

# ***Community Policing in Brookmont Farms:***

## ***An Evaluation for the New Castle County Police Department***

---

### **Volume 2:**

### **Conference Evaluation Report**



**October 2000**

**Written by**

**Janice Barlow**  
**Melissa Hinton**

***Published by***

**Center for Community Development & Family Policy**  
**College of Human Services, Education & Public Policy**  
**University of Delaware**

This project was supported by cooperative agreement #97PAW XK005 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, US Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the US Department of Justice.

***Successful Community Policing:  
Practical Approaches to Policing Strategies***

***Conference Evaluation Report***

By

Janice Barlow

&

Melissa Hinton

Center for Community Development and Family Policy

College of Human Services, Education, and Public Policy

University of Delaware

Newark, Delaware

October 2000

## Table of Contents

### Full Group Sessions / 2

Satisfaction with Full Group Sessions / 2

Keynote Speaker / 3

The Technology Edge / 4

Community Services Project Teams / 5

Government and Private Industry Private Partnerships / 6

Brookmont Farms Project / 6

The Future / 8

### Executive Staff Tract Sessions / 9

Satisfaction with Executive Staff Tract Sessions / 9

Strategic Directions / 10

Leading Organizational Transformation / 10

Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations / 11

Identify Internal/External Support / 12

The Public's Right to Know / 12

Grant Writing / 13

### Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions / 15

Satisfaction with Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions / 15

Supervisors as Agents of Change / 16

The Supervisor's Role / 16

Maintaining Accountability / 17

Use of Mediation in Community Policing / 18

Bikes in Community Policing / 18

Use of K9/Mounted / 19

### Operational Staff & Field Training Officers' Tract Sessions / 20

Satisfaction with Operational Staff and Field Training Officer's Tract Sessions / 20

Emerging Role of the PIO / 21

Training for POP / 21

Observation/Evaluation of POP / 22

Maintaining Accountability / 25

POP Workshop / 25

### Conference Overall / 27

Overall Satisfaction / 27

## Tables

### Tables

1. Satisfaction with Full Group Sessions / 2
2. The Keynote Speaker / 3
3. Keynote Speaker: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 3
4. The Technology Edge / 4
5. The Technology Edge: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 4
6. Community Services Project Teams / 5
7. Community Services Project Teams: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus Strength or Area of Improvement / 5
8. Government and Private Industry Partnerships / 6
9. Brookmont Farms Project / 6
10. Brookmont Farms Project: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 7
11. The Future / 8
12. Satisfaction with Executive Staff Tract Sessions / 9
13. Strategic Directions / 10
14. Leading Organizational Transformation / 10
15. Leading Organizational Transformation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 11
16. Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations / 11
17. Identify Internal/External Support / 12
18. The Public's Right to Know / 12
19. Grant Writing / 13
20. Grant Writing: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 14
21. Satisfaction with Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions / 15
22. Supervisors as Agents of Change / 16
23. The Supervisor's Role / 16
24. Maintaining Accountability / 17
25. Use of Mediation in Community Policing / 18
26. Bikes in Community Policing / 18
27. Use of K9/Mounted / 19
28. Use of K9/Mounted: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area / 19
29. Satisfaction with Operational Staff and Field Training Officers' Tract Sessions / 20
30. Emerging Role of the PIO / 21
31. Training for POP / 21
32. Training for POP: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus Area / 22
33. Observation/Evaluation of POP / 22
34. Domestic and Hostages / 23
35. Domestic and Hostages: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement / 24

- 36. Maintaining Accountability / 25
- 37. POP Workshop / 25
- 38. Satisfaction with Conference Overall / 27
- 39. Day One Overall: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area / 28
- 40. Day Three: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area / 29

***Successful Community Policing:  
Practical Approaches to Policing Strategies  
Conference #2 Evaluation Report***

***Introduction***

On September 26<sup>th</sup> through September 28<sup>th</sup>, the Southern Police Institute in cooperation with the New Castle County Police Department held a community policing conference. The conference, entitled Successful Community Policing: Practical Approaches to Policing Strategies, was held at the New Castle County Police Demonstration Center- Del Tech Community College's Stanton Campus.

The conference was a duplicate of one held May 30, 2000- June 1, 2000. It was marketed to multiple community-level police departments. Participants came from localities throughout the east coast.

In addition to the "full group" sessions, there were three training tracts being offered to participants. These tracts were designed for (1) executive staff, (2) supervisory staff, and (3) operational staff and field training officers.

***Survey Content***

For each session, participants were asked how satisfied they were with the session. Then, participants were asked to rate the session on several points: subject matter knowledge of the instructor(s)/speaker(s), presentation skills of the instructor(s)/speaker(s), relevance of the topics presented, clarity of the material presented, usefulness of the handouts, and usefulness of the discussion. Participants are then asked an open-ended question about how to improve the session.

***Organization of the Report***

In this report, survey results are grouped into the categories of Full Group, Executive Staff Tract, Supervisory Staff Tract, and Operational Staff/Field Training Officer Tract. Within these categories, data is then reported by individual session.

The results of the surveys administered throughout the conference are overwhelmingly positive. Specifically, conference participants had good things to say about almost all aspect of the conference.

