were most successful were ones in which the following conditions were met:

- (1) The right tone was set at the beginning of the session; that is, a positive atmosphere was established and expectations were made clear.
- (2) The trainers had presence; they took control of the class and maintained momentum.
- (3) The trainers were credible; they had internalized the CAPS philosophy and demonstrated their experience with policing in Chicago.
- (4) The presentation was interesting; trainers were fluent and expressive and taught by example rather than by straight lecturing or reading from the manual.
- (5) The training was interactive; trainers were good facilitators and employed techniques that encouraged participation.

Setting the proper tone at the beginning of a session was crucial to its success. Establishing a positive atmosphere, encouraging participation, detailing expectations and informing trainees of the consequences of not meeting them were key elements. Observers illustrated how it was done in two classes:

The way in which the sergeant addressed the class in the beginning clearly helped set the tone for the entire day. The introductions also appeared to make the officers feel secure in knowing where everybody else stood with regards to their level of

knowledge about CAPS and their beliefs on whether or not it could succeed. Everyone seemed to be more open with one another. Throughout the day, there was a very high level of participation by members of the class.

In this session, I was able to see the role the trainers played in setting the tone, especially by comparing it with other sessions I had observed. The sergeant and two trainers were very clear about their expectations from the outset. They were firm without being condescending. I thought back to how [one trainer], in his intro, had motivated the trainees to be prompt in returning from breaks. He told them that the trainers wouldn't start until everyone was back, and that an early dismissal depended upon their compliance with the requested return times. He made it clear that it was up to them. They were always prompt.

In less successful classes, the tone was not properly established. Either trainers appeared noncommittal about CAPS, or they failed to encourage participation at the outset, or their expectations of trainees were not clearly set forth. As a result, trainees could be passive or hostile. It should be noted that these were usually classes in which the sergeant was absent at the beginning. An observer described one class:

One thing that stood out to me was the behavior of the two trainers toward the class. They appeared to act more like peers than trainers. Many of the topics were presented using words like "supposed to" and they said on many occasions that they were only here to provide the class with the information. While this probably had a calming effect on the class, it also may have contributed to the officers' unwillingness to ask a lot of questions. The level of resentment and unwillingness to address new issues, that I had seen in other classes, was clearly not visible in today's training session.

Trainers who had presence commanded respect from the class. They effectively took control and did not allow the class to linger on superfluous issues not directly related to the training. Here is how they behaved, in the observers' words:

When several started talking at once about how the dispatch policy wasn't being followed, [the trainer] said politely, "Excuse me! We're all going to respect one another, OK?" [He wasn't afraid to take control of the class.]

The trainers said that they had not had any real problems; that they had headed off complaints about the department that didn't pertain to the training. For example, if a trainee complained about staffing, they would respond that that was a personnel issue, and continue with the curriculum.

Trainers who lacked presence failed to keep the momentum going and sometimes lost control of their classes. The observers noted the results:

The trainers let the most vocal and most obnoxious officers control the mood of the training. When they were quiet, the class seemed to move at a good pace. But when something was mentioned that they didn't seem to like, or when they simply got frustrated, the class dragged on and on.

The training turned into a gripe session and the trainers lost control. They didn't know where to draw the line between letting the trainees vent and allowing them to take over the class. I suspect they may have had trouble acting as authority figures with some of their co-workers.

The trainers' credibility was also important to the success of a class. While all of them had mastered the content of the curriculum, a few had not internalized the CAPS philosophy. In some cases, their credibility also hinged on their work experience. The observers' notes offer contrasting views of trainers' credibility:

The trainers made sure to hit all of the key points mentioned in the curriculum. They just came across to me as two individuals who knew that CAPS was for real, but were not too sure if it would ever work. The trainers seemed to just want to get it all over with as easily as possible without having any hostility directed towards them.

They obviously had internalized the CAPS philosophy and their dedication to the program was convincing. One thing that helped establish their credibility was [one trainer's] revelation that he had at first been opposed to CAPS; also, [the other trainer's] experience in a prototype district.

[The trainer] was very effective and believable. Many of the officers showed a lot of respect for him. He started the class by putting his credentials out there and

letting them know that he was an experienced officer. This experience, I think, helped him diffuse a lot of problems. He was able to respond realistically to some of the officers' concerns as well as to put them in their places when they tried to pull the wool over his eyes.

Sessions were more informative and interesting when trainers taught by example rather than by lecturing or reading from the manual. Good expression and voice modulation also contributed to the success of a presentation. Effective trainer styles are reflected in these observer comments:

[The trainer] had a good grasp of the material and conveyed it in a conversational style, using examples that everyone could relate to.

[The trainer] was very expressive and dramatic; fluent and thorough. Her volume, pace, and tone of voice were good, and her presentation was very interesting. The class was very quiet, focused on her.

A less effective approach is described in the following observation:

The class was also boring because the trainers spent too much time reading the curriculum word for word. While they appeared to be very prepared and organized, they clearly didn't seem comfortable with injecting their own personal viewpoints into the training. They were also not comfortable with letting the officers vent.

