

# THE COMMUNITY POLICING NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN KANSAS AND NEBRASKA

## FINAL REPORT

Revised December 1999



ANDRA J. BANNISTER, PH.D., DIRECTOR  
Regional Community Policing Institute  
1845 Fairmount  
Wichita State University  
Wichita, KS 67260-0135  
316.978.3386/888.877.0585/Fax 316.978.3345  
E-mail: [rcpi@wsurcpi.org](mailto:rcpi@wsurcpi.org) / Web: [www.wsurcpi.org](http://www.wsurcpi.org)

Produced by the Regional Community Policing Training Institute at Wichita State University under Cooperative Agreement Number 97-CK-WX-0026 from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the U.S. Department of Justice, or Wichita State University. COPS Grant Monitor, Ed Templeman.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
 <u>Section</u>	
INTRODUCTION	1
Methodology	2
IMPLICATIONS AND FINDINGS	4
Community Policing Practices and Training	4
Primary Training Needs	5
Technology	6
Police Programs	7
 <u>Appendices</u>	
A Summary Survey Results	9
B Training Topics Suggested From focus Groups	14
C Comments From Focus Group Participants	15
D Evaluation Summary of Focus Group Sessions	22

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Focus Group Locations	3
2 Mission of the WSU RCPTI	4
3 Core Values of the WSU RCPTI	4

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

The purpose of the Needs Assessment was to solicit information about community policing training needs in Kansas and Nebraska. Specifically, the intent was to collect input from police executives, primarily from rural law enforcement agencies, to determine their views of needs with respect to community policing training topics, the best methods to deliver training, and technical assistance. Appendix B of the Final Report contains a list of the most frequently cited/requested training topics.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

A two pronged methodology was used to collect the desired information. First, a comprehensive Needs Assessment survey was mailed to all police chiefs and sheriffs in Kansas and Nebraska. There were 232 usable responses (44%) proportionately balanced between the two states. The typical responding agency was a municipal police department which had 0-5 sworn officers serving a resident population of 5,000 or fewer with a geographic area of five square miles or less. (Appendix A of the Final Report contains the summary of the survey results.)

The second information collection method was the use of Focus Groups. Eight Focus Group sessions were held (three in Nebraska and five in Kansas) with a total of sixty-five police chiefs and sheriffs participating. (The size of the sessions was kept small in order to maximize the discussion.) The sessions began with an overview presentation of the project followed by a guided discussion where participants provided input on training and technical assistance needs. (Appendix C of the Final Report contains comments of participants in the focus Group sessions.)

#### **SUMMARY RESULTS**

The following material represents only the highlights of the integrated survey and Focus Group findings. The reader urge to review the complete final report for more detailed discussion.

#### **COMMUNITY POLICING PRACTICES AND TRAINING**

The results show that agencies of all sizes in both states are moving toward adoption of the community policing model, if they have not done so already. While this trend is clear, it was similarly clear from the Focus Groups that there were significantly different interpretations of what was meant by community policing. Based on this

experience, as well as direct requests from a number of the Focus Group members, it appears that the need remains to have training on the basic philosophy and rationale for community policing.

For both agencies which have adopted community policing and those in the process, it was clear that the transition to the philosophy has been difficult—both because of the conceptual nature of the change and the general resistance to change by many personnel. Training implications include sessions on the concept as an operational and administrative philosophy of policing as well as implementation issues, policies and practices and insights on organizational change. On this latter point, while only about one quarter (24.3%) of the survey respondents indicated a need for organizational change training, it was a constant topic in the Focus Groups.

Another common theme from the Focus Groups was “who” in the department should be doing community policing: Only uniformed officers or *all* sworn officers. Because of the size and diversity of the agencies involved, it appears, from a training and technical assistance perspective, the best service would be to provide...

- ...a training program exploring the conceptual and operational issues of each model;
- ...a facilitated session where police executives could discuss the issues and gain input and advice from their peers; and
- ...the offering of technical assistance, particularly in the form of research or white papers which would be placed on the RCPTI Web Page.

### **PRIMARY TRAINING NEEDS**

Those agencies currently using or planning to implement community policing were asked what their primary training needs related to community policing implementation. High on the list were...

- Keeping the Community Involved: 72.9%
- Dealing with the Public in a Community Policing Role: 59.6%
- Developing and Using Volunteers: 55.3%
- Organizing the Community: 55.3%

Slightly over one-half (51.7%) of the respondents reported that their officers had received no training on community policing. Primary reasons given were:

- Training has not been easily accessible to the rural, sometimes remote, areas;

- Many agencies “can’t afford” sending an officer to training. This includes travel expense, program expense, overtime payments, and/or the loss of staffing over a period of two days or more.
- Available training is typically designed for large or moderate-sized cities; not small rural cities and sheriffs’ departments.

## TECHNOLOGY

Well over one-half (69.0%) of the respondents currently have a computer with a modem and nearly 42% of those *not* having this equipment indicated they have a current plan to obtain a computer and modem. Even though 69% of the respondents already had this equipment, a smaller number, 42.2%, currently have access to the Internet with nearly 40% of those not having connected to the Web indicating they have a plan to gain access.

When examined more closely during the Focus Group sessions, it was apparent that the vast majority of participants knew little, if anything, about using the Internet. Moreover, in most cases, only one or two people in the department used the Web.

It was quite evident that police executives wanted technology training for themselves and their personnel. There was a very high interest in training people to use the Internet as well as sessions on how the police department could use the Internet and e-mail as both tools to enhance communications with the community and to solve problems.

## POLICE PROGRAMS

Perhaps not surprisingly, both the survey data and Focus Group comments indicated the most common programs in use were Neighborhood Watch and D.A.R.E. (Both produced a 59.9% adoption.) Several Focus Group comments recommended that a summary of various programs be made along with a list of people or organizations to contact for more information on implementing the programs. This, in principle, appears to be feasible and will be explored more fully as the project progresses. Initial thoughts are to place this information on the project’s Web page and to hyperlink the descriptions to other Web resources and police department home pages where the programs are demonstrated.