### ***Full Group Sessions***

Six separate full group sessions were offered during the course of the conference. These included:

- Keynote Speaker
- The Technology Edge
- Community Services Project Teams
- Government and Private Industry Partnerships
- Brookmont Farms Project
- The Future

#### ***Satisfaction with Full Group Sessions***

Overall, the majority of respondents reported being very satisfied with each of the respective group sessions. As displayed in Table 1, the full group session that had the most 'not satisfied' responses was the keynote speaker.

With the exception of the keynote address, speakers were overwhelmingly rated as being "excellent" with respect to subject matter knowledge, presentation skills, relevance of topic presented, and clarity of the material presented. In the keynote session, only about half rated these areas as "excellent" while approximately another quarter rated these areas as "good." In all full group sessions, high marks were given with respect to usefulness of handouts and discussion.

Table 1  
**Satisfaction with Full Group Sessions**

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Keynote Speaker	50 58.8%	27 31.8%	8 9.4%	85 100%
The Technology Edge	30 81.1%	7 18.9%	0	37 100%
Community Services Project Teams	83 86.4%	12 12.5%	1 1%	96 100%
Government and Private Industry Partnerships	32 84.2%	6 15.8%	0	38 100%
Brookmont Farms Project	64 77.1%	19 22.9%	0	83 100%
The Future	26 86.7%	4 13.3%	0	30 100%



## The Keynote Speaker

Table 2

### The Keynote Speaker

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker	49 57.7%	30 35.3%	5 5.9%	1 1.2%	85 100%
Presentation Skills of the Speaker	45 52.9%	23 27.1%	11 12.9%	6 7.1%	85 100%
Relevance of the topic presented	44 51.8%	28 32.9%	12 14.1%	1 1.2%	85 100%

Seven of the twenty respondents who added additional comments on the keynote speaker noted that there were no improvements that they would make to the session (i.e., "no", "none", and "excellent"). Comments from the remaining 13 individuals who answered this open-ended question covered both strengths and areas for improvement regarding content, the speaker, format, and logistics. Table 3 details the specific answers given.

Table 3

### Keynote Speaker: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=13)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
Content	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>good material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>too much material thrown out</li> <li>speech was low level community policing information. I think most police officers know the basics. Police need to be challenged</li> </ul>
Speaker	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the speaker was obviously knowledgeable</li> <li>was knowledgeable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the speaker failed to grab the attention in the room and keep the energy flowing</li> <li>better presentation skills</li> <li>very hard to follow</li> <li>too dry</li> </ul>
Format	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>audio/visual would have helped with key points</li> <li>audio/visual material</li> </ul>
Logistics	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more seats</li> <li>don't turn lights down during speaker's time (especially in morning)</li> <li>shorter session (1 hour per)</li> <li>less time spent on subject, lost interest</li> <li>too long [3]</li> </ul>

## *The Technology Edge*

Table 4  
The Technology Edge

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	51 79.7%	13 20.3%	0	0	64 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	42 65.6%	21 32.8%	1 1.6%	0	64 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	42 66.6%	17 26.8%	3 5.1%	1 1.5%	63 100%
Clarity of the material presented	37 57.8%	22 34.4%	5 7.8%	0	64 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	28 47.4%	20 33.9%	6 10.2%	5 8.5%	59 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	32 51.6%	20 32.3%	7 11.3%	3 4.8%	62 100%

In the full group session entitled "The Technology Edge," multiple conference participants suggested areas for improvement focusing on logistics, session content, and session format. A handful of respondents cited strengths of the session and three responses indicated that no changes could be made (i.e., "none," "no," and "well rounded presentation"). Table 5 details specific strengths and areas for improvement cited.

Table 5  
The Technology Edge: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=13)

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Area for Improvement</i>
Logistics	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turn lights on so we can see handouts and notes (also helps to stay awake)</li> <li>• Better view of screen</li> <li>• Hard to sit through 1 1/2 hours of this at end of day [2]</li> </ul>
Content	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very interesting material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of how the technology was funded</li> <li>• Eliminate it [the session]. Replace it with an interesting and useful subject</li> <li>• Could be more general for other departments</li> <li>• A little in depth about how the computer equipment works- not just what it can do- too specific for this department not generic for all jurisdictions- appeared to be for Delaware departments</li> <li>• Community policing strategies based topics should focus on "practical approaches to police strategies"</li> </ul>
Format	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent visual presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More hands-on viewing of computer</li> </ul>
Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have this in our department</li> </ul>	

## Community Services Project Teams

Table 6

Community Services Project Teams

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	90 93.8%	5 5.2%	1 1%	0	96 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	77 80.2%	18 18.8%	1 1%	0	96 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	75 78.2%	19 19.8%	1 1%	1 1%	95 100%
Clarity of the material presented	73 76.8%	20 21.1%	2 2.1%	0	92 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	70 76.1%	20 21.7%	2 2.2%	0	92 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	69 74.2%	21 22.5%	2 2.2%	1 1.1%	93 100%

Twenty-four respondents provided additional input on the evaluation forms for the full-group session entitled "Community Services Project Teams." While asked how the session could be improved, respondents remarked on a variety of strengths as well as areas for improvement. General satisfaction was expressed with the session (i.e., "excellent," "very good job," and "job well done"). Specific strengths were also identified with regard to content, speaker, and next steps. Suggestions for improvement surrounded content, speaker and logistics. Table 7 details specific strengths and areas for improvement.

