

National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program

G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) Report

Prepared by:

Terrance J. Taylor, Ph.D.

Finn-Aage Esbensen, Ph.D.

University of Missouri-St. Louis

Dana Peterson, Ph.D.

University at Albany

June, 2009

This project was supported by Award No. 2006-JV-FX-0011 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. This research was made possible, in part, by the support and participation of seven school districts, including the School District of Philadelphia. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice or of the seven participating school districts.

For questions about this report or for more information about the evaluation, please contact:

G.R.E.A.T. Evaluation
Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499
Phone: (314) 516-4777
Fax: (314) 516-5048

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)

The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program is a primary gang and delinquency prevention program delivered by law enforcement officers in school settings. The original G.R.E.A.T. program was developed in 1991 by Phoenix-area law enforcement agencies and quickly adopted by agencies throughout the United States. This curriculum contained nine lecture-based lessons to be taught primarily in middle-school grades. Results from an earlier National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program (1995-2001) found no differences between G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. youths in terms of key behavioral outcomes the program intended to affect (i.e., involvement in gangs and delinquent behavior).

Based in part on these findings, the G.R.E.A.T. program underwent a critical review that resulted in substantial program modifications. The revised curriculum consists of 13 lessons aimed at teaching youths the life-skills (e.g., communication and refusal skills, conflict resolution and anger management techniques) thought necessary to prevent involvement in gangs and delinquency. The program's two main goals are 1) to help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity, and 2) to help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement. The revised G.R.E.A.T. curriculum was piloted in 2001, and full-scale implementation began in 2003.

Process and Outcome Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.

In 2006, following a competitive peer review process, the National Institute of Justice awarded the University of Missouri-St. Louis funding to conduct an evaluation of the revised G.R.E.A.T. program. This process and outcome evaluation consists of a number of different components, including student surveys (see Esbensen et al. 2007, 2008, 2009); classroom

observations in both G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. classrooms (see Leugoud et al. 2009); surveys of school personnel (see Peterson et al. 2009); surveys and interviews with G.R.E.A.T. officers and G.R.E.A.T. supervisors (see Carson et al. 2009); and observations of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) and G.R.E.A.T. Families sessions. ***This report provides information from the G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) component of the evaluation.***

Overview of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.)

This report provides descriptive information about the G.O.T. structure and content. Additionally, information collected from observations of eight G.O.T. sessions is included. To this end, researchers attended G.O.T.s in Frisco, TX and Philadelphia, PA (June, 2006); Phoenix, AZ (July, 2007); La Crosse, WI (August, 2007; June, 2008); Portland, OR (August, 2007; August, 2008); and Orlando, FL (July, 2008).

G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) is intended to prepare officers to deliver the G.R.E.A.T. program in schools. Since this is often a departure from the normal duties of law enforcement officers, training is intended to be multi-faceted, rigorous, and comprehensive. The primary goals of G.O.T. are to familiarize officers with the G.R.E.A.T. program curriculum and to provide skills needed to successfully teach the program to the target audience (i.e., elementary- and middle-school youths). Training officers about the substance of the G.R.E.A.T. program and methods of working with the target audience is an essential component of program fidelity (i.e., delivering the program in the field as intended). Additional insights into program fidelity were assessed through observations of officers delivering the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum in the evaluation classrooms. (For information on observations of G.R.E.A.T. program delivery in the school setting, see Leugoud et al. 2009). Surveys and interviews with officers (see Carson et al. 2008) and surveys of teachers (see Peterson et al. 2009) allowed for triangulation of program

fidelity. Based on these sources, we conclude that the vast majority of officers were successful in implementing the program as desired. The purpose of this report is to answer the following question: To what extent does the G.O.T. account for this quality of program implementation?

G.O.T. Structure

Two different G.R.E.A.T. Officer Trainings (G.O.T.s) are available to officers interested in becoming G.R.E.A.T. instructors: 1) a 40-hour (i.e., one-week) training for officers with prior teaching experience, and 2) an 80-hour (i.e., two-week) training for officers with no prior teaching experience. The 80-hour G.O.T. includes more officer-student modeling of the G.R.E.A.T. lessons (i.e., “teach-backs”), more detailed information related to the logistics associated with classroom management, and an additional section on the “transitions” from law-enforcement/patrol to G.R.E.A.T. instructor, since these topics are important for officers new to the G.R.E.A.T. program and school environments. Specifics of these two different trainings are described below.

Both types of G.O.T. have a similar group of staff. There is one training supervisor who oversees the training. Approximately 5-8 trainers (i.e., officers certified by the National Training Team [NTT] to instruct others how to teach the G.R.E.A.T. program) are present. One staff member from the Institute for Intergovernmental Research [IIR] is in attendance to provide technical assistance to trainers and trainees. One “professional educator” (i.e., a classroom teacher) is in attendance for part of the training to provide trainees with a session related to teaching theory and pedagogy. Finally, a “gang expert” provides trainees with a session devoted to gang trends and characteristics.

40-Hour Training

The description presented in this report highlights one model of 40-hour trainings and one model of 80-hour trainings. Trainings observed illustrated some degree of flexibility in the ordering of topical areas and time schedules. Several of these are noted throughout this report.

On the night immediately preceding training, members of the training team meet to arrange the room, discuss strategies for effective training sessions, and, if they do not already know one another, meet and greet. Each day typically begins and ends with a staff meeting restricted to members of the training team. The morning staff meeting allows the trainers to revisit the previous day's session, cover any last minute adjustments to the upcoming day's session, and get settled in for the day. The evening staff meetings allows the trainers to review the day's progress, discuss any issues which arose during the day (e.g., format, discipline), and discuss the following day's session. Additionally, the training supervisors present feedback to the day's presenters about their performance, identifying any areas for improvement and/or highlighting particular strengths that the presenter illustrated during the day. Thus, these staff meetings provide a confidential setting where the trainers can provide honest feedback about how the training is going, while also receiving feedback about personal performance. Each of the staff meetings (morning and evening) is scheduled for approximately 30 minutes, although that time is flexible depending on the day's events.

After the morning staff meeting ends, the day begins for the trainees. Trainees are welcomed and an overview of the day's objectives is presented.