In the most successful classes, trainers were good facilitators, working to stimulate discussion in groups that were slow to interact. They also employed inventive techniques to encourage class participation. One was to personalize the class by using trainees' names as often as possible. They did this by ensuring that trainees either wore name tags or remained in the desks bearing their nameplates. An observer noted the difference this technique made:

I liked the personal touch -- using names and keeping everyone in desks with their names on them. I felt it gave the trainees identity and perhaps made them take the training more personally, feel more accountable.

In contrast, the observer described a class in which names were not used:

I think that calling the trainees by name or asking their names before they spoke would have helped to make the class more personal. Because the trainees were not wearing name tags and were not necessarily in the desks bearing their name cards (after moving for an exercise), an opportunity to help the class to bond was missed.

Other creative techniques employed by trainers to increase class participation included: inviting trainees to express their feelings about CAPS at the outset of the training, during introductions; having them share in reading aloud the lengthy Beat Plan Form instructions with the trainer; and calling on them at random. The benefits of using these techniques are described by the following excerpts from observers' notes:

Having trainees express their opinions of CAPS and describe their familiarity with it at the beginning of class was an effective tool. This way the trainers could gauge the mood of the class and know what they were dealing with. They could identify their allies in the prototype districts. Also, if the trainees wanted to vent, they could take this opportunity to do it, and perhaps get it out of their system. It was a good ice breaker, too, helping all in the class to get acquainted with one another.

Drawing the trainees into the teaching, by having them take turns reading aloud, was a clever way to involve them and hold their attention.

A good technique he used was to call on the groups randomly, rather than in a predictable sequence, one through six. A trainee in Group 6 in another class I had observed complained about always being called on last, after all the possible answers had already been given. I think this method held their attention, too.

Trainers' Evaluation of the Training

All trainers interviewed rated themselves as effective or very effective. The sample included trainers from all but one teaching team. They attributed their success to the quality of the material, their internalization of the information, and their communication skills. Their comments illustrate their feelings:

I felt much more effective than I did the first time, in the prototype training. I think it was because the material was much more realistic. It had more answers built in, so it made us more credible to the class. And we were given more fact sheets, etcetera, beforehand, to be able to answer questions.

I felt very effective because I tend to carry things a little bit further. I was open to their feedback, brought them in to get their ideas, and asked them to develop their ideas, especially if they said something negative, because the negative thinking can block out what they hear. If you let them come out with it and get it into the open, I can challenge them. Maybe that will clear their head and open them up.

I feel like I've stimulated new growth in these people. For a long time they've been cattle. Now, the police department is giving them the resources to do a good job.

85% of the people who went through our classes left feeling positive, comfortable, and more receptive to the CAPS program.

They measured their effectiveness in various ways: good student test results; feedback from trainees who approached them after class; standing ovations; class evaluations; evaluations by their site supervisors, in a few cases; and, in one case, being asked to teach a class attended by the superintendent of police and the mayor on their day off, on a different watch. Some of their comments were:

After every class someone told us we changed their mind and they'd give it a chance.

What lets me know that what I taught them got across is when they pass the test. Then I feel that it's been a job well done.

On the evaluation, there were very positive comments, for the most part. Some evaluations showed it cleared up misconceptions they had, or made them more open to it. I saw that as being successful.

They did not feel that they encountered any difficulties training officers of the same rank. In fact, they felt this enhanced communication because the officers could relate to them. In their own words:

Being the same rank, that validated us, created a common ground.

They were glad to have someone of the same rank, who had been on the street the last 10 years; they gave me respect.

But they were prepared to confront skepticism. They related how this was done:

Every once in a while, you'd have a class that would say you'd been brain-washed. You just go over the fact that you're just like them and this is your job right now.

At the outset, I elaborated on my experience with CAPS so they knew that I worked on a tough beat and had organized a lot of problem solving activities. There was no room for them to challenge me after that.

They did encounter some resistance to the training, but not as much as they expected. Their opinions of which participants offered resistance varied. Some described them in terms of time in service, but no consensus was reached. Others characterized them by the districts they worked in, noting that negative participants often came from districts with unsupportive supervisors or district commanders. These could be either "busy" districts or "nice" districts. In general, trainers thought they tended to be white males with five years or more on the job and, in some cases, assigned to tact or mission teams. The parts of CAPS they objected to most were the forms and beat meetings.

Several felt that resistance was individualistic. The variety of contradictory characterizations given support this theory. Among their comments were:

Whatever resistance there was was sporadic. They were all individuals. The ones who were resistant at first were resistant throughout. They could either be negative or uninvolved.

There were some who resisted it. Those are the ones who have never worked a real job in their lives, because if they did they'd appreciate how good they have it in this profession.

There really wasn't too much resistance to the training. There was some resistance to the philosophy, but I couldn't identify who from. There's a certain type of

policeman who's resistant to change -- the type who doesn't want to listen to another viewpoint. It's a smaller percentage than people would think. I saw a lot more acceptance and open mindedness than I anticipated. I think police officers have come to the conclusion on their own (before the training) that the old way's not working.

Overall, trainers found participants' questions to be more of an inquisitive nature than of a suspicious nature, although there was, in the words of one, "a good mix of both." Those who were inquisitive seemed sincere about wanting to implement the program correctly. One trainer remarked:

I was pleasantly surprised with some of the questions from people who wanted to know more about it.