Table 7

Community Services Project Teams: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area of Improvement (n=14)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<b>Content</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very informative</li> <li>• This class has been one of the best in terms of course content</li> <li>• Great information</li> <li>• Very informative</li> <li>• Excellent programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just need to talk about, not so much detail or in-depth. I know you have a good agency</li> <li>• Funding sources should be outlined</li> <li>• Seemed to be more of a NCCPD show than a "how to" for community policing</li> </ul>
<b>Speaker</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This class has been one of the best in terms of the skill of the speaker</li> <li>• This unit's enthusiasm has led to proven success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thought OFC Crowley could try to loosen up during her presentations and use less police jargon</li> </ul>
<b>Logistics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be nice to allow more time for this team's presentation</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This class has been one of the best in terms of usability</li> <li>• For any department hoping to enhance its community services office it was an assistance</li> </ul>	

## *Government and Private Industry Partnerships*

Table 8  
Government and Private Industry Partnerships

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	32 84.2%	6 15.8%	0	0	38 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	29 74.4%	10 25.6%	0	0	39 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	26 66.7%	11 28.2%	2 5.1%	0	39 100%
Clarity of the material presented	26 66.7%	13 33.3%	0	0	39 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	24 64.9%	10 27%	3 8.1%	0	37 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	27 69.2%	9 23.1%	3 7.7%	0	39 100%

Only eight respondents answered the open-ended question, "Do you have any suggestions about how this session could be improved?" for the full-group session "Government and Private Industry Partnerships." Half of these respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the session as it was presented (i.e., "none" and "nice presentation"). Two respondents reported strengths regarding content of the session, saying that the session was "informative" and that it provided "useful information." The remaining two respondents cited areas for improvement. These comments were as follows:

- Discussion should have been more centered around issues relating to establishing the partnership- how to's and how not to's, etc.
- More flashlights. Not everyone got one.

## *Brookmont Farms Project*

Table 9  
Brookmont Farms Project

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	68 80%	16 18.8%	1 1.2%	0	85 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	61 72.6%	20 23.8%	3 3.6%	0	84 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	57 68.7%	22 26.5%	4 4.8%	0	83 100%
Clarity of the material presented	55 63.9%	26 30.2%	4 4.7%	1 1.2%	86 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	49 57.7%	24 28.2%	11 12.9%	1 1.2%	85 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	53 62.4%	24 28.2%	6 7.1%	2 2.3%	85 100%



Several participants in the full-group session "Brookmont Farms Project" provided positive feedback regarding this session. These comments ranged from general approval (i.e., "good session" or "enjoyed") to specific strengths (as shown in Table 10). While format, speaker(s), and logistics were all identified as areas for improvement, the majority of responses regarding areas for improvement focused on the session content. In particular, respondents noted repetition of topics by speakers, the basic level of the session's content, and several respondents noted questions that weren't answered by the presentation. Table 10 shows specific answers.

Table 10

Brookmont Farms Project: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=15)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<b>Content</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ok use of available partnerships</li> <li>• Great examples of community policing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too repetitive</li> <li>• Was a repeat, although more in-depth of the workshop on Day 2, Identify internal/external support</li> <li>• Less repetition of topic by each speaker</li> <li>• There was some overlap of materials presented by the speaker. Reduce # of speakers hence the repetition</li> <li>• More time should be allowed to explain how the program is maintained- how to start up the program</li> <li>• Do you have crime watch? How active are citizens?</li> <li>• This was an intro type of class. Could have been one of the breakout sessions</li> </ul>
<b>Format</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No pictures of the community</li> <li>• Improvement on the power point presentation</li> </ul>
<b>Speaker(s)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great team work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation needed to be more upbeat and energetic</li> </ul>
<b>Logistics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A little drawn out</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gave me some insight and ideas for my section 8 and affordable living housing areas</li> </ul>	

## *The Future*

Table 11  
The Future

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	29 93.5%	2 6.5%	0	0	31 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	29 93.5%	2 6.5%	0	0	31 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	29 93.5%	1 3.2%	1 3.2%	0	31 100%
Clarity of the material presented	29 93.5%	2 6.5%	0	0	31 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	25 96.2%	1 3.8%	0	0	26 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	28 90.3%	3 9.7%	0	0	31 100%

One respondent noted that the full group session "The Future," was an excellent training. Another commented on the quality of instruction, saying it was "superior to many seminars I've attended." The four other respondents to give additional input noted that there were no improvements that could be made to the session (i.e., "none").

### *Executive Staff Tract Sessions*

There were six sessions designed especially for executive staff in attendance. These sessions were:

- Strategic Directions
- Leading Organizational Transformation
- Develop and Maintain Innovative organizations
- Identify Internal/External Support
- The Public's Right to Know
- Grant Writing

### *Satisfaction with Executive Staff Tract Sessions*

Of those conference participants who participated in the Executive Staff Tract sessions and who returned the survey forms, approximately two-thirds reported being very satisfied with the sessions.