Day 1

As with each other training day, the first session begins with a staff meeting for the trainers. Trainers are typically familiar with each other already, but this allows them to re-acquaint themselves with one another. After the initial greetings, the training supervisor reminds the trainers of the training rules, provides an overview of the trainees (e.g., where they are from, the demographic characteristics of the group) and the training (e.g., goals, objectives, format, schedule), and provides each group with his/her list of “teams.” These teams (i.e., 5-8 trainees) become the foundation for much of the later training (addressed later). The initial staff meeting concludes after trainers are given a brief question and answer session with the training leader.

The G.O.T. generally begins at 8am; trainees are prompted to take their designated seats (name tents identify the assigned seating), where binders containing the course information are already awaiting. The training leader provides a welcome statement and briefly explains the purpose of the training (i.e., to provide trainees with knowledge of the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum and relevant classroom skills needed to deliver the curriculum). The training supervisor introduces him/herself, including information about his/her agency, background in law enforcement, and experience with the G.R.E.A.T. program. The training supervisor then asks each of the training staff to introduce themselves, providing similar information. Once each of the trainers has completed introductions, trainees are asked to introduce themselves individually. After the introduction phase, trainees are informed of their teams (i.e., trainer and other trainees). Trainees are asked to complete some brief paperwork for recordkeeping. This process takes approximately one hour, after which there is a short break (approximately 10 minutes).

After the break, the trainers and trainees reconvene. One member of the training team is designated to provide an overview of the G.R.E.A.T. program. This overview includes

information on the history and development of G.R.E.A.T., how the program is structured (e.g., roles of Bureau of Justice Assistance and G.R.E.A.T. National Policy Board), and what it is intended to do (i.e., reduce youth violence and gang membership and improve police – community relations). Trainees are encouraged to look at the binder containing the curriculum and familiarize themselves with the material. The overview of the G.R.E.A.T. program takes approximately 40 minutes, after which there is another short break (approximately 10 minutes).

After the second break, the training resumes. At this point, a professional educator (e.g., classroom teacher) provides an overview of basic educational theory. Trainees are informed of the importance of recognizing different learning styles and basic pedagogical methods to stimulate student learning. This section on educational theory also typically involves some exercises for the trainees. The educational theory component typically lasts two hours, after which trainees are released for a one-hour lunch break.

After lunch, trainers and trainees reconvene for a group photo followed by a short break (approximately five minutes). This process typically lasts approximately 30 minutes.

After the photo, training resumes. The professional educator presents additional information on best practices in classroom instruction. This second component of the educational theory training lasts approximately one-hour, after which there is a short break (approximately 10 minutes). The educational component focuses on three primary areas. First, a general overview of the target population is covered. This section focuses on the period of adolescence, including physical, emotional, social, and intellectual changes occurring in youth during this time. The second component focuses on different types of learning styles (i.e., visual, audio, and kinesthetic). During this component, the educator presents information on how some students learn best by watching, some by hearing, and some by doing. Discussion of these

learning styles serve as a transition to discussion of the importance of incorporating different types of teaching styles and classroom examples and exercises to meet the needs of students with different learning styles.

After the break, a different member of the training staff provides an introduction and overview of the first two lessons of the elementary school curriculum. It is stressed that while the core G.R.E.A.T. program is aimed at youths in middle school (the period when they are most likely to become involved with gangs), the elementary curriculum is an important component of G.R.E.A.T. It is stated that reaching youths in their elementary years is important because it allows prevention before most youths have been directly exposed to gangs. The first two lessons are briefly modeled by the instructor for approximately 50 minutes. This is followed by a short break (approximately 10 minutes).

After the break, Lessons 3 – 6 of the elementary component are covered. The key points of the lesson are highlighted and briefly modeled for approximately 50 minutes. This is again followed by a short break (approximately 10 minutes).

After the final break, the officers convene to their team meetings. The first day's team meeting provides an opportunity for officers to meet the other members of their teams and their team leader. Introductions are exchanged and the team leader informs the officers what to expect during the rest of the week. Additionally, the team leader informs his/her team that the officers should feel comfortable approaching the team leader with questions, concerns, or advice during the duration of the training. The trainees' day concludes after the team meeting, while the team leaders reconvene for the afternoon staff meeting.

Days 2 & 3

The team leaders and training supervisor reconvene at approximately 7:30 AM for a staff meeting. Trainees arrive approximately 30 minutes later to take their seats. Seating is assigned by trainers and changes each day, so trainees must find their assigned seats prior to the start of the day. Each morning, trainees arrive to find additional G.R.E.A.T.-related trinkets waiting for them at their seats. After a brief welcome and some “ice-breaker” activities (e.g., trivia where trainees answering correctly get additional G.R.E.A.T.-related prizes), the training supervisor outlines the day’s goals and objectives.

In the sample outline included (Appendix A), a national gang expert provides an overview of gang issues lasting approximately four hours during the morning of Day 2.¹ The gang expert is typically an officer who has worked in gang enforcement. Information about trends in gang activity and methods of identifying gang members (e.g., tattoos) and gang activity (e.g., graffiti) in communities are provided.

After the gang trends session, there is a lunch break lasting approximately one hour. Once lunch is over, the training turns to the middle school curriculum. The remainder of Days 2 and 3 are devoted entirely to this aspect, which is considered the core program. Lessons are either “modeled” or “overviewed” by one member of the training team. The modeling consists of the presenter teaching the lesson as he/she would in the classroom, using a block of about 50 minutes. Whenever there are key points, the trainer sometimes calls a “time-out” to break from the teaching role and add the additional information as a sidebar; in other cases, a trainer models the entire lesson “in character” and holds additional material until after the lesson is completely

¹ It should be noted that the “gang trends” session often varies in when it is delivered due to scheduling issues. For example, in one training observed, the gang trends section was presented after lunch on Day 3 and lasted two (rather than four) hours. This illustrates that not all of the trainings are structured in identical manners, although the content included is nearly identical across trainings.

modeled. This allows the trainees to see how members of the training team actually present the lesson, which is expected to carry over into the actual classroom setting. In some sessions, trainees were instructed to act as “typical middle-school students,” while in others they were simply instructed to follow along and participate in the lesson. Lesson overviews are shorter (approximately 30-35 minutes), where the trainer covers the key points of the lesson without taking on the role of a classroom teacher.