Those who were suspicious were wary of unsupportive supervisors and a new job evaluation process. As one trainer put it:

Because the department has been historically punitive rather than supportive of its members, police officers don't trust the department.

Trainers found that the presence of prototype officers in the classroom was usually helpful in reinforcing what was taught. The trainers described how this worked:

They were able to validate what I was saying, that it was actually happening. I think it helped a great deal.

For the most part, it was helpful because I could count on them to help me explain how things worked, so the information didn't always have to be coming from the instructor. They would share their experiences, and it wasn't a rehearsed response, so that was good for the audience. I tried to call on those who I knew to be good beat officers.

In some cases, however, their presence made no difference. A supervisor made the following observation:

It should have made a bigger difference than it did. Police officers didn't want to share their positive experiences, admit it worked, because of peer pressure.

A small percentage of the time, their presence was a hindrance to the instructor, because they were negative. One trainer described it this way:

Some would say, "That's the way it is on paper, but I'll tell you the real way it works." There are several district commanders in the prototypes who are not following the guidelines. There's a lack of uniformity among prototype officers. There's a credibility issue because of points brought up by prototype officers to the effect that things weren't happening in reality the way they're supposed to.

Almost all of the trainers agreed with the timing of the training. They commented:

If done earlier, they wouldn't have accepted it; would have said it was just for the prototypes.

There's enough that has already taken place, where it's not like a foreign language to them, and yet, there's enough forthcoming where they'll be prepared.

If we waited for all the conditions to be perfect, it would never happen. There will always be a manpower shortage, bad bosses, faulty equipment. These were some of the complaints. Also, they complained that all of the supervisors should have been trained first.

Trainers received frequent complaints about supervisors not having been trained before patrolmen. One addressed this issue in an interview:

Supervisors -- sergeants and lieutenants -- were trained first, in the spring. Unfortunately, this model hadn't been developed so they didn't get all this information the police officers got. I think it would have been advantageous to bring supervisors back for a day of retraining to fill in the holes, because now police officers know more than supervisors, so who is there to guide them?

They had strong feelings about the need for continued training and reinforcement in the districts:

From this, they need to do more problem solving, but this laid the foundation. There needs to be some follow up. Don't just put them out there and leave them.

If they want to make this (CAPS) work, it has to be ongoing. In order to succeed, you have to continually remind the current officers, especially those with eight to ten years, what his roles and responsibilities and changes to them are. I don't know how -- through the sergeant or roll call training, or what. You need a constant repetition.

A lot of districts need hand holding. They need to be supported, encouraged through the process. Those instructors picked for the CANS project (police officers and community members) or teams of police officers who did the police officer training should go out to districts to help them set up beat teams and beat profiles. They need to be helped through the process.

Trainers felt that the appearance of high ranking police department and city personnel at training sessions lent credibility to the program, and hence, to them. One expressed it in the following way:

The mayor and superintendent coming out was good, because you could tell classes they had come. Deputy Ramsey coming, and being available to come if there was a problem, was good.

One suggestion made for improvement of the training process was that trainees be awarded certificates upon completion. As one trainer put it:

Certificates would have been good. Little acknowledgements like that make things better.

Trainers' Reactions to Training

Overall, the trainers viewed the training as a very positive, satisfying experience and expressed the desire to continue to be involved in it. Only one admitted to boredom with teaching the same material and answering repetitive questions four days a week. But most found the experience rewarding, as they explained:

It gave my career new life.

It was the best thing that's happened to me in five years on the job.

It was definitely an experience -- to see so much emotion, on such a scale, and to see the department getting fired up about something (even if it was negative), rather than stagnating.

It's been a good learning experience for me because I thought I would be able to teach my peers and they would listen to me because I was a police officer just like them. I found out that life wasn't like that. I found out I had to know the material, I had to stand toe to toe with my co-workers, whereas I hadn't had to do that; I've only had to arrest citizens, who don't even care if you're friends or co-workers. They made me be on top of it because they'd try to shoot me down. It shows that if you do your best, you can accomplish something. It's made me a better teacher and a better person, and I've enjoyed it and am glad I had the opportunity.

The trainers felt well prepared for the training. They praised the curriculum and the teaching team of Deputy Superintendent Ramsey, Barbara McDonald, and Nola Joyce, and were particularly enthusiastic about the segment on instructional methods taught by the Thomas Paget consultant. Some of them said:

The preparation we got was excellent, and the amount of time given was very generous. It was professional, well put together, and organized.

This round of training and training for trainers was better than last. Giving us time to prepare and produce was good. They even gave us enough time with our partners so we could get a system down.

TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

Description of Participants

Almost all 7,491 participants completed questionnaires at the beginning of their training sessions. Large percentages of respondents were male (81%), white (62%), and married (58%). Trainees' ages ranged from 21 to 64, with 39 being the median age. A significant majority (85%) had at least some college or technical school training, and 28% were college graduates.

More than half (55%) had been with the CPD ten years or less, 19% had spent 11 to 20 years with the department, and 26% had 21 years of experience or more. The median number of years on the force was nine. Most participants (85%) were working in nonprototype districts at the time they were trained; 15% served in prototype districts.