Despite low levels of reported use, four programs generated a great deal of discussion and enthusiasm in the Focus Group sessions: The Citizens’ Police Academy (17.2%), Education Resource Officers (16.4%), Citizen Volunteers (10.3%), and Citizens on Patrol (4.3%) were all felt to hold a great deal of potential, particularly for the citizen involvement issue. Participants urged that these programs be explored in detail with

more information on implementation issues, costs, and effects provided to agencies in the service region. It was suggested suggested that a training session be developed which provides information on various programs from which agencies could “pick and choose” those which are needed and fall within the resources of the department.

## FINAL REPORT

### COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Kansas and Nebraska Regional Community Policing Training Institute (RCPTI) was created under a cooperative agreement between the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), U.S. Department of Justice, and Wichita State University (WSU). This twelve-month renewable project is designed to provide community policing training, technical assistance and access to updated research and policy information to police agencies in Kansas and Nebraska. While the primary focus is on rural agencies, resources and services will be available to all agencies within the region. The project's partners are the Wichita Police Department, Kansas Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Wichita Crime Commission.

The Institute has several components:

- A two part Needs Assessment directed toward rural agencies in Kansas and Nebraska using...
  1. A Needs Assessment survey to all municipal police and sheriffs' departments and
  2. Focus Groups to solidify training needs and issues based on issues emerging from the survey.
- Development of an Internet Home Page for the Project. The Web site is already on line, containing a good amount of information and is located at: **<http://www.wsurspi.org>**
- Four, 3-day Train-the-Trainer sessions (total of 125 officers) to be held in Wichita. (All travel and training expenses to be paid for by the Project.) The sessions will include a "hands-on" Internet training session, an overview of Distance Education technologies, and other substantive community policing information to be specified.
- Distance education, using two-way audio-visual communications for simultaneous broadcast of training sessions throughout the region.
- The Future: The delivery of short, no-cost training courses, based on identified needs, throughout the region.

Beyond providing training and significant resource assistance, the Regional Community Policing Training Institute staff is available for technical assistance to help

law enforcement agencies in the region with any aspect of this project or help in the implementation of community policing or the Internet as needed.

## METHODOLOGY

As noted previously, the WSU CPTI seeks to provide needed training in support of community policing to rural law enforcement agencies in Kansas and Nebraska. Part of that mission is to use non-traditional training delivery methods in order to increase access to a wider array of law enforcement agencies with greater ease. In light of this responsibility, the purpose of the Needs Assessment was to ascertain perceived community policing training needs of law enforcement agencies in the service region as well as the agencies' access and expertise related to resources which may support the non-traditional delivery systems.

To achieve these ends, the Needs Assessment employed two protocols: Survey Research and Focus Groups. The survey instrument was developed to measure the above factors in a simple, quick format. The questions were based on a review of community policing training options as well as policy research in the area. Once drafted and placed in format, the instrument was pre-tested on a small purposive sample of police managers (not from the study's population) to assess the survey's clarity, flow, and ease of response. Two additional iterations of the instrument were made before it was ready for mailing.

The study population was defined as all municipal and consolidated police departments and all Sheriffs' Departments in Kansas and Nebraska. Using a comprehensive law enforcement directory, surveys, along with a letter of introduction and a return envelope were mailed to the complete population (N=533). There were 232 usable responses returned for a response rate of 44%. The typical agency responding was a municipal police department which had 0-5 sworn officers serving a resident population of 5,000 people or fewer with a geographic area of five square miles or less. (*See Summary Findings, Questions 12 and 13.*)

Included in the survey packet was a form describing the Focus Groups and soliciting police chiefs and sheriffs to mail or fax the form to the RCPTI in order to participate. As an incentive for participation, the project paid for all meals, lodging, and travel expenses for participants. The primary intent of the Focus Groups was to refine and gain more insight on issues which emerged from the survey. Secondly, other issues, which were included in survey comments and other sources, were included in Focus Group discussions for clarity and an assessment of priority. A third purpose of the group meetings was networking: Given that this is a new project, the Focus Groups

afforded the opportunity to the RCPTI staff to meet and establish a relationship with police executives in the Region.

Eight Focus Group sessions were held—three in Nebraska and five in Kansas. (See Figure 1.) Consistent with the spirit of the project, meeting locales were selected to be geographically diverse and easily accessible to the rural agencies.

Only ten participants were scheduled for each site in order to make the session more conducive to discussions. To be eligible, a participant must be a police chief or sheriff in the service region. Participants and the locations they requested to attend were accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis. A total of 65 people participated in the sessions; all were chiefs or sheriffs except for three people who were last-minute substitutes for the police executives. The sessions included an informal “get acquainted” continental breakfast followed by a four hour session (including a “working lunch”).

Two facilitators conducted all the sessions in the same manner for consistency and reliability. In the first two hours the presentation was on the total project with a discussion of general issues related to the project’s methods, training delivery, resources and administrative issues. The final two hours consisted of a guided discussion of specific training (and related technical assistance) issues. The centerpiece for this discussion was the project’s mission and core values (See Figures 2 and 3), followed by discussion of specific training topics, including feasibility, need, approach, and related issues. (The sessions used “PowerPoint presentations” for clarity with participants receiving copies of all slides.)

**Figure 1**  
**FOCUS GROUP LOCATIONS**

- McCook, Nebraska
- Hastings, Nebraska
- Lincoln, Nebraska
- Independence, Kansas
- Leavenworth, Kansas
- Concordia, Kansas
- Hays, Kansas
- Dodge City, Kansas

Both the empirical results and comments on the survey as well as clear trends and comments from the Focus Groups have been integrated together in the following

discussion. The summary results of all survey questions are included in this report as are a synthesis of comments, issues and concerns from the Focus Groups. In addition, summary results from the Focus Group evaluation are included. These assessments of the sessions are very high--a facet which provides an unobtrusive measure of validity of the comments from the sessions.

**Figure 2**  
**MISSION OF THE WSU**  
**REGIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING INSTITUTE**

To provide current information and research on community oriented policing specifically addressing the issues and needs of police agencies in Kansas and Nebraska. This includes responding to specifically identified needs of police executives; providing traditional training, distance learning, and technical assistance; serving as an information resource; and providing interventions as a basis of police policy in response to our targeted law enforcement agencies.