Day 4

After the morning staff meeting, Day 4 begins with a typical introduction of the day’s goals and objectives. Trainees then complete a multiple-choice test about the G.R.E.A.T. goals and content, followed by a review of the correct answers (approximately one hour). Each trainee then models one lesson in front of the class, providing an opportunity to practice public speaking, present one G.R.E.A.T. lesson, and receive feedback on the presentations. Lessons are chosen by trainees during team meetings earlier in the week, so trainees have a chance to practice before presenting to the class. Short (approximately 5 minute) breaks are structured between lesson modeling.

Day 5

Day 5 begins after the morning staff meeting. The day’s goals and objectives are presented before training moves to the remainder of the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum. Approximately 45 minutes are devoted to each of the remaining G.R.E.A.T. components (G.R.E.A.T. Families and the G.R.E.A.T. Summer component) and Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern, with ten minute breaks structured between each section. The G.R.E.A.T. Families section provides an overview

of the importance of having families involved in youth prevention programs, key components of the G.R.E.A.T. Families curriculum are highlighted, and examples of popular G.R.E.A.T. Families activities are provided. Similarly, the G.R.E.A.T. Summer component is highlighted as an important and fun way in which the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum can be supplemented. As the Summer component varies across sites, ideas are presented for innovative methods of implementing a summer program and logistical issues associated with moving out of the classroom. The “Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern” section covers information about the G.R.E.A.T. program, including copyright information, where to get course materials, and additional information about how the G.R.E.A.T. program is structured. The 40-hour training concludes with a “final evaluation” which thanks trainees and trainers for their participation and a “pep talk” about the importance of the G.R.E.A.T. program as a method of reducing youth violence and gang activity. While the content of these sections were consistent across observations, it is important to highlight that some trainings covered this topical material on days other than Day 5.

80-Hour Training

The 80-hour training sessions are similar in format to the 40-hour sessions. The main difference between the two is that the 80-hour sessions are aimed at officers who have limited teaching experience. Thus, the 80-hour training devotes a week to trainees practicing teaching the lessons. Additionally, two components are unique to the 80-hour training: 1) Public Speaking and 2) Transitions.

Public speaking is a skill obviously required for instructors. The 80-hour training session incorporates public speaking components for the participants during each day. These begin with

smaller exercises, eventually building to a “walk-through” of a G.R.E.A.T. lesson. For example, one popular exercise at the beginning of the training session involves trainees being called to the front of the room, one at a time, where they receive an index card from the training supervisor. Each index card has a word (e.g., corn, snow, socks) on it. Participants are expected to talk to the rest of the class about the selected word for two minutes. Gradually, the public speaking exercises become more elaborate. On Day 2 of the 80-hour training, participants are expected to give a three-minute demonstration speech to the rest of the trainees. Topics are quite broad, and can generally be anything that participants choose, as long as the topic is not “police-related.” Sample topics include “how to tie your shoes,” “changing a car tire,” and “how to prepare [insert food here].” The 80-hour training session concludes its public speaking component by having trainees individually overview a G.R.E.A.T. lesson in front of the class. To facilitate learning, trainees present their overviews to other members of their teams and team leaders throughout the week (i.e., “coaching facilitations”). This allows trainees to practice and receive feedback before presenting to the entire group.

The “Transitions” section is a unique component intended to help officers change their orientation from law enforcement to prevention program provider. Since few of the officers in the 80-hour training sessions have experience teaching in schools, the Transitions section provides an important segue for officers to broaden their views of policing. As stated by one of the trainers presenting this section, officers need to learn that “what works in the streets often doesn’t work in the classroom.” Thus, it is important that officers view their participation in the G.R.E.A.T. program as a transition to a new role, one that provides the officers with a unique opportunity to work in an unfamiliar role within a community. For example, while officers may be accustomed to visiting schools for law enforcement-related duties, the school community (and

subsequent role of the officer) is different when an officer is teaching the G.R.E.A.T. program. Officers learn about adolescents, the middle school environment, and alternatives to the “enforcement” role that officers typically have while on patrol.

Assessments of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.)

As previously stated, one of the goals of the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. was to assess the quality of the G.O.T.s. To this end, members of the research team observed a total of eight G.O.T.s conducted between June 2006 and August 2008. A diversity of locations and times were selected (two trainings observed in each of two sites, one training observed in six sites) with at least one training observed in each of the five G.R.E.A.T. regions² [Midwest (2), Northeast (1), Southeast (1), Southwest (2), and West (2)]. Observers were expected to evaluate the training on multiple criteria, including: 1) coverage of the G.R.E.A.T. components (primarily the middle-school component), 2) styles and strategies for modeling effective classroom delivery, and 3) adherence to the training guidelines. The overarching goal was to assess the extent to which G.O.T. prepared officers for delivering the G.R.E.A.T. program in the field.³

G.O.T. Structure

The structure of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training presented above provides one example of the organizational “flow” used in the G.O.T.s. While each of the trainings observed covered the same curricular content, the organization of that content varied across the trainings. For

² G.R.E.A.T. regions will soon be reduced from five to four: 1) West, 2) Southwest, 3) Southeast, and 4) Midwest Atlantic. The Midwest Atlantic region will encompass most of what are currently the Northeast and Midwest regions, although some of the specific regional boundaries will be modified.

³ Observations of 522 G.R.E.A.T. sessions were also conducted “in the field” (i.e., middle-school classrooms) to assess program fidelity. Results of those observations are reported in a separate document (Leugoud et al 2009).

example, in one session, the G.R.E.A.T. Core Curriculum was covered after the G.R.E.A.T. Families, G.R.E.A.T. Summer, and Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern segments. In two other sessions, the Gang Component was covered at the end of training. Discussions with training supervisors illustrated that the curricular areas sometimes needed to be rearranged to accommodate members of the training team. One observer highlighted that the implications of organizing the curriculum is important, noting “reorganization of agenda does not seem to work as well; it seems odd to do G.R.E.A.T. Families and Summer before Core; Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern also seems as though it would be more effective after Core.”

This flexibility in the ordering of training sections must be highlighted, as it can impact the natural flow of the curriculum content. The G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is based upon a “building-block” approach where each lesson builds upon the prior lesson. It is recommended that the training be assessed to also reflect this approach.

G.O.T. Trainers

Trainers must receive additional certification from G.R.E.A.T. to be eligible to serve as trainers; thus, these trainers should be considered the most qualified to teach trainees how to deliver the program. Observers generally noted that trainers were good at covering the key points of the program during training, although the trainers varied in terms of their familiarity with the program, presentation styles, and “comfort level” with individual lessons.