Participants' knowledge of CAPS prior to training was tested with nine questions in the survey instrument. Understandably, police officers already serving in prototype districts performed significantly better than nonprototype officers. Because the survey questionnaires were administered at the beginning of each class, they do not reflect any of the impact of training on officers' views or knowledge about the program. This will be assessed in future surveys. Instead, the survey presents a baseline describing the views and knowledge officers brought to the training sessions.

Participants' Behavior

Most trainees were attentive and cooperative during training. They all appeared to understand the material and the majority participated willingly in exercises and discussions. Among the nonparticipants, older white males, in their 40's and up, were disproportionately represented in the classes observed. Overall, younger trainees and African-Americans seemed most receptive. Trainees appeared to be uninhibited, feeling free to vent their anger and voice their concerns.

The behavior of individuals in the class was directly related to the tone set by the trainers, as well as to their presence and credibility. The presence of a sergeant also impacted their

behavior; when a sergeant introduced the session and participated throughout, trainees tended to be more polite and less disruptive.

The most successful classes were ones in which participants were open minded and trainers were highly credible, respectful towards trainees, and skilled at heading off digressions from the curriculum. A sample of these classes is described in the following excerpts from observers' notes:

The trainees seemed intelligent and open to change. Also, they appeared convinced of the reality of CAPS. They approached the training with the attitude that they would be using the information in their jobs, and were anxious to do it right. Everyone in the class contributed at least once in the two days.

The class was generally upbeat from beginning to end. They openly expressed their concerns, but didn't harp on their own individual points. They appeared to be more interested in getting the information than they were in making a statement. Most of the officers were very serious about the training. This was apparent in their actions during the exercises. There was a lot of discussion, teamwork, and camaraderie.

The majority of the officers did seem to come away with more appreciation for the new program. The level of involvement and discussion was tremendous. I was very pleased with the way that the trainers succeeded in making the officers feel comfortable enough to actively participate.

In less successful classes, trainers lost control and disruptive trainees sidetracked the training, or trainers disengaged participants by disowning CAPS, stating that they were there merely to present the information. Examples of such classes are described by observers:

There was a "mob mentality" in the class. Once a few gripes were aired, the negativism was infectious. Of the eight trainees from the prototype districts, not one allied himself with the trainers. In fact, many of them were among the loudest protesters.

For the most part, the class listened politely to what the trainers had to say. I got the feeling, though, that many of them were just putting in their time; they didn't care one way or another about CAPS, and the training didn't light their fire.

More classes were observed to be successful than not.

Participants' Feelings About Their Jobs

Most of the training participants appeared to be satisfied with their jobs. In the survey, approximately three-fifths or more agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements: "I like the kind of work I do very much" (74%) and, "This city's police department is a good organization to work for" (57%). However, it appeared that they had not "taken ownership" in their work, as espoused by the CAPS philosophy. Only 26% agreed or strongly agreed that, "I am very much involved personally with my job." A trainer offered one explanation for this, that most police officers don't live in the district in which they work:

Many of these officers don't give a damn about the inner city. I work and live in my district so what goes on there directly affects me and my family. Some of these officers get off work and go home to Hegewisch or some other area and tell their family how they kicked ass all day long.

A trainee revealed another view:

The police deal with all the negative aspects of the community. Then, when I go to work, I think, it's another eight hours focusing on the negative aspects of the community.

Despite their job satisfaction, most patrolmen did not feel that communication with higher ranking personnel was good. Only one-fifth (22%) reported, "My supervisor frequently seeks my opinion when a problem comes up involving my job environment." Fewer than one-third (29%) felt, "If I have a suggestion for improving my job in some way, it is easy for me to communicate my ideas to management." A training observer described a conversation with a trainee on this subject:

[She explained that] she has wanted to employ some specific crime prevention measures and her supervisor has forbidden her to do so. She sounded appalled that, not only was there a lack of support, but she was actually forbidden to try to do a good job. She said, "No one ever asks for our input. They just tell us what to do."

Communication problems also existed in districts where CAPS had already been implemented. An observer described a prototype district officer's lack of success when he attempted to inform his supervisor that the Daily Watch Assignment Record was being used ineffectively, without a face-to-face meeting with one's relief:

He told me he had gathered the courage to complain once about the watch supervisor's failure to enforce the face to face, and nothing was done about it. He doesn't want to complain a second time.

Additionally, most participants did not feel that they were treated well by their superiors. Only 23% of those surveyed expressed the view, "From my experience, I feel our management in general treats its employees quite well." An observer in one training session noted:

They [the trainees] obviously felt a lot of anger and resentment about the way things were going in their districts. I got the impression that many of them work in a climate of fear of retaliation by their supervisors, that more emphasis is placed on what they do wrong than what they do right.

A trainee in another class echoed this observation:

The problem is, a lot of supervisors don't reward you for the things you do, but discipline you for the things you don't do. There's no incentive.

Even fewer trainees (18%) felt, "This department is open to suggestions for change." One trainee voiced a commonly heard opinion, as recorded by an observer:

She said she didn't think the department cared about fighting crime; they just wanted to appear like they were fighting crime to appease the public. They wanted large numbers to show, such as the number of calls police officers were sent on.

She said it doesn't matter whether police officers actually do anything when they respond to a call, as long as the department has the numbers to show for it.