**Figure 3**  
**CORE VALUES OF THE WSU**  
**REGIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING INSTITUTE**

- The implementation of community policing as a philosophy which guides the organization, administration and operation of the police department.
- Development of an open police management style which encourages innovation, creativity and flexibility.
- Emphasis on a proactive, problem-solving orientation by the police which seeks to resolve both crime and quality of life issues.
- Encouragement of active citizen involvement in the policing process through both leadership and advocacy by officers and self-initiated involvement and volunteerism by community members.
- Establishment of a working relationship between the police department and the community as well as a personal relationship between individual officers and the community they serve.

## IMPLICATIONS AND FINDINGS

A number of important trends emerged from the Needs Assessment. While summary information of all the empirical questions is provided later in the report, there are some clear facets which were consistent between the survey and the Focus Groups.

### COMMUNITY POLICING PRACTICES AND TRAINING

Over one-half (53.9%) of Kansas and Nebraska respondents reported they were currently using the community policing philosophy with another 9.9% planning to implement the philosophy. While there is a clear trend of formally adopting community policing--or at least saying so--it was similarly clear from the Focus Groups that there were significantly different interpretations of what was meant by community policing. Based on this experience, as well as direct requests from a number of the Focus Group members, it appears that the need remains to have training on the basic philosophy and rationale for community policing. It is not uncommon to hear police executives discuss the need to move on to “more advanced” community policing issues. We must remember, however, that the concept is still new to many police officials. As a result, in the WSU RCPTI Service Region we conclude that “the basics” of community policing need to be incorporated in training initiatives.

Of those agencies using or planning to use community policing, 34.5% reported that all *uniformed* officers would be actively involved in community policing, while 53.7% reported *all sworn* officers would be actively involved. This reflects the notion that respondents tend to view community policing as a philosophy of police service delivery, however, there is still reluctance--whether conceptual or operational--to fully commit the department to this mode of policing. Instead, many chiefs and sheriffs are exploring the concept with specially selected officers. Training implications include sessions on the concept as an operational and administrative philosophy of policing as well as implementation issues, policies and practices and insights on organizational change. On this latter point, while only about one quarter (24.3%) of the survey respondents indicated a need for organizational change training, it was a constant topic in the Focus Groups. An observation by one participant was that police executives recognize the need for training (and general assistance) on “change issues”, they may not have thought of it in terms of an “organizational change” training program. All of these conclusions were repeated by Focus Group participants, some of whom expressed concerns about full implementation of community policing, particularly as it applies to small rural agencies.

Another common theme from the Focus Groups was a practically even division on “who” in the department should be doing community policing. Many felt it was inherently an operational approach for *uniformed* services. Others felt that *all* sworn officers--including investigators--could be more productive using problem-solving and quality management techniques. Several of the sheriffs observed that some of their sworn personnel worked almost exclusively in the jail and/or were primarily involved in civil processes. Because of the size and diversity of the agencies involved, it would be unreasonable to attempt to impose a specific model. It appears, from a training and technical assistance perspective, that the WSU RCPTI could provide the best service through...

- ...a training program exploring the conceptual and operational issues of each model;
- ...a facilitated session where police executives could discuss the issues and gain input and advice from their peers; and
- ...the offering of technical assistance, particularly in the form of research or white papers which would be placed on the RCPTI Web Page.

## PRIMARY TRAINING NEEDS

Those agencies currently using or planning to implement community policing were asked what their primary training needs were as related to the broad implementation of the philosophy. Interestingly, primary foci (see the Summary Findings, Question 3) were on specific community issues, namely:

- Keeping the Community Involved: 72.9%
- Dealing with the Public in a Community Policing Role: 59.6%
- Developing and Using Volunteers: 55.3%
- Organizing the Community: 55.3%

Two conclusions come to mind. First, the responding agencies feel they have received sufficient policing skills training to do their work. Thus local academies in Kansas and Nebraska as well as other training opportunities have been adequate to meet their needs. Second, the respondents may feel they simply have had inadequate institutional experience in dealing with the public, notably as community organizers and partners. Moreover, the police may feel less comfortable with this role than more traditional police roles, hence the perceived need for training in this area.

The major concern evident in these findings, and repeatedly reinforced in the Focus Groups, was how to keep the community involved in community policing and

related citizen-based activities. Given the repeated emphasis on this issue, it appears the WSU RCPTI should develop a program involving discussions by community activists and leaders as well as law enforcement agencies which have had positive experiences in keeping their communities active. While the level of citizen involvement will naturally differ with communities, there will be experiences and policies worth sharing. Moreover, a reasonable task for the RCPTI in this regard is to take notes during these sessions and develop a small publication on “lessons learned” in keeping the community involved. This would include anecdotes, experiences, policies, practices, and contact resources.

Slightly over one-half (51.7%) of the respondents reported that their officers had received no training on community policing. When asked why in the Focus Groups, police executives repeatedly gave the same primary reasons:

- Training has not been easily accessible to the rural, sometimes remote, areas;
- Many agencies “can’t afford” sending an officer to training. This includes travel expense, program expense, overtime payments, and/or the loss of staffing over a period of two days or more.
- Available training is typically designed for large or moderate-sized cities; not small rural cities and sheriffs’ departments.

A few survey and focus group comments also stated that they had not seen any community policing training programs offered. Further examination of this issue suggested that it was most likely a problem of communication to the police department from training sources. One intent of the WSU RCPTI is to remedy this problem. Of course, some agencies simply did not send officers to community policing training because either the executive did not subscribe to the community policing philosophy or because of the echoed sentiment, “In small communities we’ve been doing community policing all along. We don’t need any training on it.”

This point regularly generated some discussion, with the facilitators agreeing that many rural law enforcement agencies have been community-based. The facilitators went on to note, however, that there were infrastructure policies and practices as well as training programs which could enhance the efficacy of the departments’ community policing initiatives. After this discussion, Focus Group participants tended to agree that supporting information could contribute to the quality of their efforts.

Of those police and sheriffs’ departments which had sent officers to community policing training, the most common sources were the Community Policing Consortium (34.3%) followed by the local police academy (29.6%), Bureau of Justice Assistance Technical Assistance and Training (28.7%), and a training program internally presented by the police department (23.1%). Comments from the Focus Groups indicated that

police executives tended to use the external resources simply because “they were available and free”, but their satisfaction with the training programs were generally expressed in terms of indifference. Representative comments explaining this attitude included:

- “Their problems and examples don’t apply to my department.”
- “They talk about using ‘extra officers’—there are only six people in my department. I don’t have extras.”
- “The two training programs I went to might as well have been from another planet; their information meant nothing to me.”