Trainers should also represent a broad diversity of the locales in which the G.R.E.A.T. program is delivered. G.O.T. trainers in the observed trainings represented a broad cross-section of officers implementing the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum, including a mix of males and females, members of different racial and ethnic groups, and officers from a broad range of agencies.

Discussions with training supervisors highlighted the importance of the “right mix” of trainers in the G.O.T.s. Trainers are invited to participate in trainings, and the trainers often work together in different training sessions. Observers of the G.O.T.s noted the diversity of the training teams, as well as the positive working relationship these trainers had during the training sessions.

One issue which arose consistently in the observations that needs to be addressed is trainers’ behaviors when they are not leading the training. In most cases, trainers were working on various tasks in the back of the room when they were not responsible for leading the training (e.g., modeling lessons). In each of the trainings observed, there were instances when the trainers at the back of the room became loud and somewhat disruptive while someone else was speaking. In some cases, this was when another trainer was modeling a lesson; in other cases, this occurred when trainees were presenting. As noted by one observer:

“Early in the day, the trainers’ behavior was very distracting. While this changed once the training turned to the G.R.E.A.T. material, the trainees’ behavior often became disruptive when the trainers were modeling the program. It seemed that the *trainees* were more attentive and responsive to the presentations by the other *trainees* and the *trainers* more attentive and responsive to the presentations by the other *trainers* today. This training seems to be on the edge at times, with trainers potentially losing their credibility with and respect of the trainees (and vice versa). This is in stark contrast to the verbal messages that are shared by the trainers about the importance of establishing and maintaining credibility.”

It is imperative that trainers consistently conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the ground rules provided for trainees. Even when not in front of the room, they must remember that they are “modeling” appropriate behavior. While some minor disruptions may be expected, it is crucial that such disruptions be kept to a minimum.

Additionally, during one G.O.T., the training supervisor was viewed as contributing very little to the training, other than introducing the other trainers when it was their turn to lead the class. According to this observer, “Cost saving comment – what is role of training supervisor?

X really didn't do anything and often wasn't even paying attention to what was going on." Other observers commented on the role of the training supervisor. For example, one noted that:

"It was interesting to hear the training supervisor describe his role as a 'cheerleader.' This perfectly described the role he has been playing. He keeps a very positive environment for the training. His role is to evaluate the performance of the training team, while the training team members are expected to evaluate the performance of the participants on their 'team.'"

The training supervisor noted by the second observer was also noted to be actively involved in nearly all aspects of the training, spending most of the G.O.T. presenting, facilitating trainers' modeling, and assessing trainers' performance. These observations highlight the discrepancy in the role (and utility) of the training supervisor across trainings, and leads to a recommendation that the role of the training supervisor be clearly delineated and consistently implemented across the G.O.T. sessions.

G.O.T. Participants

Officers attending the G.O.T. sessions varied across the training observed. One G.O.T., for example, was held by a "host" agency where nearly all of the trainees were from that agency. Another G.O.T., however, had only two officers (out of approximately 40 trainees) from the locale in which the training was held, with the remainder coming from multiple agencies representing a broad cross-section of the United States. Thus, the composition of participants varied across trainings.

Participants differed in their reasons for attending G.O.T. In some cases, officers indicated that they had volunteered to attend, in other cases officers indicated that they were assigned by their agency to attend, either because the agency was planning on implementing the G.R.E.A.T. program or because the officer had moved into a new assignment that involved

becoming a G.R.E.A.T. officer. The diversity of reasons why officers attended training was summarized by one observer:

“3 re-trys for the certification [i.e., not successful at completing training on two prior attempts], one because of inter-agency politics; one of the men on his team was chief of a reservation police department who does not have the manpower in his department to implement program, politics of his job is why he is here. One officer is ‘right out of the army and very enthusiastic.’… Two officers from a particular city were “forced” to come here by department, they told team leader they had been trying to get out of this assignment for the last month but were unable to do so, leader seemed to think that they were just burdened by coming here because they also teach DARE; stated their attitude was “ok” but nothing negative enough that would prevent them from doing fine in the field, another team leader said “as long as you are willing to work” (in regard to the officers); another officer from this group had been trying to get to this training for the last [several] years (since 1998) and finally got to come here, he is very excited about the training.”

This demonstrates the range of reasons why officers attend the G.O.T. sessions.⁴ Each of the observed training sessions involved staff meeting discussions about why their team members were at G.O.T. Trainers appear cognizant of the varied reasons why officers are in attendance and take a reasonable approach to work with officers, regardless of why they are there.

Observers also noted that trainees (and in some cases, trainers), tended to “lose steam” towards the end of the morning (i.e., shortly before lunch) or late afternoon (i.e., shortly before

⁴ It also corresponds well with results reported from surveys of G.R.E.A.T.-trained officers in the seven cities participating in the National Evaluation (Carson et al. 2008).

the end) of training days. This is perhaps not surprising, given the amount of material covered during the trainings. As stated by one trainer at the beginning of the week, G.R.E.A.T. training is “unlike any police training you’ve had because you have to participate” and the training is full of material. Observers noted no specific sections that seemed to lose participants’ interests more than others. Additionally, the structure of the trainings appears to do a reasonable job of providing breaks throughout the day to allow participants to decompress and refocus. Interestingly, observers consistently noted that the breaks could be best described as “working breaks” with trainers and trainees mingling to talk about the G.O.T. and/or the G.R.E.A.T. program.

Observers also suggested a number of areas that may enhance trainees’ experiences in the G.O.T. sessions. One issue which consistently arose was observers’ statements regarding trainees’ lack of note-taking during the training. While the binders provide substantial material necessary for officers during training, trainees should be explicitly encouraged to take notes. These will be the materials on which officers primarily rely to deliver the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum once they leave training. By encouraging note-taking, trainers could better ensure that trainees were paying attention (rather than causing distractions) and also reinforce important issues by advising trainees to “check their notes.” This would also provide trainees with additional material to take with them when they leave training. Note-taking by participants, however, is not explicitly encouraged and may be informally (although perhaps unintentionally) discouraged. For example, the importance of taking notes among trainees may be hindered through early notification that the test will be “open book” and all answers can be found in the binders. There appears to be little reason to inform trainees about this beforehand, as the test is a relatively simple multiple-choice assessment.