Training observations and interviews confirmed that the perception the department will not change is cause for low morale among police officers. A trainer commented:

The general attitude of the department is poor morale and they don't trust anyone. Police officers get accused of things they didn't do (like beating people). The department's on you, the media's on you, the any citizen public has no idea what cops are up against. With CAPS, they think your job's gonna be harder, but nothing's gonna change for you. Discipline will be the same. If we're gonna change this department, let's change it across the board, real change; make life easier for cops.

Participants' Feelings About Citizens

The survey revealed that only 13% of the participants felt that, "The relationship between the police and the people of this city is very good." Comments made in training sessions and interviews reinforced this finding. In poorer districts especially, police officers thought that citizens viewed them unfavorably, and they, in turn, viewed citizens they dealt with in a negative light. They commented:

This area is such an anti-police area, it's hard to believe they would get into a different idea of what policing is.

The police officer thinks of the community he works with as being sub-standard and anti-police. He has a negative image of the community he works in, because his experience with them has always been bad.

A lot of people think we should do everything for them. People are more demanding now (since CAPS started). They say, "This is community policing. You're supposed to be doing this."

Prototype district officers addressed these concerns in training classes and described how CAPS could make a difference. Their comments were recorded by observers:

[A trainee from a prototype district] said, "If you show the community that you care, they will get interested and get involved."

A white male in his early 50's from [a prototype district] commented on the difficulty in getting the community to trust the police, cooperate and give you helpful information. He talked about how hard it was for him to get businessmen to tell him what was going on in their area. He said, "It may take time for the business owner to feel comfortable with you. If you're not out there on a regular basis they won't tell you shit. Once they are comfortable with you they will tell you the truth and they will thank you for getting rid of the assholes."

[A trainee] said, "You have to let people know that they are either part of the problem or part of the solution. Sooner or later, the problem will affect them and their families. Get the few to go back and encourage others to participate."

Participants' Feelings About Community Policing and CAPS

A series of items in the survey examined police officers' orientation towards tasks often associated with community policing. A large majority (88%) of respondents believed that, "The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and the police." Only a quarter of them (26%), however, thought that, "Police officers should try to solve noncrime problems on their beat."

Overall, trainees appeared to welcome community participation if it meant helping to relieve their burden, and as long as it did not mean additional work for them. Comments made indicated that trainees felt that many communities were not adequately self supporting, calling too frequently upon police to respond to situations that should instead be referred to other resources, such as doctors, counselors, or locksmiths. They would welcome a respite, and some conceded that if the responsibility for responding to these calls were lifted, time could be allocated to building a relationship with the community; however, many did not believe that this change would come about.

Trainees were less receptive to using CAPS Service Request Forms, i.e., solving noncrime problems, frequently laying blame for this new procedure on city employees who failed to perform their jobs. Their views on this were recorded by observers:

Why must city services be coordinated through the police department? Why don't we attack the services

Where's the ward superintendent? We should be out looking for the bad guy, not potholes. The

There was resentment towards city services, apparently the result of a history of perceived unresponsiveness to police officers' requests for service, notably from the Department of Streets and Sanitation for tow trucks, and from the Department of Human Services for assistance with rape victims and homeless people.

Trainees' perceptions of CAPS were as varied as the districts they worked in. To those in quieter districts it meant ridding their areas of graffiti, potholes and abandoned cars. To those in more impoverished neighborhoods where citizens are perceived as overly dependent on police, it meant citizens would be forced to be more self-reliant. As one trainee put it:

I think this is a hell of a good program. Citizens have to participate. They have to get off their asses and do something.

To others, it meant a shift in attitude towards a better understanding of racial differences. One trainee expressed it this way:

Everyone in the black community is treated like they're criminals. If they see black males on a corner, the first concept in police officers' heads is that they're gangbangers. They might not think that maybe they've just come out of a gym or that they're just getting together having a good time. That's not only white officers, but black officers, too, because of conditioning. The CAPS program tries to have officers transcend -- to put themselves in another person's place -- to try to break down prejudices and barriers that have been put in their heads throughout childhood and adulthood. At least, that's my concept of what CAPS is.

Many trainees also had misperceptions of CAPS:

To me, it was a typical city operation where they got some federal money they had to spend.

CAPS is campaign bullshit. If people stayed in jail, we won't have to do anything. Why do we have to change?

It's obvious this whole program is an obvious public relations plan, more than it is a police program. They want visibility and want citizens to get a sense of security. They don't care what they do, as long as citizens think they're doing something. They want the citizens to think they know what's best for themselves in law enforcement, when in fact, they don't.

It seems like they want us to be more social workers now. Law enforcement should be their priority. I don't see how we can change people that drastically. It has to start with the babies -- in the home and the school. Now, it's all being thrown on the police department.

The way society is going with lawsuits, that's a major factor in this CAPS thing. The police can't go out and kick ass any more. There's more violent crime because the police aren't allowed to do their job. The city gave out billions of dollars in huge settlements last year because of lawsuits. Some of them were beatable.

[One trainee] said she thought that the new 911 system was really designed to find out exactly where each police officer was, at any minute. Their radios would have transmitters on them to relay their locations.

They confused other issues with CAPS, blaming the program for partnerships being broken up, more women being hired, and police officers having to work straight shifts instead of rotating.