Virtually all Focus Group participants expressed enthusiasm about the Kansas and Nebraska RCPTI. Specifically, they were encouraged by the facts that:

- They would have direct input on the training curricula and program structure.
- The programs would be tailored to their specific needs (both substantive, geographic and size).
- The programs would be delivered to locations throughout the states which made access much easier.

## TECHNOLOGY

Since an important part of the project is distribution of information via the Internet, we attempted to assess both the resources and expertise for accessing the Web currently available to agencies. Well over one-half (69.0%) of the respondents currently have a computer with a modem and nearly 42% of those *not* having this equipment indicated they have a current plan to obtain a computer and modem. Even though 69% of the respondents already had this equipment, a smaller number, 42.2%, currently have access to the Internet with nearly 40% of those not having connected to the Web indicating they have a plan to gain access.

When examined more closely during the Focus Group sessions, it was apparent that the vast majority of participants knew little, if anything, about using the Internet. Moreover, in most cases, only one or two people in the department used the Web. On a positive note, nearly all of the police executives in the Focus sessions appeared eager to learn and to have the Internet used as a regular part of their police operations.

The participants strongly emphasized the need for training in this area. As one chief of police noted, “We need a *very* basic program for some of us who have difficulty even turning a computer on.” Additionally, most Focus Group participants stated they

would like to see all of their officers become familiar with using the Web because of the resources and assistance which could be used in problem solving and communications. Currently, only 12.1% of the survey respondents indicated they had sent at least one employee to Internet training while another 8.6% reported that at least one employee had attended an Internet training program “on their own.”

## **POLICE PROGRAMS**

**P**olice departments across the country have adopted a wide range of programs intended to accomplish specific goals in support of their policing philosophy. For example, in El Paso (a city of about 600,000) the police department developed the Drive By Shooting Response Team to deal with increasing numbers of such crimes. In Detroit (population 3.5 million), the police department established mini-stations throughout the city to enhance their communications and relationship with the community. While both programs are good, neither are applicable to the vast majority of law enforcement agencies in the WSU RCPTI service region.

Consequently, part of the Needs Assessment was to inventory programs in Kansas and Nebraska law enforcement agencies to determine standards of common practice. Many of these programs were then discussed in the Focus Groups with respect to their utility, demands on the organization, responsiveness to service needs, and transferability between agencies.

The goal was to define programs of good practice which meet the service region’s needs. When needed, the RCPTI will provide training on program implementation. In other cases, a descriptive/prescriptive narrative of the program will be developed and placed on the Institute’s Web page.

Perhaps not surprisingly, both the survey data and Focus Group comments indicated the most common programs in use were Neighborhood Watch and D.A.R.E. (Both produced a 59.9% adoption.) In the case of G.R.E.A.T., only 9.5% of the respondents had the program because it was reported that gangs were not a problem in the vast majority of the service region’s communities. In the case of Neighborhood Watch, while there was plenty of information on the program’s concept, most Focus Group participants indicated the problem was keeping membership active. This issue is similar to the broader problems of citizen involvement discussed earlier. One suggestion affecting the WSU RCPTI was to develop a section within the project Web page devoted to Neighborhood Watch and citizens issues in general. The feasibility of this will be further explored with the Institute’s partners.

Overall, the program issues (*See Summary Findings, Question 11*), generated a great deal of discussion and interest. Perhaps because the programs may be more concretely grasped than the philosophical issues, there was strong support for the RCPTI to provide assistance in program development. Several Focus Group comments recommended that a summary of various programs be made along with a list of people or organizations to contact for more information on implementing the programs. This, in principle, appears to be feasible and will be explored more fully as the project progresses. Initial thoughts are to place this information on the project's Web page and to hyperlink the descriptions to other Web resources and police department home pages where the programs are demonstrated.

Despite low levels of usage reported on the Needs Assessment survey, four programs generated a great deal of discussion and enthusiasm in the Focus Group sessions. The Citizens' Police Academy (17.2%), Education Resource Officers (16.4%), Citizen Volunteers (10.3%), and Citizens on Patrol (4.3%) were all felt to hold a great deal of potential, particularly for the citizen involvement issue. Participants urged that these programs be explored in detail with more information on implementation issues, costs, and effects provided to agencies in the service region. Several participants suggested that a training session be developed which provides information on a wide array of programs from which law enforcement agencies could "pick and choose" those programs which are needed and fall within the resource capabilities of a department.

## Appendix A

### SUMMARY FINDINGS

The following information reflects the responses received on the Needs Assessment Survey. In some cases, the responses do not equal 100% due to rounding or missing responses. For questions where the total responses exceed 100%, the respondents could select more than one response option. Since some questions were “filtered”, the number of responses (N) is noted for each question.

- 
1. Does your department *currently* have a community policing strategy or plan? (N=232)
    - 34.5% Yes, the department currently is using community policing
    - 19.4% The department is currently phasing in community policing
    - 9.9% The department is definitely planning to implement community policing
    - 17.2% The department is considering implementation of community policing
    - 15.5% There is no plan to implement community policing
    - 1.7% The department will not be implementing community policing
  
  2. Which of the following best describes your department’s community policing practice? (N=188)
    - 34.5% **All uniformed** officers are/will be actively involved in community policing
    - 53.7% **All sworn** officers are/will be actively involved in community policing
    - 12.8% Only specifically assigned officers are/will be involved in community policing
    - 18.1% The department does not use community policing.
  