The second component involves highlighting the extended teacher activities. Observations of G.O.T. provided mixed evidence as to how much attention was paid to these supplemental materials. For example, some observations noted that the extended teaching materials associated with each lesson were covered in detail and trainees were strongly encouraged to elicit teachers' implementation of the activities to supplement the G.R.E.A.T. program, other observations indicated that the teacher activities were briefly covered, and other observations indicated that the extended teacher activities were given little attention during training. Given survey findings that teachers⁵ rarely implement the extended teacher activities, often because they are unaware of them, it is recommended that the importance of these activities be highlighted throughout G.O.T. sessions.

A third issue involves the perceptions of what middle school students are typically like. While the observers typically noted the high quality of the training teams (see above) and education specialists (see below), they also consistently noted the negative perceptions that trainees seemed to have about middle school students. While this is perhaps not surprising, observers noted that trainers and education specialists often did not dispel the negative stereotypes of students held by officers. Since some trainings expected trainees to "act like typical middle school students," and officers had negative perceptions of middle school students, it is perhaps not surprising that observers noted disruptions arising during some of the lessons. Some of the trainees took the act to the extreme, faux confronting trainers or simply not paying attention during the lesson modeling. It is recommended that the G.R.E.A.T. National Training Team reconsider whether it is necessary to tell the trainees to act like students. If so, it is

⁵ Findings from surveys of school personnel at the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. schools are discussed in more detail in a separate report (Peterson et al. 2009).

important to develop a mechanism where the negative stereotypes can be addressed and framed within a positive framework in training.

Education Specialists

Education specialists assist by providing educational-related sections during each of the G.O.T.s. These education specialists cover material related to characteristics of adolescence, classroom settings, school operations, learning disabilities, and effective methods of teaching pedagogy. Observers noted the “buy-in” to the G.R.E.A.T. program exhibited by the Education Specialists, demonstrated through their statements about being excited about the program and stressing the importance of prevention.

Observers also highlighted the role that the Education Specialists played during the G.O.T. sessions observed. Assessments indicated that the Education Specialists have an important role, particularly during the 80-hour training sessions. As officers attending the 80-hour sessions typically do not have the classroom experience of officers attending the 40-hour trainings, the importance of topics covered by the Educator is important to prepare officers for their role as educators when delivering the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum. Observers noted that the Education Specialists generally did a good job covering the key issues associated with the content areas necessary for officers to be reasonably expected to succeed in G.R.E.A.T. program delivery.

Observers did note, however, some areas which could be improved. While each of the Educators covered the key areas, they varied in the amount of coverage of each section. For example, some Educators were better than others at making the “educational theory” section applicable to the officers. Some of the material covered (e.g., Maslow’s hierarchy of needs) may

be important information to have available, but its utility for officers delivering the G.R.E.A.T. program is questionable. Similarly, specific characteristics associated with learning disabilities may be less important than highlighting the importance that officers are tolerant of students with differential needs and that officers work closely with classroom teachers to find ways of effectively teaching the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum to all students.

A second issue which should be reexamined is the time that the Education Specialists attend the G.O.T. sessions. The Educators were typically at training for the beginning of the training, presented their section when scheduled, and then left the training. It is recommended that G.R.E.A.T. consider having these Education Specialists play a larger role during the one day they are on site for the 40-hour training and consider expanding their on-site time to two days during 80-hour sessions. The G.O.T. observations highlight that the Educators have substantial expertise which may be particularly helpful for G.O.T. participants. Such contributions could include, but not be limited to, providing additional “helpful hints” for participants at the conclusion of each modeled lesson, assisting trainers in answering questions related to working with school personnel to get the G.R.E.A.T. program into the schools, and highlighting ways in which classroom teachers may take an expanded role in reinforcing the lessons of G.R.E.A.T. In short, it appears that the Education Specialists’ contributions to training remain somewhat underutilized.

The Gang Component

As one key goal of the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is to prevent youth from becoming gang members, it is imperative that officers are familiar with issues related to gangs and gang membership. This is a particularly difficult task, however, for a national program as gangs are

typically localized in nature. That is, gangs vary across communities. Observers of the training sessions, however, noted a number of concerns with the “gang component” of trainings. Specifically, these training sessions often presented gangs as highly organized and national (or international) in scope. In some cases, this was the primary message of the gang expert. In other cases, this arose in the discussions after the gang expert had given his (in all observations, the Gang Expert was male) presentation. Regardless of the timing, observers consistently noted that the “take home message” from the gang component was based on stereotypical notions of gangs and gang members.

The gang component of G.O.T. may need to be re-assessed. We note the difficulty posed by the structure of a national-level program aimed at typically localized problems. That is, it is difficult to maintain consistency in the gang component across training sessions when the nature of the gang problem facing officers varies by locale. We are unable to provide specific suggestions as to how this may be best accomplished, however, as it may require substantial restructuring of training sessions. For example, trainees attending G.O.T. sessions often come from a number of different jurisdictions. One possible approach would involve that, whenever possible, trainees come from the same jurisdiction. Gang experts from the jurisdiction in which the training is held could possibly be hired as consultants to provide the gang component. Conversely, the gang component could be restructured in a manner to highlight the similarities and *differences* (i.e., patterns and deviations) across gangs in multiple communities. Such an approach could focus on the risk factors associated with gang membership and how the G.R.E.A.T. program is suited to specifically address these risk factors. One potential approach would be to contract with IIR to have their gang experts provide the gang component. Additionally, incorporating the gang typology devised by Cheryl Maxson and Malcolm Klein

(1995) and/or bringing in a “gang scholar” familiar with the research could serve as mechanisms for addressing the variation in gangs across locales but also to emphasize that most gangs are not “traditional” gangs.

Coverage of the G.R.E.A.T. Components

The G.R.E.A.T. program has four main components: 1) the middle-school curriculum, 2) the elementary-school curriculum, 3) the family curriculum (i.e., *G.R.E.A.T. Families*), and 4) the summer curriculum. Observers were particularly attentive to the coverage of the middle-school and families components during G.O.T.s.