Their negativism was fueled by reports that CAPS was not working as designed. Trainees from both prototype and nonprototype districts noted the following discrepancies: community members, rather than beat officers, running beat meetings; beat meetings being attended by only one or two members of the beat team, causing some police officers to be put on the spot; officers not receiving overtime pay for attending beat meetings; the CAPS dispatch policy not being followed; Daily Watch Assignment Records and CAPS Service Request Forms being used as disciplinary tools.

Some expressed the view that the program was intentionally being sabotaged by higher ranking district personnel. In interviews, they said:

Sergeants undermine CAPS by constantly reassigning people. It's intentional. Their argument is that we are short of people.

A lot of bosses are not on board with CAPS because it benefits us, the police officers.

They also saw it used in a punitive fashion:

Who gets assigned to rapid response? People who the boss don't like, or who don't kiss up. I've seen a situation where a watch commander has someone he doesn't like, so he gets assigned to rapid response. It's picking who will get hurt.

Here it's being used more as a punishment than as a positive thing the way I assume it's supposed to be. If they think they can punish you by bouncing you back and forth between 3:00, 4:00, and 6:00 starts, then they'll do it. They're playing games with people you work with. Instead of saying, "These people work good together; we'll keep them," they say, "These people work good together; we'll separate them."

They had mixed feelings about whether or not CAPS would work. Those who vocalized their feelings in class usually had reservations. Some felt that its success depended upon the police department, while others thought it was up to the community. Those who viewed the support of higher ranking police department personnel as the main determinant in its success saw barriers to implementation: insufficient staffing, a lack of support from supervisors, and an irrelevant evaluation system. Many did not believe that these deterrents would be overcome. Their views are illustrated in the following excerpts from observers' notes and interviews:

[One trainee] said, "This plan is never going to work for the simple fact that the department is focused on making arrests. Promotions are based on how many arrests you make. Until you start giving people praise for the job that they do under

CAPS, it's never going to change." Everyone clapped their hands. Some of them shouted and whistled. They were in general agreement with his statement.

[The trainer] said, "When you go on the radio and say, 'I'm going down to work on a CAPS problem,' they'll let you." This provoked much laughter and expressions of disbelief from the class.

[One trainee] said, "You can't do CAPS without support from your district commander." He added that it was the commanders who were in fear of losing their jobs who wouldn't want to go along with CAPS.

I'm not a proponent of CAPS for a couple of reasons: I don't think the city has the intention of hiring the manpower they would need to make this work. If some of the restrictions were taken off the officers, this might work. Our system is based on innocent until proven guilty unless you're the police.

A training supervisor addressed these common concerns of police officers in an interview:

I think the department and the superintendent should make good on what they're saying is going to happen - - actually giving the patrol officer the ability to go out and do problem solving, and to make a decision about the problem; the ability to sit down with his supervisor (field lieutenant) and have a free flow of information; and have the officer judged by his actions in a reasonable and timely manner, in other words, in his efficiency marks.

Some police officers are skeptical. Our efficiency system is horrendous -- outdated and outmoded. If you're going to make the police officer responsible for a plot of land, you better come up with a system that's relevant and responsible to reward him for what he does. The present evaluation system is irrelevant to having the police officer take ownership of his beat. You better give him the necessary tools and backing for him to do his job.

Those who thought the community was the key to the success of CAPS, were skeptical about the program working in poorer, higher crime areas. They elaborated on the reasons, in class and in interviews:

Whether the program itself will work, I don't know. From what I've seen already, I think it will work in nice, upscale neighborhoods where people are concerned about their property. It's gonna be a harder sell in neighborhoods like Humboldt Park, because I don't think people are gonna participate. I firmly believe they're not gonna want it. There are families who depend on their family members selling drugs for a living. Mama's sitting in the living room waiting for her son to bring drug money up from the corner.

He didn't believe CAPS would work in all districts. He said it's working in District 24 because of the concerned community, but he didn't think it would work in districts such as 11. In District 11, he claimed, only 5% to 10% of residents care about the neighborhood. Many of them don't think crime is wrong (have no moral values) and those who do are only concerned with moving out of the neighborhood.

As far as community meetings go, people are intimidated when they try to go and vote. They certainly will be intimidated when they try to go to a beat meeting. There's a lot of gang intimidation in some of those buildings. I don't know how the community will overcome that.

Despite these concerns, most police officers were attracted by the empowerment that CAPS promised, and seemed willing to try to make it work, if given the necessary support. They said:

I'm not gung ho about CAPS. I'm not negative about it. I'm not positive about it, either, but I would be willing to put my best foot forward.

Speaking as a minority, we will come forward and work with the police. Minority communities have to be serviced and not just policed. We, the police, have to change our mentalities. Anything is feasible if we listen and try it.

I'm all for making arrests and I worked hard at it, but that's the reason I'm sold on this program, because if the mediocre and lazy patrolmen get on board ...Now they're gonna have to get off their butts, if the public's telling them to do something. It's gonna force him to look into things, because you lose credibility with the public and with your fellow officers if you don't.

At least they have a goal in mind. Whether it works or not, it will take 10 or 15 years to find out.