The majority of the respondents rated the six sessions as "excellent" and "good" with respect to subject matter knowledge, presentation skills, relevance of topics presented, and clarity of matter. There were a few incidences of "fair" ratings regarding the usefulness of handouts and discussions. There was a very low occurrence of "poor" ratings throughout the six sessions.

Table 12  
Satisfaction with Executive Staff Tract Sessions

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Strategic Directions	14 73.7%	5 26.3%	0	19 100%
Leading Organizational Transformation	16 72.7%	6 27.3%	0	22 100%
Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations	17 94.4%	1 5.6%	0	18 100%
Identify Internal/External Support	4 100%	0	0	4 100%
The Public's Right to Know	14 87.5%	2 12.5%	0	16 100%
Grant Writing	30 81.1%	7 18.9%	0	37 100%

### *Strategic Directions*

Table 13  
Strategic Directions

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	21 87.5%	3 12.5%	0	0	24 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	21 87.5%	3 12.5%	0	0	24 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	16 66.7%	7 29.2%	1 4.2%	0	24 100%
Clarity of the material presented	17 70.8%	6 25%	1 4.2%	0	24 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	16 69.6%	5 21.7%	2 8.7%	0	23 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	19 82.6%	3 13%	1 4.4%	0	23 100%

Only six executive staff answered the open-ended question, "Do you have any suggestions about how this session could be improved?" in the "Strategic Directions" course. One respondent stated "none" and another respondent stated that "this program encouraged open/frank discussion- could have continued all day!" The other strength cited was the speaker's "obvious expert status." Other comments focused on areas for improvement, such as:

- Keep audience from going on tangents to keep on subject matter
- Give more than one answer or suggestion to questions asked
- Little more time dedicated to subject

### *Leading Organizational Transformation*

Table 14  
Leading Organizational Transformation

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	20 90.9%	2 9.1%	0	0	22 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	20 90.9%	2 9.1%	0	0	22 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	14 63.6%	8 36.4%	0	0	22 100%
Clarity of the material presented	18 81.8%	3 13.6%	1 4.5%	0	22 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	7 35.0%	9 45.0%	4 20.0%	0	20 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	15 68.2%	7 31.8%	0	0	22 100%



Regarding the session "Leading Organizational Transformation," three respondents noted that they saw no areas in need of improvement (i.e., "none" and "refreshing"). Several respondents cited specific strengths of the session, mainly surrounding the speaker. Respondents who noted areas for improvement focused on session format, session content, and logistics. Table 15 details specific answers given by respondents.

Table 15

Leading Organizational Transformation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=8)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<b>Format</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintaining a high degree of class participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should add audio/visual material to keep students' attention (i.e. power point)</li> <li>Present the material in handouts</li> <li>Provide more detailed handout for reference</li> </ul>
<b>Content</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generated a great amount of information for thought</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep to the listed topic. Too much time spent on discussion not directly related to the listed topic</li> </ul>
<b>Logistics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More time allotted for subject</li> <li>More time to work through concept and discuss same</li> </ul>
<b>Speaker</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dynamite presentation</li> <li>Excellent speaker</li> <li>As always, professor Turner commands attention based on his knowledge and approach to the subject</li> </ul>	

### *Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations*

Table 16

Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	20 95.2%	1 4.8%	0	0	21 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	19 90.4%	1 4.8%	1 4.8%	0	21 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	16 76.2%	5 23.8%	0	0	21 100%
Clarity of the material presented	18 90%	2 10%	0	0	20 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	15 71.4%	5 23.8%	1 4.8%	0	21 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	17 80.9%	3 14.3%	1 4.8%	0	21 100%

In the executive tract session "Develop and Maintain Innovative Organizations," five respondents provided further information on their evaluations. Most indicated that there was nothing that could be changed for improvement (i.e., "none," "very good!" "outstanding presentation," "very good job!" and "very good group discussion"). The only respondent to cite an area for improvement encouraged more involvement with the officers.

#### *Identify Internal/External Support*

Table 17

#### Identify Internal/External Support

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	7 100%	0	0	0	7 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	3 50%	3 50%	0	0	6 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	6 85.7%	1 14.3%	0	0	7 100%
Clarity of the material presented	4 66.7%	2 33.3%	0	0	6 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	3 50%	3 50%	0	0	6 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	4 66.6%	1 16.7%	1 16.7%	0	6 100%

Three respondents answered the open-ended question on the evaluation form for the session entitled "Identify Internal/External Support." Two of these respondents noted that they would change nothing. The third stated that the class was "an eye opener that I may be able to put to good use!"

#### *The Public's Right to Know*

Table 18

#### The Public's Right to Know

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	20 87%	3 13%	0	0	23 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	18 78.3%	5 21.7%	0	0	23 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	18 78.3%	5 21.7%	0	0	23 100%
Clarity of the material presented	18 78.3%	5 21.7%	0	0	23 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	16 72.7%	3 13.6%	2 9.1%	1 4.6%	22 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	19 82.6%	4 17.4%	0	0	23 100%

In the session entitled "The Public's Right to Know," most responses were positive. These strengths included speakers' knowledge and presentation skills, as well as the usefulness of the material presented in class. While only four participants gave additional insight, only one cited an area for improvement. This person noted that "not being from Delaware, I had no interest in listening to information on Delaware FOIA."