Observers noted that trainers generally did a good job in highlighting key elements of the G.R.E.A.T. program, including the “skills-building” approach, importance of delivering the program exactly as intended, the program’s use of “scientifically-proven” content and delivery mechanisms, and its intention to supplement (rather than replace all) other programs. Additionally, the history of the G.R.E.A.T. program and its revisions over time were covered well. In some ways, the program’s strengths may be somewhat overstated. For example, the previous National Evaluation’s more positive cross-sectional findings are stressed, while the less favorable longitudinal findings are not covered, and in at least one instance a trainer told trainees that the “results [of the ongoing evaluation] are not available yet, but [(s)he is] pretty certain they will show the same positive results.” This is an optimistic assessment, but one consistent with preliminary analyses (see Esbensen et al. 2009).⁶

G.O.T. trainers generally did a good job covering the content of the core G.R.E.A.T. curriculum. This was accomplished through two mechanisms: overviews and lesson modeling.

⁶ The Principal Investigator first reported preliminary results examining data collected during the first three waves of student surveys to the National Policy Board in December 2008.

Each of the trainings observed contained extensive lesson modeling. The process of lesson modeling involved a trainer delivering the curriculum as (s)he would in a normal classroom setting. That is, trainers shifted to an “instructor mode” where they acted as if they were presenting to a classroom of middle school students. Trainees assumed the role of students, participating in the exercises that middle schools students are expected to complete. In most cases, trainees were instructed to “act like adults but ask middle school questions” during the lesson models.

Trainers generally covered the lesson content exactly as presented in the binder. In most cases, trainers had a copy of curriculum with them while modeling and looked down to read sections verbatim. Trainers varied in terms of their “flow” of presenting the material, with some trainers appearing more comfortable in front of the classroom than others. Each of the trainers illustrated a different presentation style, demonstrating a range of approaches to introducing individual personality into the structured lessons. Thus, trainees were exposed to different teaching styles and could be expected to recognize that the curriculum may be somewhat “canned” but the presentation of the material is not.

Trainers also modeled the activities in the G.R.E.A.T. lessons. Trainers again illustrated different styles in running the exercises. For example, some of the trainers appeared to be more comfortable (and thus generally more effective) in eliciting participation from the “students.” Additionally, some “instructors” were better able to maintain student attention than others, and some trainers were more successful than others at dealing with inattentive or disruptive students. It is important to note, however, that the exercises were generally modeled as intended and trainers modeled different methods of appropriate classroom management strategies.

Utilization of Teaching Aids/Targeting Different Learning Styles

One of the key issues addressed by the Education Specialist is different types of learning styles used by students. Differences between auditory and visual learners, for example, were extensively covered. During the modeling of lessons, trainers highlighted the importance of meeting the needs of different types of learners by using different teaching methodologies. Some instructors made more extensive use of visual aids (such as flip charts) than others, while others employed more extensive use of classroom discussions. Thus, the modeling of lessons reinforced many of the recommendations provided by the Education Specialists.

Observers often noted, however, that these skills were not consistently *explicitly* reinforced during trainees' presentations. While trainers discuss the importance of classroom management and model mechanisms for effectively managing classrooms throughout the curriculum, observers consistently noted that a substantial number of trainees did not practice these skills during their presentations. Additionally, while the training highlights the importance of reaching different types of learners (such as through the use of visual aids), the use of such materials were notably absent from many trainees' presentations. More importantly, trainers rarely addressed this deficiency. Trainees may benefit from a consistent reinforcement of such "helpful hints" as they will be expected to use these skills after leaving training.

Time Management

Observers also noted the importance of time management during the training sessions. To reiterate, trainers are modeling the important elements of teaching the G.R.E.A.T. program. Thus, it is important that trainers adhere to appropriate time limits during the training sessions to highlight the importance of adhering to time frames while in the classroom. In short, even when

trainers are not modeling a lesson, their role as trainers (i.e., “modelers” of the G.R.E.A.T. program) remains important throughout the course.

One issue that arises throughout the observations of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training sessions relates to the time devoted to modeling lessons. Course syllabi typically devoted one hour to modeling each G.R.E.A.T. lesson. With few exceptions, trainers completed the lesson within the one-hour block devoted to each lesson and training leaders enforced the specified time frames. A few instances arose, however, when trainers were unable to complete the entire lesson in the specified hour. When this occurred, trainers typically skipped the review of the program goals, although in a few instances, entire components of the lessons were skipped.

While the one-hour blocks devoted to each lesson may be conducive to training sessions, our observations of G.R.E.A.T. program delivery in the classrooms suggest that few middle-school classes allow a full hour to complete the G.R.E.A.T. lessons. Officers typically have about 35 minutes to deliver the G.R.E.A.T. lesson. By the time students are in their seats and all “housekeeping” issues are completed, officers generally have 30 to 40 minutes to complete the lesson. Thus, it is recommended that training reflect realistic time frames which officers will typically encounter when delivering the lessons in schools. Modeling lessons in an hour block during training appears to overestimate the amount of time available to officers when they implement the program in the field. This discrepancy may decrease the likelihood that officers will be prepared to deliver the program with fidelity in the schools. This is particularly true if trainers are unable to complete the entire lesson in the hour block devoted to the lesson in G.O.T.

Rules and Rule Enforcement during G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training

Participants are expected to follow set rules when attending G.O.T.s. Trainers cover these ground rules at the beginning of the training sessions, and staff meetings are often used as a setting in which trainers decide how to handle rule violations by participants. Observers noted that the training rules were made explicit at the beginning of the training sessions. Some ground rules were consistent across trainings (e.g., respect of trainers and other participants, no inappropriate jokes or comments) while others (e.g., appropriate attire) varied across settings.

Observers also noted instances when participants violated ground rules and how these violations were handled by the training teams. Two specific instances involved inappropriate attire. In one training session, a trainee wore clothing that exposed undergarments, while in another G.O.T. a participant wore shorts on one day and jeans on another. In the underwear case, the training team decided to announce a new G.R.E.A.T. rule that no underwear could be shown and the trainee was advised of this. In the other instance, the Training Supervisor reminded the trainee of the dress code and told him to wear more appropriate clothing the next day. When this officer showed up wearing inappropriate attire the next day, the Training Supervisor contacted the trainee's departmental supervisor and asked him to intervene. A third incident involved an officer having too many drinks in the bar one night and continued making lewd phone calls to one of the trainer's rooms throughout the night. The officer's agency was contacted the next day, and the officer was promptly sent home. More common, however, were "minor infractions," such as trainees being tardy in the morning or after breaks. These situations were handled by team leaders in one-on-one meetings with violators. Each of these methods worked to suitably resolve the situation.