Participants' Reactions to Training

The majority of police officers interviewed made favorable comments about the training. They were generally satisfied with the experience and thought it was useful. Their satisfaction stemmed from the interactive nature of the training, as illustrated by the following comments:

We were included in the training. They weren't just bombarding you with information, so I was satisfied with it.

I went in with an open mind and enjoyed the day, the two days. We could talk about what was bothering us about the program, too. Any time you can vent and someone's gonna listen, it's good.

The usefulness of the training lay in its ability to give participants a new perspective on their jobs, as reflected in the following remarks:

It made us more aware of conditions on our beat and what we should be looking for, more than just driving around looking for traffic violations.

In CAPS, they want you to know what are priorities for people in the community. I know what's priority, but I guess I have to look at it from the perspective of the community.

Parts of the training they particularly found useful were learning about teamwork among the community, police department and city services; instructions for using CAPS Service Request Forms; phone numbers of city services; and hearing firsthand about how CAPS worked in other city districts. The survival exercise was mentioned most often as a component that was helpful in teaching them to understand their roles in CAPS. One officer described how that was done:

That [the survival exercise] made me think about priorities. It makes you think about different answers. There's no one set right or wrong.

Those who said they did not find the training useful usually gave one of two reasons: that they learned nothing new, or that they did not expect to use CAPS in their jobs. Most who felt they learned nothing new said that they had already been practicing the CAPS philosophy of working with the community, even in nonprototype districts. Others who said they did not learn anything new were police officers who had previously studied the material, either because they worked in a prototype district or had prepared for a promotional exam. As one 18 year veteran put it:

I've tried to adopt a style of work habits and traits over the years since I came on the job. One of those things is to try to communicate with people as best you can. Another is to try to help people. For the police department now to try to teach me these things doesn't make sense, because I've tried to do it all along.

An officer with eight years on the force said:

Most of the things they taught, we always did, so CAPS is really nothing new.

Those who did not expect to use CAPS in their jobs were either police officers who did not believe that CAPS would be fully implemented in their districts, or those who felt it did not relate to their particular assignment. The disbelieving ones cited opposition from higher ranking district personnel, or a shortage of manpower. The following comments are examples of their reaction:

You can't really get enthusiastic about it when you know it's not going to work in your district the way things are now.

I knew it [the training] wouldn't affect the way I do my job.

Our boss here doesn't like it, and he wants to be in control of his end.

Among those who felt the training did not relate directly to their jobs were the rapid response officers who said:

Rapid response cars don't really do much CAPS.

Response cars are overworked because we get sent throughout the whole district, and also do case reports. Response cars don't go to community meetings. We're not tied down to one area.

A trainer confirmed this attitude:

Specialized units question why they should go to a beat meeting. They don't seem to mentally understand how they fit in. They fail to see how they support it, because their services have to be requested. They're not doing what the beat officers are doing. In the last two weeks, we've had mostly gangs, housing, and tact officers and many of them say they don't feel a need to be here.

Most of the police officers interviewed believed that the training related more to the job they would be doing in the future than to their present jobs. While some remained skeptical that the program would materialize as projected, others were optimistic. Their comments reflected their thoughts about how the training related to their jobs:

Possibly it will [relate to my job], if we ever get the manpower.

If they stay with CAPS...

If the district beats get cut down...

It [the training] seemed to be more futuristic. Some of the things they were talking about aren't happening at the present moment; they're things that they want to do. For example, all of a sudden they want you to get out of the cars and talk to the community.

It [the training] wasn't directly related to what we are doing, but will have a big impact on what we're doing in the future. Now we're going to community programs. Prior to that, the autonomy we had was limited. The first things supervisors did was penalize you.

Trainees found the presence of prototype officers in class useful for illustrating how CAPS worked in a variety of districts. They described the benefits:

We saw how it should be run.

It was helpful to see how they deal with certain situations with the citizens.

They tended to qualify their affirmation, however, noting that prototype districts had been allocated additional manpower to enable CAPS to work, and also that, because of differences between districts, the lessons learned may not necessarily be universally applied.

The prototype officers involved had mixed feelings about being called upon to assist the trainers. Their comments illustrate their differing attitudes:

I felt like I was getting picked on.

Our input helped the class go along.

One recurrent suggestion from trainees was that higher ranking personnel be present in the classroom for at least part of each training session. This was because they felt that they were being asked to implement procedures that were not supported by their supervisors. Several questioned why supervisors were not trained first, not realizing that they had been trained last spring. They expressed their feelings in interviews, as follows:

It would be important to have higher ranking people there, either as instructors or participants, so they can engage in open dialogue with the participants. I think everyone from the superintendent on down should go through the class and should be intermingled with the patrolmen. If we couldn't be honest with the bosses in a controlled classroom, then how could they expect us to conduct ourselves as taught outside of the classroom. It's important to have a whole cross section of rank.

Ranking officers could present the material if they knew how to talk to people without falling back on their rank. I think it would be good for ranking officers and police officers to be in class together so you would have a similar understanding of the material. You'd be in the same room while the information was being given.

There were no higher ranking personnel, so there was a communication gap. I would have liked to ask them things like why, in CAPS, did they break up partnerships?

A training observer noted that this issue was also raised in class:

[One trainee] thought that Deputy Ramsey should be present for at least 15 minutes of every training class. [Another] conjectured that Ramsey could make a film to be shown in training classes. [Another] said that if Ramsey were present it would make a difference.