### *Grant Writing*

Table 19  
Grant Writing

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	44 93.6%	3 6.4%	0	0	47 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	38 80.9%	6 12.7%	3 6.4%	0	47 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	35 77.8%	10 22.2%	0	0	45 100%
Clarity of the material presented	35 72.9%	11 22.9%	2 4.2%	0	48 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	25 55.6%	14 31.1%	5 11.1%	1 2.2%	45 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	34 72.2%	11 23.4%	2 4.4%	0	46 100%

The executive tract session entitled "Grant Writing" elicited strengths as well as areas for improvement from participants. Several respondents noted "none" and "no," indicating that the session could not be improved. Additionally, other respondents expressed their satisfaction with the session in general (i.e., "great class," "good job," "enjoyable presentation," and "excellent job"). Yet other respondents gave insight into specific strengths and areas for improvement regarding session content, format, logistics, and the speaker. These comments are displayed on Table 20.

Table 20

Grant Writing: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=16)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<b>Content</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very educational class</li> <li>• Very informative</li> <li>• A lot of new information learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where to find funding sources could have been expanded</li> <li>• From a smaller agency, would have liked to heard more about "private sector grant" information</li> </ul>
<b>Format</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unique approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copies of grants given out</li> <li>• Give a handout of useful web sites</li> </ul>
<b>Logistics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much to get across in this period</li> <li>• Set aside a longer block of time for this class</li> <li>• Longer session</li> <li>• More time should be allowed for this class</li> <li>• Allow more time</li> <li>• Could be full class</li> </ul>
<b>Speaker</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent instructor- dedicated to his mission "chase every dollar"- unselfish and willing to share knowledge and expertise</li> <li>• Very knowledgeable instructor [2]</li> <li>• Sgt. McAllister is an excellent instructor and is obviously very knowledgeable re: this topic</li> <li>• NCCPD better be careful with this guy. A lot of agencies would pay a great deal for him!</li> </ul>	

### *Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions*

The second set of tract-sessions at the police conference was designed for supervisory level staff. The session included in this tract included:

- Supervisors as Agents of Change
- The Supervisor's Role
- Maintaining Accountability
- Use of Mediation in Community Policing
- Bikes in Community Policing
- Use of K/9 Mounted

#### *Satisfaction with Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions*

Generally, supervisors were very satisfied with the sessions in their tract. The Supervisor's Role is the only session to receive less than an overwhelming majority of respondents rating it very satisfied. In this session, approximately half were generally satisfied with the session.

The Supervisory Tract Sessions received generally good ratings in all areas. The majority of the respondents ranked the sessions as "excellent" and "good" with respect to subject matter, presentation skills, relevance of the topics presented, and clarity of the material presented. Very few respondents rated any category as "fair" and almost none of the respondents rated any category as "poor."

Table 21  
Satisfaction with Supervisory Staff Tract Sessions

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Supervisors as Agents of Change	22 91.7%	2 8.3%	0	24 100%
The Supervisor's Role	10 52.6%	9 47.4%	0	19 100%
Maintaining Accountability	15 88.2%	2 11.8%	0	17 100%
Use of Mediation in Community Policing	13 86.7%	2 13.3%	0	15 100%
Bikes in Community Policing	21 91.3%	2 8.7%	0	23 100%
Use of K/9 Mounted	18 94.7%	1 5.3%	0	19 100%



### *Supervisors as Agents of Change*

Table 22  
Supervisors as Agents of Change

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	21 91.3%	2 8.7%	0	0	23 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	20 87%	3 13%	0	0	23 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	17 73.9%	5 21.7%	1 4.4%	0	23 100%
Clarity of the material presented	15 71.4%	6 28.6%	0	0	21 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	12 52.2%	11 47.8%	0	0	23 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	11 57.9%	8 42.1%	0	0	19 100%

A total of nine supervisors wrote additional remarks regarding the session entitled "Supervisors as Agents of Change." Of these nine, many noted that nothing could be changed to improve the session (i.e., "no" and "none"). Others noted that the session in general was excellent. A single respondent noted a strength of this session, saying that the instructor did an excellent job of reducing an 8 hour block of information into 90 minutes of presentation. Suggestions for improvement were given. These suggestions are:

- More time for class participation
- This block needed more class time
- Maybe more time but not instructor's fault
- Need more discussion

### *The Supervisor's Role*

Table 23  
The Supervisor's Role

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	13 68.4%	6 31.6%	0	0	19 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	12 63.2%	6 31.6%	1 5.2%	0	19 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	10 58.8%	6 35.3%	1 5.9%	0	17 100%
Clarity of the material presented	8 42.1%	9 47.4%	2 10.5%	0	19 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	6 33.3%	5 27.8%	5 27.8%	2 11.1%	18 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	7 36.8%	11 57.9%	1 5.3%	0	19 100%

Six of the eleven supervisors who provided additional information on their evaluation of "The Supervisor's Role" were positive (i.e., "very good class," "great information," and "handout was very helpful"). Five respondents cited areas for improvement, including:

- Audio/visual material needed with handout
- Never really told group anything about self or his company
- Power point system down
- Provide working power point projector
- Make the course at least four hours- the course content was from a forty hour course

### *Maintaining Accountability*

Table 24  
Maintaining Accountability

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	16 88.9%	1 5.6%	1 5.6%	0	18 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	16 88.9%	1 5.6%	1 5.6%	0	18 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	14 77.8%	2 11.1%	2 11.1%	0	18 100%
Clarity of the material presented	15 83.3%	3 16.7%	0	0	18 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	12 70.6%	4 23.5%	1 5.9%	0	17 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	15 83.3%	3 16.7%	0	0	18 100%

In the "Maintaining Accountability" session, very few respondents indicated areas for improvement. Specifically, three respondents indicated a need for more time for this session. On the other hand, many strengths were cited, some of which include:

- Very good/outstanding class
- Good program/ideas
- Great/excellent presentation/instruction
- Practical and attainable
- Provided many ideas to take back to my department
- Good speaker, very motivated, very relevant to job duties of supervisor and admin.
- Major Hester is an excellent speaker/teacher, very enthusiastic

### *Use of Mediation in Community Policing*

Table 25

#### Use of Mediation in Community Policing

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	13 76.5%	4 23.5%	0	0	17 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	15 88.2%	2 11.8%	0	0	17 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	14 82.4%	3 17.6%	0	0	17 100%
Clarity of the material presented	14 82.4%	3 17.6%	0	0	17 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	11 64.7%	6 35.3%	0	0	17 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	11 64.7%	6 35.3%	0	0	17 100%

Four individuals noted that they could not identify improvements in the "Use of Mediation in Community Policing" class (i.e., 'no' and 'none'). One respondent suggested a next steps action to be taken:

- work with chiefs of police- make each department within the state require a mediator.

### *Bikes in Community Policing*

Table 26

#### Bikes in Community Policing

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	23 92.0%	2 8.0%	0	0	25 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	20 76.9%	5 19.2%	1 3.9%	0	26 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	20 80.0%	4 16.0%	1 4.0%	0	25 100%
Clarity of the material presented	23 88.5%	3 11.5%	0	0	26 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	19 79.2%	4 16.7%	1 4.1%	0	24 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	20 76.9%	5 19.2%	1 3.9%	0	26 100%



Additional comments regarding the session "Bikes in Community Policing" were:

- None
- Good overall session
- Have a copy of general order

*Use of K9/Mounted*

Table 27

Use of K9/Mounted

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	22 84.6%	3 11.5%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	20 76.9%	5 19.2%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	18 69.2%	7 26.9%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%
Clarity of the material presented	21 80.8%	4 15.4%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	19 73.1%	6 23.1%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	19 73.1%	6 23.1%	1 3.8%	0	26 100%

While three respondents noted that they had no changes to suggest for the "use of K/9 Mounted" class, there were a few suggestions for improvement regarding speaker(s), course format, and course content.

Table 28

Use of K-9/Mounted: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area (n=3)

	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
Speaker(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OFC Boland presented good material, however, she needs to work on her presentation skills. OFC Aufiero's presentation was well planned and very informative and to the point. Excellent job!</li> <li>• Mounted unit needs to work on presentation</li> </ul>
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible bring K9 in to show to the audience</li> </ul>
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need more time on K9s</li> </ul>

## *Operational Staff & Field Training Officers' Tract Sessions*

Lastly, the third set of tract-sessions at this conference included sessions that would appeal to operational staff and field training officers. These sessions included:

- Emerging Role of the PIO
- Training for POP
- Observation/Evaluation of POP
- Domestics and Hostages
- Maintaining Accountability
- POP Workshop

### *Satisfaction with Operational Staff and Field Training Officers' Tract Sessions*

Generally, Operational Staff and Field Training Officers were very satisfied with each of the respective sessions in their tract.

Specifically, these conference participants rated the individual sessions with an "excellent" status regarding subject matter knowledge, presentation skills, relevance of topics presented, clarity of material presented, and usefulness of handouts and discussion. In fact, there was an extremely low occurrence of "poor" ratings for any of these categories across all of the sessions.

Table 29

*Satisfaction with Operational Staff and Field Training Officers' Tract Sessions*

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Emerging Role of the PIO	14 87.5%	2 12.5%	0	16 100%
Training for POP	30 76.9%	8 20.5%	1 2.6%	39 100%
Observation/Evaluation of POP	19 76.0%	6 24.0%	0	25 100%
Domestics and Hostages	59 93.7%	4 6.3%	0	63 100%
Maintaining Accountability	12 85.7%	2 14.3%	0	14 100%
POP Workshop	10 100%	0	0	10 100%

### *Emerging Role of the PIO*

Table 30  
Emerging Role of the PIO

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	14 82.3%	3 17.7%	0	0	17 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	11 64.7%	6 35.3%	0	0	17 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	13 76.5%	4 23.5%	0	0	17 100%
Clarity of the material presented	14 82.4%	2 11.8%	1 5.9%	0	17 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	8 53.3%	5 33.3%	2 13.4%	0	15 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	10 62.5%	5 31.3%	1 6.2%	0	16 100%