The Binders

Trainees are provided with several binders at the beginning of training. Materials included involve rules for training, the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum, and presentations by Education Specialists and Gang Experts. The materials included in these binders are comprehensive and provide trainees with the necessary information to succeed in G.O.T. and in delivering the program. In several instances, however, additional materials were provided to trainees immediately preceding coverage of the content. Trainees were then instructed to place the additional materials in their binders. While this approach may work in some instances, observers consistently noted disruptions associated with providing additional materials to be placed in the binders. In some cases, the wrong handouts were distributed; in other cases, trainers assumed that the material was already included in the binders and no handouts were distributed. When handouts were being distributed, trainees were often conversing with one another, making it difficult for the trainer to maintain attention. When materials were not in the binders, both trainers and trainees appeared confused, with trainers referring trainees to the binders, and trainees flipping through the binders and/or asking other trainees where to find the material. It is recommended that, whenever possible, all relevant information be included in the binders prior to their circulation to trainees. When additional materials must be distributed, it is recommended that these materials are distributed at a predetermined point (e.g., immediately before or during a scheduled break) to minimize disruptions and maintain training flow.

Recommendations

This report highlights observations of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) conducted by members of the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Members of the research team observed a

total of eight trainings, including 40- and 80-hour sessions, in each of the G.R.E.A.T. regions between 2006 and 2008. Each component of the trainings was assessed, and recommendations are provided.

These observations led to a number of conclusions, including:

- 1) Training sessions cover the key components of G.R.E.A.T. (especially the “core” middle-school component) in a manner that trainees should reasonably understand the G.R.E.A.T. program upon completion of training. The lesson contents are sufficiently covered by the trainers both in their lesson modeling and the content included in the binders.
- 2) Training sessions are generally well-organized, have consistent rules and discipline for rule infractions, and adherence to specified time-frames. Observers noted that trainers worked together before, during, and after training days to ensure everything was on schedule. The morning and afternoon staff meetings provide a good setting for prepping for the day’s events and re-capping the day’s session. These staff meetings were particularly useful as a method of gathering feedback from other trainers about how the training sessions were operating and providing feedback about the status of trainees’ progression. Of particular note were the collaborative efforts to identify and handle potential problems and take a proactive approach to dealing with them.
- 3) Trainers do a good job of modeling the G.R.E.A.T. lessons and classroom management strategies. This modeling presents trainees with the ability to see how G.R.E.A.T. is expected to be delivered in a classroom setting. Observers noted that trainers illustrated different instructional styles, providing trainees with an opportunity to see different

methods of classroom instruction, which may be used once the officers begin delivering the program in their communities.

- 4) Education specialists do a good job of covering key topics associated with adolescence, issues of importance to schools, and teaching pedagogy. Observers consistently noted that the education specialists were well-prepared, knowledgeable about the topics, had a good rapport with trainers, and were able to convey necessary information to trainees in an easy-to-comprehend format.

Observers noted a number of areas which may deserve additional consideration in efforts to improve G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training. Specifically, the following suggestions are presented:

- 1) The ordering of how G.R.E.A.T. components are presented during G.O.T.s should be assessed to determine the best “flow” of the curriculum. Observers noted that the timing in which lesson content was covered varied across trainings and that this sometimes made for awkward transitions. As the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is structured in a “building-block approach” where each lesson builds upon prior lessons, trainings should be structured in a similar manner. Once a standard training schedule is developed, every effort should be made to maintain consistency in this training structure.
- 2) The time-frames devoted to lesson modeling may be inconsistent with the amount of time officers have available when in the school setting. The one-hour blocks devoted to lesson modeling in training appear to be substantially longer than actual class periods in typical middle schools in which the program is delivered. (Our classroom observations found that officers typically had 30 to 40 minutes to cover each lesson in the schools.) This discrepancy may reduce the likelihood that officers are able to deliver the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum with fidelity (and consistent with training modeling) in the classroom setting.

- 3) The expertise of the Education Specialists remains somewhat untapped. The Education Specialists provide an important contribution to the G.O.T.s, particularly the 80-hour sessions. Expanding the availability of these Educators to more than their specific time-block so that they are accessible by trainers and trainees during more of the G.O.T.s deserves consideration. The Educators may be particularly suited to critique and/or reinforce methods of effective classroom management techniques and answer questions about how the curriculum meets the needs of different types of learners. We are not suggesting that the Education Specialist attend the entire session, but that they are better utilized the entire day they are currently present. Consideration, however, may be given to extending the educator presence to two days in the 80-hour G.O.T.
- 4) The role of the Training Supervisors and trainers throughout the G.O.T.s should be re-assessed. In at least one G.O.T., the role of the Training Supervisor was unclear and the observer questioned the utility of this role. If this role is to be continued, the exact duties and role of the Supervisor should be clearly articulated. Additionally, the role of trainers as “program representatives” and “models” should be stressed. The importance of trainers’ engagement in the training process, regardless of whether they are in the front or back of the room, must be consistent. Observers consistently noted disruptions resulting from trainers talking, playing on their computers, etc., when they were not involved in modeling lessons. It was apparent that trainees also noticed these disruptions and observers noted that this led to several awkward situations.
- 5) The content of the Gang Component should be re-assessed. Youth gangs are typically “localized” and “unstructured,” yet the content of the Gang Component often reinforces stereotypes of gangs as highly structured, national- or international-level organized crime

groups. While the Gang Experts often began by talking about “localized,” “unstructured” groups, training often turned to coverage of stereotypical gangs once trainees began participating. Trainees would be better equipped to prevent gang-involvement if they understand the nature of the youth gangs in their areas. Conversely, experts who can relate specific risk factors for gang membership to the G.R.E.A.T. program may be sought. The established pipeline between G.R.E.A.T. and IIR provides one mechanism in which this could be addressed rather easily, as IIR has a number of national gang experts at their disposal. These experts should be incorporated into G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training sessions. Additionally, incorporating the gang typology devised by Cheryl Maxson and Malcolm Klein (1995) and/or bringing in a “gang scholar” familiar with the research could serve as mechanisms for addressing the variation in gangs across locales but also to emphasize that most gangs are not “traditional” gangs.