  3. What are your **primary training needs** related to community policing? (N=188)
    - 72.9% Keeping the community involved
    - 59.6% Dealing with the public in a community policing role
    - 55.3% Community policing techniques and practices
    - 55.3% Developing and using volunteers
    - 55.3% Organizing the community
    - 52.1% Crime prevention
    - 47.9% Community policing basic concepts and role
    - 46.3% Problem solving
    - 44.7% Managing patrol time
    - 43.1% Administration, management and supervision of community police officers
    - 42.6% Leadership role of a community police officer
    - 38.3% Problem identification
    - 35.6% Resources and referrals
    - 30.9% Identifying and handling quality of life issues
    - 23.9% Crime analysis
    - 23.4% Organizational change
    - 4.3% Other

4. Have any of your officers received community policing training? (N=232)

51.7% No  
46.6% Yes

4a. Who presented/provided the training? (N=108)

34.3% Community Policing Consortium  
29.6% Local police academy  
28.7% Bureau of Justice Assistance Training and Technical Assistance  
23.1% Training program internally presented by the department  
13.0% College or university  
12.0% U.S. Attorney's Law Enforcement Coordinator  
10.2% FBI  
6.4% National Center for Community Policing  
3.7% Community Research Associates  
3.7% PERF Annual Problem Solving Conference  
0.9% Southern Police Institute  
0.0% Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute  
25.5% Other Sources

4b. About what percentage of your officer have received community policing training? (N=108)

10% or Less	6.9%
11%-25%	8.6%
26%-50%	8.6%
51%-75%	2.6%
76%-100%	12.1%

5. Does your department have at least one computer with a modem? (N=232)

69.0% Yes  
31.0% No

If no, does your department have a current plan to get a computer with a modem? (N=72)

41.7% Yes

6. Does your department currently have access to the Internet? (N=232)

42.2% Yes  
57.3% No

If no, do you currently have a plan to get departmental access to the Internet? (N=133)

39.8% Yes

7. Does your department currently have an **Internet Web Page**? (N=232)

11.6% Yes

88.4% No

If no, do you have a current plan to develop a police department Internet web site? (N=205)

24.9% Yes

8. Does your agency currently have E-mail which is external to the department? (N=232)

27.6% Yes

72.4% No

If no, do you have a current plan to get external E-mail access for the police department?  
(N=168)

28.0% Yes

9. Do you have an employee who has personal access to the Internet which is sometimes also used for departmental work? (N=232)

54.3% Yes

45.3% No

10. Have your officers had any Internet training? (N=232)

12.1% Yes, the department sent at least one employee to Internet training

8.6% Yes, at least one employee went to Internet training on his/her own

39.7% Yes, at least one employee who has "self-taught" him/herself on how to use the Internet

49.1% No, not to my knowledge

11. Which of the following programs/activities does your department currently have? Please add any additional programs in which you are involved (N=232)

59.9% DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education)

59.9% Neighborhood Watch

46.6% Reserve officers

41.8% Citizen Ride Along Program

40.5% Crime Stoppers

38.4% Foot patrol

35.8% Business Watch

27.6% Bike patrol

17.2% Citizens' Police Academy

16.8% Explorer Scouts

16.4% Education Resource Officers in schools

12.1% Fixed Community Centers

12.1% Danger-Stranger

10.3% Citizen Volunteer Program

9.5% GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training)

6.5% Motorcycle patrol

4.3% Citizen's on Patrol

2.2% Horse patrol

- 1.7% Mobile Community Centers
- 1.7% Police Athletic League
- 0.9% Eyes and Ears
- 22.8% Other

12. Descriptive characteristics about responding departments and jurisdictions (N=232)

Number of Sworn officers

0-5 Officers	53.0%
6-10 Officers	19.4%
11-20 Officers	10.3%
21-40 Officers	5.6%
40+ Officers	4.7%

Number of Reserve officers

0-5 Officers	72.4%
6-10 Officers	13.4%
11-20 Officers	6.5%
21-40 Officers	1.7%
40+ Officers	0.9%

Square miles in your jurisdiction

< 2 Square Miles	11.2%
2-5 Square Miles	26.3%
5.1-10 Square Miles	13.4%
10.1-20 Square Miles	3.0%
20.1-99 Square Miles	6.5%
99.1-500 Square Miles	6.0%
> 500 Square Miles*	4.7%

\*Predominantly reflects County Sheriffs' Departments.

Approximate resident population

<2,500	27.6%
2,501-5,000	22.0%
5,001-10,000	19.0%
10,001-25,000	16.8%
> 50,000	5.2%

13. Which best describes your department (N=232)

- 66.4% Municipal/city police department
- 31.0% Sheriff's Department
- 2.2% Consolidated Department

14. Nebraska respondents, because of a geographical services agreement with COPS, we need to know if your community is located North or South of the Platte River? (N=81)

54.3% North  
41.9% South  
0.3% Jurisdiction is on both sides of the Platte River

15. Departments which responded indicating a desire for more information on training from the WSU RCPTI:

97% Yes

## Appendix B

### TRAINING TOPICS SUGGESTED FROM FOCUS GROUPS

The following training topics and technical assistance issues were those most frequently cited by the Focus Group Participants as needing attention. They are presented in alphabetical order.

---

- Communications Skills
- Community Organization/Mobilization/Partnerships
- Concept/Philosophy of Community Policing
- Contemporary Management Concepts
- Contemporary Crime and Policing Issues in Kansas and Nebraska
- Crime Analysis
- Crime Prevention
- Crime-Specific Policing
- Cultural Diversity/Awareness/Sensitivity
- Developing and Using Volunteers
- Dispatcher Communications Skills
- Domestic Violence
- Ethics
- Identifying and Handling Quality of Life Issues
- Implementing Community Policing
- Internet Applications for Law Enforcement
- Innovative Programs From Other Departments
- Leadership in Community Policing
- Leadership Role of the Community Police Officer
- Managing Patrol Time
- Mediation Techniques
- Organizational Culture and Change
- Performance Evaluation of Personnel
- Problem Solving/Problem Oriented Policing
- Program Development and Evaluation
- Resource Organizations in Kansas and Nebraska
- Strategic Planning
- Supervisory Skills
- Team Building
- Total Quality Management

## Appendix C

### COMMENTS FROM FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

For greater insight to the reader, the following is a compilation of the comments from the Focus Group participants. As will be seen, some were simple suggestions for training topics while others were more conceptual ideas inter-linking training topics, training delivery, and policy. The comments in this appendix are as close as possible to being verbatim, although some minor editing was done for clarity.