When high ranking personnel did make an appearance, the impression they made was great. An observer recorded Deputy Superintendent Ramsey's visit to a particularly volatile classroom:

He was passionate and believable. The entire time that he spoke, the class was quiet, their attention riveted on him. Also, they asked their questions respectfully, not in the angry manner they had used with the trainers. There was no doubt Deputy Ramsey had made a good impression. There was a more positive feeling in the air than there had been in the entire two days.

Superintendent of Police Rodriguez and Mayor Daley spoke at another training session, again with very favorable results, as recorded by the observer:

The appearance of the superintendent and the mayor was a surprise to many of the officers. They were glad that they got the opportunity to talk to their bosses. The officers did not seem afraid to ask difficult questions. The superintendent made it clear to doubters that CAPS was here to stay so they should get with the program.

Participants' Reactions to the Trainers

The participants reacted positively to the instructors. In general, they thought that trainers were capable and well informed, that they presented the material clearly, and that they respected their audience. They described the trainers in the following words:

They were excellent instructors and tried to present the material in a professional and educational manner that kept our interest.

I guess they felt this could really work. They had a positive attitude about it.

They presented it well. I didn't feel talked down to.

Overall, trainees were enthusiastic about having fellow police officers conduct the training, rather than higher ranking personnel. They felt they could identify with them and were able to express their opinions more freely. The following comments are examples of their reactions:

It's good to have patrolmen do this, because these are people you would probably relate to, as far as having to do the same thing.

I think I'd rather have a police officer doing it than a supervisor because they've been out of touch with what we're doing.

I think it made you feel a little bit more comfortable. Sometimes, with higher ranking personnel, people don't want to say what's on their mind.

The few who made unfavorable comments about trainers questioned their credibility because they perceived them as lacking experience. In some cases, they complained that the trainers had not worked in prototype districts. One said:

To me, the way they talked about some of their programs seemed like they were actually brainwashed by the department rather than talking about experiences they had themselves.

In other cases, participants felt trainers did not have enough time in service "on the street" to have the experience they deemed essential for teaching. Comments made along these lines were:

There was one girl who probably had a year or less on the job. Some guys resent someone like this telling you what to do on the job; there's a little animosity there.

You've gotta have street experience to learn how things are gonna work. It doesn't always work on the streets the way it works in the books.

I don't think [one trainer] had a grasp on the city-wide districts and how they varied. From the way he spoke, I figure [he] had less than three years on the job.

The importance of the trainer to the success of the training session was summed up by one trainee as follows:

I would have to rate it, overall, pretty good. It boils down to the instructor and the delivery. I talked to others who had instructors who just lectured at them. [The trainer I had] made it enjoyable.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The training process was well thought out. The combination of off site facilities, classes on all three watches, and permission to wear civilian clothing was well received, contributing to the success of the training. While most trainees benefited from surroundings well suited to training, those in Room 109 at the Police Academy were shortchanged. They were deprived of the opportunity to group properly for exercises because of the room's configuration, and had to endure a room temperature too cold for comfort. It is recommended that an alternate site be used for future training.

2. The curriculum was well designed, being interactive and easy to teach. It adequately covered all the elements of CAPS, with the exception of Working With the Community. It is recommended that that segment be expanded to include exercises, such as a mock community meeting and mock beat team meeting; and a film showing actual beat meetings. The survival exercises and problem solving exercises were very effective in demonstrating the value of teamwork and providing realistic scenarios that trainees could identify with and understand. It would be logical to teach Beat Planning prior to the problem solving exercise, since the Beat Plan is integrated into the exercise.

3. Most methods and materials used by the trainers worked well, with the exception of overheads and two of the films, the one on ICAM and Cops Talk CAPS. The two films that were not well received should be revised. Proven methods used by creative trainers should be incorporated into the training to standardize it. Included would be having trainees take nameplates with them when they move for exercises, and asking them to state their feelings about CAPS at the outset of training, during introductions. Trainers should also involve trainees and hold their attention by calling on them at random to read or volunteer answers.

4. The trainer is the element most critical to the success of the training. Police officers, on the whole, were a good choice for teaching members of the same rank; the majority performed very well. In order to be credible, trainers should have at least five years of experience on the street, should have internalized the CAPS philosophy, should not be intimidated by their peers, and should have presence. Trainers should continue to have the opportunity to practice their presentations and be evaluated before training begins.

5. The presence of high ranking personnel in some training classes lent a great deal of credibility to the program. Because there is widespread distrust of management in the department, and reports that supervisors are unsupportive of CAPS, at least one department member ranking higher than sergeant should be present at each training session for a question and answer session.

6. Because of varying degrees of interest and support for CAPS from district personnel, districts throughout the city are at different stages in implementing CAPS. Reinforcement of the training and assistance in implementing the program should be provided in each district by personnel experienced with the program. Sergeants and lieutenants should receive supplementary training to bring them up to the knowledge level of police officers as soon as possible.

7. One of the biggest barriers to the success of CAPS is an outdated evaluation system that measures a police officer's performance on the basis of arrests made and tickets issued. Meaningful job performance standards and productivity measures need to be developed.