Eight operational staff and field training officers provided additional comments on their evaluation forms regarding the session entitled "Emerging Role of the PIO." Of these, four indicated that no change was necessary (i.e., "no" and "excellent"). One respondent cited a strength of the session (i.e., "Officer Navarro did an excellent job. He was knowledgeable, professional and he kept the session interesting and informative") and the others cited areas for improvement, saying:

- Content could be enhanced with more on media involvement
- Good for upper level management only
- Offer to middle management tract

### *Training for POP*

Table 31  
Training for POP

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	31 73.8%	10 23.8%	1 2.4%	0	42 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	28 66.7%	13 31%	1 2.4%	0	42 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	29 70.7%	11 26.8%	0	1 2.4%	41 100%
Clarity of the material presented	25 59.5%	15 35.7%	1 2.4%	1 2.4%	42 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	27 64.3%	11 26.2%	4 9.5%	0	42 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	26 63.4%	13 31.7%	1 2.4%	1 2.4%	41 100%

While evaluating the session entitled "Training for POP," ten participants included additional responses regarding how to improve the session. Four of these respondents noted that the session could not be improved (i.e., "none," "no," "excellent," and "did a good job"). The remaining respondents cited specific suggestions for improvement with regard to logistics, session content, and session format. These suggestions are detailed in Table 30.

Table 32

Training for POP: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area (n=6)

	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have "some" lighting available for note-taking during the presentation. It helps those of us with "old eyes"</li> <li>• More time allotted for this block of instruction</li> <li>• Not long enough</li> <li>• More time allotted</li> <li>• Better computer</li> <li>• More time for class input and discussion</li> </ul>
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more examples (ex. What kind of anticipatory plan and examples)</li> <li>• More specific examples should be given on how you implemented POP in your neighborhoods and what were the results</li> </ul>
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be nice to have had some of the power point slides as handouts, especially those that covered principal/critical teaching points not covered in master handout</li> </ul>

### *Observation/Evaluation of POP*

Table 33

Observation/Evaluation of POP

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	25 86.2%	4 13.8%	0	0	29 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	21 72.4%	8 27.6%	0	0	29 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	22 75.9%	7 24.1%	0	0	29 100%
Clarity of the material presented	22 75.9%	7 24.1%	0	0	29 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	18 62.1%	10 34.5%	1 3.4%	0	30 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	22 75.9%	7 24.1%	0	0	29 100%

Several participants of the session "Observation/Evaluation of POP" added positive comments to their evaluation forms (i.e., "great," "good audio/visual," and "I am impressed with the commitment you and your agency have to POP"). Two respondents remarked on areas for improvement, saying:

- Repeat of material from day 1
- Need more time

## *Domestics and Hostages*

Table 34  
Domestics and Hostages

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	70 95.9%	1 1.4%	2 2.7%	0	73 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	66 90.4%	6 8.2%	1 1.4%	0	73 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	67 91.8%	5 6.8%	1 1.4%	0	73 100%
Clarity of the material presented	66 90.4%	6 8.2%	1 1.4%	0	73 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	56 81.2%	11 15.9%	2 2.9%	0	69 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	61 85.9%	9 12.7%	1 1.4%	0	71 100%

The session "Domestics and Hostages" received several comments on the evaluation forms' question, "Do you have any suggestions about how this session could be improved?" Responses ranged from the general (i.e., "no" and "none") to the specific (as detailed in Table 33). Strengths were cited regarding content, speaker, and format while areas for improvement centered around content, logistics, and next steps.



Table 35

Domestics and Hostages: Strengths and Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Strength or Area for Improvement (n=15)

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<b>Content</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely interesting</li> <li>Very informative class</li> <li>Very educational experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I didn't know NCCPD handles 375,000 in New Castle County?</li> <li>How often do you return to domestic? How often arrest made? How many in unit?</li> <li>List of upcoming seminars that would expand on the topic covered. What if any website(s) are available, etc. great presentation</li> </ul>
<b>Logistics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow more time or make it two parts</li> <li>Longer period of time</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement this course into an in-service curriculum</li> <li>Train 911 personnel at recom</li> <li>Should have recom dispatchers trained</li> </ul>
<b>Speaker</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very knowledgeable</li> <li>Great instructor!</li> <li>Excellent speaker- Sgt. Donovan is a tremendous instructor</li> <li>Sgt. Donovan presents one of the most informative and professional segments you offered- great job!</li> <li>Dt. Donovan is very knowledgeable in this area and truly believes in what he speaks of</li> </ul>	
<b>Format</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good videos</li> <li>Great videos</li> </ul>	

## Maintaining Accountability

Table 36

### Maintaining Accountability

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	16 100%	0	0	0	16 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	13 81.3%	3 18.7%	0	0	16 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	13 86.7%	2 13.3%	0	0	15 100%
Clarity of the material presented	12 75.0%	4 25.0%	0	0	16 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	9 60.0%	5 33.3%	1 6.7%	0	15 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	11 73.3%	4 26.7%	0	0	15 100%

Of the operational staff and field training officers who evaluated the maintaining accountability session, only three individuals gave additional input in the open-ended question. All three were positive in their responses. One noted that no changes needed to be made; another wrote "very good session!" The third stated, "excellent information provided, I'd work for him."