---

First line supervisors need training in:

- The philosophy of community policing
- The direction of community policing both in the country and in the department
- Training in evaluating personnel and role of supervisor as a trainer and coach.
- Problem solving: the meaning/rationale of the concepts and problem solving techniques.
- Work ethics and organizational change (issues and processes)
- Role and uses of discipline (as well as different levels of discipline)

Training supervisors on different types of supervisory techniques for changing perceptions, change organizational values-non-traditional/emerging roles in supervision

"Implementing community policing" training for chiefs and Sheriffs

Training for city managers and council members on general community policing concepts, issues, etc. (in conjunction with chiefs at same sessions).

Training Delivery:

- Include non-police with police officials
- Need training at all levels (Executive, supervisory, line)

Dispatcher training

- Telephone etiquette (Sprint/United telephone; APCO training-Independence PD has APCO certified trainer)

Jail staff training and communications skills

Training for city inspectors, code enforcement, street services and other city departments as a separate session on community policing concept and their role in COP

Basic community policing training at all levels. includes city council, code inspectors, managers, mayors, etc.

We need to be able to send our officers to short training sessions (3-4 hours in length) at locations which are close by. We cannot afford to lose the officer for a complete shift or send him away for a couple of days. we can't afford the cost of paying for training, we can't afford the cost of travel expenses, and it's difficult to provide the coverage we need while an officer is gone. (Strong agreement on these points)

- Training sessions need to be brought to us.
- Training should be stratified by size of agency for greater relevancy

- Training sessions should be offered in back-to-back sessions, such as 3 or 4 hours in the afternoon followed by a repeat of the same session at night. this would permit us to send more officers during their shift thereby reducing overtime costs and reducing the need to call officers in for training. it would also be better for midnight officers. (Overall strong agreement on this.)

A long term target would be to:

- Training every officer in the state on the community policing philosophy
- Work with KLEOTC to include more Community policing in the basic curriculum
- RCPTI should give presentations at KLEOTC

Community policing training is needed at all levels in police departments.

There needs to be training for building inspectors, fire inspectors, code enforcement, mayors, city managers, city and county commissioners, community leaders, and other government department heads about the community policing philosophy and how it relates to their roles and responsibilities.

- Explain their responsibilities
- Explain how it will make their job easier.
- Other department heads must realize that needs arise to handle problems even though it might not be between 8 and 5 on a weekday.

NOTE: Mixed feelings whether this training should be in conjunction with the police or separate.

NOTE: Procedures should be established to permit "direct communication" between line level officers and line level city/county workers in order to get a job done.

Strong support of providing Internet training in regions--"bring the training to us so we can get as many officers as possible up to speed on the Internet."

Preferred training group model:

- 6 hour training program
- training site no more than a 90 minute commute or so
- training for agencies within the same region
- offer training two days in a row to maximize the number of officers who can attend the session
- preferably a small group (20 people or so)

Training program for police executives and city manager, etc. in the same session

Offer training both during the day and evening (distance education)

Training topics:

- Overview of community policing philosophy
- Problem solving practices and techniques
- Employee rights
- Managing Problem Employees
- Citizen involvement
- Crime-specific policing

Dispatchers need training which can support community policing and problem solving. Logic: For many people, their first contact with the police-particularly during times of stress-is the dispatcher. Poor communication by the first point of contact can undermine any community policing effort. Topics include:

- Community policing philosophy

- Information needed for problem solving
- Police community relations
- Soliciting information over the telephone
- Effective communications techniques

Training needs to be "top to bottom"-everyone needs it.

A basic course is needed in the philosophy of community policing.

Organization change

- Issues and processes
- Police-community interaction-formalize and organize
- Processes and issues in organizational change

Community-based issues:

- Surveying the community
- Motivating the community
- The idea of a "Problem Resolution Team" which includes the police department, social services, housing, code enforcement, etc.
- Developing programs to include community members
- Sustaining community support/activity
- Volunteerism

Youth programs for intervention, prevention, and gang suppression (includes curfews, DARE, GREAT, School Resource Officers).

Managing patrol time; deployment of personnel; time management

Time-manage and shift changes; scheduling; deployment; 12-hour shifts.

Crime analysis

Implementing community policing

Ethics and ethical decision-making.

Domestic violence

Total Quality Management

Crime-specific policing.

Problem identification and solving

Personnel evaluation system and determination of merit raises

Teaching line officers how to form partnerships.

Planning and time-management for line officers

Motivating line officers and supervisors from the perspective of "What's in it for me?"

Team building (concepts and processes)

Developing community partnerships (including working with community colleges, etc.)

For Chiefs and Sheriffs: Goal setting and how the executive can "let go of the organization."

Strategic planning

Nuisance abatement/quality of life issues ("Broken Windows")

Keeping citizens involved; sustaining citizen support.

Volunteerism

Citizens Police Academies

Youth Police Academy and Youth Councils

Crime analysis and forecasting

Cultural diversity (particularly the Hispanic culture)

Cultural Diversity/Awareness/Sensitivity (including policies and procedures).

Crime-specific policing

Ethics

Performance evaluation systems

Strategic planning and goal setting

Job descriptions, evaluations, promotional criteria and processes, and merit raises.

Civilian role in community policing

Budgeting, scheduling, and money management as related to community policing

Peer discussion sessions with chiefs/managers/elected officials stratified by different size towns grouped together

Crime analysis

Forming community partnerships

Varied times training is offered to meet different shifts

Evening sessions to accommodate community members

Diversity training

Training on zoning issues, code enforcement, etc.

Gang and drug training

Effective communications between different departmental components; internal communications

Shift assignments including length of shifts (8 hr, 10 hr, 12 hr), deployment, time management.

Today's worker-Gen-X work ethic-issue of wanting more free time and more interested in personal pursuits versus work devotion

Ethics

Futures issues for executives including strategic planning

Quality of life issues; applications of broken windows

Incorporate community policing training into state basic police training curricula

Citizen perceptions surveys; how to create them and interpret them.

Public speaking for officers; interpersonal skills

Problem solving

Team building

Volunteerism; resources for developing volunteers, policies and procedures for volunteers.

Crime-specific policing

Implementation issues of community policing at all levels including council, mayors, city managers

Mediation and communications

Strategic planning for executives

CPTI serving as a central point to check out specialized equipment for police departments to use.

Training leans toward 4 hour blocks

Organizational change

Citizen Police Academy

General philosophy of community policing

- Indoctrinate it within the police/sheriff's department
- Refocus direction of line officers to understand community policing

- Attitude adjustment of supervisors and line officers
- Answer “why” police departments should move to community policing
- Interpersonal skill training (e.g., role playing; Dale Carnegie videotapes)

Suggestion: RCPTI purchase Carnegie videotape series for loan to police departments

Scheduling and deployment of officers (including Fair Labor Standards Act)

Proactive training for all personnel within the agency (sworn and nonsworn)

Resource list for all officers for referral

Kansas Association of Law Enforcement Planners (see Ernie Helsig at KLEOTC) Check for web page; suggestions

Do a survey to determine the amount of time spent on crime issues versus quality of life issues

Training for county attorneys and prosecutors; updates on the law

Kansas Juvenile Justice Act and tie this into community policing; help in developing plan in each judicial district

- We will put on the Web page resources around the country in developing a juvenile justice plan

Citizen involvement as an advisory group

Citizen survey assistance

Internet training for officers delivered to the region

Information about government/military property surplus--perhaps placed on the web page

Organizational change

Strategic planning

Grantsmanship

Mediation, resolution of differences

Training should be in two repeated four hour sessions, e.g., afternoon and evening to meet officers on multiple shifts

Supervisory skills specifically for community policing

A sheriff provided an illustration where he was called to handle a raw sewage problem--the septic tank was installed incorrectly creating waste problems. He was being pressured to take action to stop use of the sewer, even if it meant arresting the home owner. His observation was: "it boggles my mind that they want the sheriff to come out and arrest someone for taking a dump."

The Kansas League of municipalities needs to have a presentation on community policing at their regular meetings.

Supervisory training as related to community policing

Training is needed on problem solving techniques; resources; the SARA model; problem identification

Crime analysis training

Training for dispatchers is needed

Performance evaluations

Internet service providers

Citizen Surveys--sample questions, methods, and analysis

Sustaining citizen support

"Breaking down barriers" between the police and community; opening lines of communications

Communications techniques between citizens and line officers

In Kansas, a significant problem is meth labs: training and information is needed on nature of problem; fire, safety, and environmental risks; danger of explosions

developing and using volunteers

assistance is needed in "creative legislation"--e.g., make eviction and public nuisance laws more user-friendly to the police

ethics is a major issue for community-based officers who now have more discretion and wider responsibilities than in the past.

developing and using volunteers

identifying and dealing with quality of life issues

Model programs from other agencies around the country: "What works" and "Lessons learned".

Quality of life issues

Changing organizational attitudes

Resource organizations for community policing

Community policing policies and initiatives that work in departments with fifteen officers or less

How to get people in a small community involved in police issues and activities

## Appendix D

### EVALUATION SUMMARY OF FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

At the completion of each of the eight Focus Group sessions, the participants were asked to complete an evaluation form. Not only were the evaluations used to adjust the presentations, but they also serve as an unobtrusive measure of the quality or validity of the comments as well as support for the RCPTI at Wichita State University.

The reader is reminded that the evaluations and comments are those of Police Chiefs and Sheriffs from Kansas and Nebraska.

Participants were asked to rate the focus Group session they attended on each of the following points using this five point scale:

QUESTION	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	POOR	VERY POOR
The focus group objectives were explained and were clear. (N=64)	29.7%	64.1%	6.2%	0%	0%
The focus group objectives were adhered to. (N=64)	20.3%	67.2%	10.9%	1.6%	0%
The facilitator(s) was/were qualified and communicated well. (N=63)	65.1%	30.2%	4.7%	0%	0%
The facilitator(s) was/were responsive to questions and comments. (N=64)	75.0%	21.9%	3.1%	0%	0%
The time allotted was adequate for the session. (N=64)	37.5%	43.8%	18.7%	0%	0%
The session content was relevant and up to date. (N=64)	51.6%	42.2%	6.2%	0%	0%
The session content was well organized and presented. (N=64)	50.0%	42.2%	6.3%	1.6%	0%
The session provided ample opportunity for individual input. (N=64)	3.4%	21.9%	4.7%	0%	0%

Did the **Regional Community Policing Training Institute** Focus Group meet your expectations ? (N=65)

100% Yes  
0% No

Please indicate how well this focus group session balanced the mix of academic and practical information: (N=63)

0%	Much too academic
1.6%	Too academic
98.4%	Balanced
0%	Too practical
0%	Much too practical

Please indicate your overall evaluation of this focus group session: (N=65)

29.0%	Excellent
58.1%	Very Good
12.9%	Good
0%	Fair
0%	Poor
0%	Very Poor

How would you rate the current need for **police executive training**? (*Check only one*) (N=64)

- 26.6% Very High Need for Police Executive Training  
 60.9% High Need for Police Executive Training  
 13.5% Moderate Need for Police Executive Training  
 0.0% Low Need for Police Executive Training  
 0.0% No Need for Police Executive Training

What primary subject areas do you feel training is most widely needed? (*Raw Numbers—Participants could give multiple responses*)

- 17 Budgeting  
 24 Changing the Organization  
 35 Program Development  
 34 Leadership Skills  
 54 Problem Solving  
 40 Performance Evaluation

**Other Responses Written In...**

- Grant Writing
- Ethics
- Crime Prevention
- Cultural Diversity
- Quality Management
- Quality Life Issues
- Group Dynamics
- Problem I.D.
- Supervising COP/POP
- Supervisory Training
- Grants: Do they help?
- Working with council members
- Officers' Image
- Employee Issues
- Decision Making
- Examples of other working programs

**THE FOLLOWING ARE WRITTEN COMMENTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS RESPONDING TO THE NOTED QUESTIONS. RESPONSES ARE ORGANIZED BASED ON THE FOCUS GROUP LOCATION.**

**What was MOST EFFECTIVE about the session? WHY?**

***McCook, Nebraska***

- Information about the institute and goals.
- Exchange/round table.
- The chance to communicate with other agencies.
- Information and interaction was excellent.
- Stimulated ideas, exchanged information.
- Information on COPS and possible programs for training.