## POP Workshop

Table 37

### POP Workshop

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
Subject matter knowledge of the speaker(s)	10 100%	0	0	0	10 100%
Presentation skills of the speaker(s)	10 100%	0	0	0	10 100%
Relevance of the topics presented	10 100%	0	0	0	10 100%
Clarity of the material presented	10 100%	0	0	0	10 100%
Usefulness of the handouts	10 100%	0	0	0	10 100%
Usefulness of the discussion	8 88.9%	1 11.1%	0	0	9 100%

Only one comment was made on the evaluation forms for the session entitled "POP Workshop." This comment was the logistical suggestion "make this course portion longer to four hours."



## *Conference Overall*

### *Overall Satisfaction*

The respondents were very satisfied with the conference overall. The most notable difference between days is that on day one 31 respondents (28.4%) indicated being only somewhat satisfied, as opposed to approximately eleven percent respectively on days two and three. From additional input provided, it may be that this discrepancy was due to the keynote speaker from day one.

Table 38  
Satisfaction with Conference Overall

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total</i>
Day One	77 70.6%	31 28.4%	1 1.0%	109 100%
Day Two	89 89.0%	11 11.0%	0	100 100%
Day Three	70 88.6%	9 11.4%	0	79 100%

### *Day One*

When asked how Day One of the conference could be improved, respondents gave insight to a variety of possibilities. Four respondents indicated that they perceived no need for improvement (i.e., "none" and "no suggestions"). Many other respondents felt that the opening speaker could have been more engaging. Additionally, participants remarked on logistical aspects that could be improved such as class length or availability. A few individuals suggested improvements in format and content and one even remarked on rainy weather. Specific answers can be found in Table 37.

Table 39

## Day One Overall: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area (n=?)

	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
Opening Speaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opening speaker needs to be more energetic and upbeat. Lost the audience, long-winded</li> <li>• Opening speaker too long-winded. Lost audience very early</li> <li>• Less time for opening speaker</li> <li>• Keynote speech should have been shorter</li> <li>• Keynote speaker more electric</li> <li>• Overall, the 1<sup>st</sup> day was excellent with the exception of keynote speaker &amp; technology session</li> </ul>
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakout sessions should be longer- 2 hours wasn't enough</li> <li>• Just longer class sessions</li> <li>• Fewer classes [offered] each day or shorter classes so I can get to more classes each day</li> <li>• Both classes had problems with the computer</li> <li>• More time for class discussion</li> <li>• More vendors</li> <li>• Too many students attending the training POP. Not everyone was able to attend this important class</li> <li>• Unable to attend training for POP- too many students</li> <li>• Need detailed handout of contents for reference</li> <li>• Different location</li> </ul>
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More classroom discussion</li> <li>• More time for class input and discussion</li> <li>• Trading of ideas with different jurisdictions</li> </ul>
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is community policing?</li> <li>• Focus of purpose</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate the rainy weather</li> </ul>

*Day Two*

In the Day Two evaluations, there were a total of twelve participants who gave additional input regarding the conference. While most of these individuals identified strengths (i.e., "so far, so good," "good overall day," and "this has been the best prepared conference I have every attended. The hospitality has been wonderful"), there were three who noted areas for improvement. These comments were:

- At the end of the seminar, if there is a desire to pick up packets from classes not seen it would be beneficial
- Develop material pertinent to inner city problems, i.e.- I am from the city of Camden police department
- Issues were repeated from Day One

*Day Three*

For Day Three overall, sixteen conference participants provided input to the question, "How could Day Three have been improved?" Eight of these sixteen respondents did not note an improvement (i.e., "excellent seminar, very professional" and "thank you for a worthwhile rewarding education opportunity"). The remaining eight responses, focusing on content and logistics, are detailed in Table 38.

Table 40

## Day Three: Areas for Improvement Classified by Focus of Area (n=8)

	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes for all classes should be available at the end of everyday</li> <li>• Police communications and 911 centers never mentioned and don't appear to be a part of the community policing process. Why?</li> <li>• Police communication should be allowed to be trained as police officers do in the academy to learn what their job entails so that they can better understand their jobs. Also, they should be included in in-service training so they can do their jobs to the best of their ability. Knowledge does conquer problems and the more knowledgeable your dispatchers are, the more knowledgeable your officers will be.</li> </ul>
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By making it a half day (leave after lunch)</li> <li>• Extend conference to three and a half days. Consider travel for those returning to home jurisdiction</li> <li>• Increase school to three and a half days to allow for travel time for out of state guests</li> <li>• Would encourage half day for curriculum on the last day of conference to allow for travel back to home jurisdiction</li> <li>• Longer sessions, very informative</li> </ul>



The University of Delaware is committed to assuring equal opportunity to all persons and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, gender, religion, ancestry, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, age, or disability in its educational programs, activities, admissions, or employment practices as required by Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act, other applicable statutes, and University policy. Inquiries concerning these statutes and information regarding campus accessibility should be referred to the Affirmative Action Officer, 305 Hullihen Hall, 302/831-2835 (voice), 302/831-4552 (TDD).