***Hastings, Nebraska***

- The informal, interactive approach. Great discussion and information sharing. Atmosphere very good for encouraging input.
- All information and exchange of information.
- Informal: much discussion from other chiefs.
- The input from other officers.
- The partnership and getting a focus group committed: getting ideas on how to get community involvement.
- Learning from other departments as to what programs/philosophies are working.
- Exchange of ideas and opinions.

***Lincoln, Nebraska***

- Group discussion – new ideas/concepts encouraged greater spread of COPS philosophy and information sharing.
- Provided insight.
- Providing a direction.
- I was here to listen and learn, as we don't have community policing as such. In our smaller community we more or less do community policing all of the time.
- That there is an area-wide interest in understanding and implementation of community policing.
- To stop and take a full 360 view of community policing and which direction to go.
- A wide range of ideas.

***Independence, Kansas***

- Good ideas from other agency administrators. Extremely concerned about support personnel.
- The instructors – very well educated and responsive to questions.
- Individual input.
- Great overview of what program is all about and resources available.
- Input re: our feelings on training topics. Why: because we have special needs in small areas.
- Gaining an understanding about the program and what to expect.
- Heard from other departments in state.

***Leavenworth, Kansas***

- Discussion of training needs – helped bring central issues to forefront.
- Good interplay among invitees and professors.
- Exchange of info.
- Handouts coordinated with projected.
- Open discussion on problems and needs of organizations as a whole. ID of new resources – info – web pages – training.
- All was good.

***Concordia, Kansas***

- The way everyone could participate if they wanted to.

- Group discussions.
- Information about resources available and input concerning future training needs.
- Information re: training – Internet and distance training and train the trainer.
- Open lines of 2-way communication.
- I came to the session with little or no knowledge about community policing, but was interested in possibly getting started. I am very glad I came—been a real eye-opener.
- I came to the session for basics. I got what I came for.
- Group input to chosen items. Get a more well-rounded point of view, from large departments to very small ones.
- My interests in outline materials and Internet info.
- Training set up.

***Hays, Kansas***

- Discussion
- More ideas for identifying and addressing problems within community.
- Small group—individual ideas were all heard.
- The group was small, so effective interagency communication could be heard.
- Awareness of training and setting up a list of needs for departments in this region. New ideas shared among like agencies is always beneficial to me and my department. Internet info also very helpful.
- Gave a lot of new ideas.
- Provided insight about needs facilitator that is available.

***Dodge City, Kansas***

- Information—good dialogue from group. Heard ideas from other areas—Identified training needs specific to my area—SW Kansas.
- The ability and the opportunity to interact and exchange information.
- Interaction between participants.
- Exchange of information between agencies and the offer of the facilitators to provide information.
- The time allowed to exchange information.

**What was LEAST EFFECTIVE about the session? WHY?**

***McCook, Nebraska***

- N/A
- Monday is a poor time for a meeting.
- More time for questions and securing information would be beneficial.
- Can't think of any.

***Hastings, Nebraska***

- Nothing.
- My lack of pre-knowledge of the subject.
- Everything was effective.
- Need more sessions.
- N/A

***Lincoln, Nebraska***

- Room was a little uncomfortable.
- N/A.
- The room was a bit uncomfortable. Presentation was good.
- It was all very informative.

***Independence, Kansas***

- Nothing.
- Nothing I can think of.
- None—been worth time and effort.

***Leavenworth, Kansas***

- Discussion of project “birth”—okay, but didn’t particularly add to purpose of session.
- Not enough organizations represented.
- Uncertainty on community policing funding sources in future.

***Concordia, Kansas***

- Didn’t see any negatives.
- Nothing.
- I wish we could have more time to cover some of the topics.

***Hays, Kansas***

- Got off track several times.
- More time for conversation would have been very helpful.
- Time – This was more of an overview, not in depth.

***Dodge City, Kansas***

- Should have packet of info ready for handout. Save postage.

**What suggestions can you offer to improve the focus group session?**

***McCook, Nebraska***

- More time, advance program material from participants on programs which work.
- Allow more time. As the agenda and programs of the RCPTI become more specific, provide more detailed explanations.

***Hastings, Nebraska***

- Agencies more to same size.
- Make the classes longer. Four hours was not long enough.
- Make chiefs from same size jurisdictions.

***Lincoln, Nebraska***

- Break-out groups—even though small group was small—some chose not to be active.
- Keep up your work.

***Independence, Kansas***

- Bigger room.
- More sessions around the S.E. Kansas area.
- Give ample time on training dates so we can make arrangements to attend.
- All subject areas were discussed—well done.
- Perhaps, if possible, allow for areas with similar population and problem areas.
- Good—limit to some “war stories.”

***Leavenworth, Kansas***

- Perhaps adding one hour to sessions for additional discussions.
- More of the same.
- Send out agenda on topical areas to be discussed ahead of time.

***Concordia, Kansas***

- Do the first session – break – have a group discussion, then the final session.
- I think the session was great. Wish we could have a little more time.

***Hays, Kansas***

- Expand on problems for smaller departments.
- Great as is.
- Open discussion among participants—was well worth coming. Maintain interest in objectives and continue to encourage conversation. Well done!

***Dodge City, Kansas***

- Invite 3 from each department: chief, line supervisor, line officer. You need all three perspectives.
- Meet community policing objectives for small towns under 10,000 population.
- Add more time to exchange information.

**Please add any additional comments you would like to share.**

***McCook, Nebraska***

- Very open to communication and suggestions.
- Thanks!
- The training and information is excellent and very necessary in today's police environment.

***Hastings, Nebraska***

- The trainers were excellent. Enjoyed!
- That the training look at all aspects of small departments: scheduling, resources.
- Good facilitators.

***Lincoln, Nebraska***

- Look forward to expansion of the concept.

***Independence, Kansas***

- Very receptive to "my" needs of training—not "theirs."

***Leavenworth, Kansas***

- Please don't overemphasize rural law enforcement to detriment of other areas.

***Concordia, Kansas***

- Keep it small – and geared to the small department.
- Looking forward to future meetings.

***Hays, Kansas***

- Enjoyed group questions and answers from different departments as were prompted by instructors.
- Good job!
- Please make efforts to continue contact with departments. I like this program.

***Dodge City, Kansas***

- No Comments Provided