- 6) It is recommended that trainees be encouraged to take notes in their binders during training. Observers noted that trainees rarely took notes and sometimes lost interest during the training sessions. Encouraging note-taking would help trainees follow along more closely with the lessons while they were being modeled and provide additional information that would be useful once they began delivering the program in the field.
- 7) It is recommended that trainers reconsider the utility of announcing at the beginning of training that the final test is “open book.” The multiple choice exam is not particularly taxing and all of the information is included in the binders. Encouraging trainees to take notes throughout training with the expectation that the exam will be rigorous should increase trainees’ attention to content throughout the sessions. Additionally, announcing that the test is “open book” immediately before test administration also has the potential

to increase morale among trainees (who, having been encouraged to pay close attention throughout, should feel more prepared for the exam) and leave trainees with a positive impression of trainers upon the completion of training (i.e., trainees will be “pleasantly surprised” that the trainers “gave them a break” by making the test open book).

- 8) It is recommended that instructing trainees to “act like middle-school students” during the lessons be reconsidered. Observers noted that trainees often slipped into the role without being instructed and/or that trainees often acted more disruptive than typical middle-school students.
- 9) Along these same lines, it is recommended that trainers and education specialists emphasize the positive aspects of middle-school students throughout training. Observers noted that this information was covered, but trainees often expressed negative views of youths of this age group anyway. In most cases, trainees’ misperceptions were not corrected by trainers or Educators. Focusing on the positive aspects of working with youths should be a major emphasis throughout training. Such positive messages may have several beneficial effects including, but not limited to, reinforcing the “Transitions” session messages, getting trainees excited about the program, and facilitating the mindset among officers that students should be treated with respect. This last component—treating students with respect—has been found to be one of the most important methods of shaping youths’ attitudes towards police in a positive manner. Noting that this is one of the main goals of the G.R.E.A.T. program, this recommendation should not be taken lightly.
- 10) It is recommended that attention be paid to ensuring binders have all information to be used in the day’s lesson prior to the beginning of the training day. Observers noted

instances where trainers requested trainees “check their binders” for missing material during lesson modeling. Such instances led to confusion between both trainers and trainees, with trainers referring trainees to the binders, and trainees flipping through the binders and/or asking other trainees where to find the material. Although uncommon, such instances detracted from successful training efforts. It is recommended that the use of Extended Teacher Activities be made a priority during training. Trainers should express to trainees the importance of sharing these materials with teachers in G.R.E.A.T. classrooms. Results from surveys of teachers and administrators found that many were unaware that such activities were available and some indicated frustration by indicating that they would have used the activities in their classes if they had been available (Peterson et al. 2009). Given the pressure on schools to meet local, state, and federal educational standards, making these Extended Teacher Activities available, illustrating to school personnel how the lessons fit within core testing areas, and encouraging teachers to utilize the activities seems a particularly important component for the sustainability of the G.R.E.A.T. program. Stressing and reinforcing the need for extensive communication with the classroom teachers should be made explicit throughout G.O.T. sessions.

Conclusions

The purpose of this report is to answer the following question: To what extent does the G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) account for the quality of program implementation? Previous reports have documented that the G.R.E.A.T. program is offered in schools with considerable fidelity, as measured through observations of officers delivering the program in

classrooms (see Leugoud et al. 2009), surveys and interviews with G.R.E.A.T. officers and supervisors (see Carson et al. 2008), and surveys of school personnel (see Peterson et al. 2009). Preliminary analyses of the first three waves of student survey data also illustrate short-term program effectiveness (see Esbensen et al. 2009).

To provide additional insight into the G.R.E.A.T. process, this report documents descriptive information about the G.O.T. structure and content collected from observations of eight G.O.T. sessions in each of the G.R.E.A.T. regions between 2006 and 2008. Since delivering the G.R.E.A.T. program in schools is often a departure from the normal duties of law enforcement officers, training is intended to be multi-faceted, rigorous, and comprehensive. Training officers about the substance of the G.R.E.A.T. program and methods of working with the target audience is an essential component of program fidelity (i.e., delivering the program in the field as intended). Thus, the primary goals of the G.O.T.s are to familiarize officers with the G.R.E.A.T. program curriculum and to provide skills needed to successfully teach the program to the target audience (i.e., elementary- and middle-school youths).

The observations documented in this report illustrate that G.R.E.A.T. Officer Trainings are generally quite good at covering the G.R.E.A.T. curricular content and skills needed for officers to deliver the program in schools. In short, *it is reasonable to expect that trainees will leave G.O.T.s with the knowledge and skills to become successful G.R.E.A.T. officers*, although some recommendations for continued refinement and success are included throughout this report.

REFERENCES

- Carson, Dena C., Finn-Aage Esbensen, Terrance J. Taylor, and Dana Peterson. 2008. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: Results from Surveys and Interviews with G.R.E.A.T.-Trained Officers*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Dana Peterson, and Terrance J. Taylor. 2009. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: 2009 Report to Schools and Communities: Program Implementation Quality and Preliminary Outcome Results*. St. Louis, MO: University of Missouri-St. Louis.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Dana Peterson, Terrance J. Taylor, Vanessa R. Panfil, and Bradley T. Brick. 2008. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: 2008 Report to Schools and Communities: Anti-Social Norms among a Sample of Middle-School Students*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Terrance J. Taylor, Bradley T. Brick, and Dana Peterson. 2007. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: 2007 Report to Schools and Communities*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.
- Leugoud, Krystle M., Finn-Aage Esbensen, Bradley T. Brick, and Terrance J. Taylor. 2009. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: Observing the Implementer: Description of Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusions from G.R.E.A.T. Program Implementation Observations*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.
- Maxson, Cheryl L., and Malcolm Klein. 1995. Investigating gang structures. *Journal of Gang Research* 3 (1): 33–40.
- Peterson, Dana, Venessa R. Panfil, Finn-Aage Esbensen, and Terrance J. Taylor. 2009. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: School Personnel Survey Report*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

For more information about the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program, see the official G.R.E.A.T. website located at <http://www.great-online.org/> .

For more information about youth gangs and effective responses, see the official website of the National Youth Gang Center located at <http://www.iir.com/nygc/> .

For more information on the earlier National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T., consult the following:

Esbensen, Finn-Aage. 2004. *Evaluating G.R.E.A.T.: A school-based gang prevention program – Research in Policy*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available online at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/198604.pdf> .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Adrienne Freng, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and D. Wayne Osgood. 2002. The National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program. Pp.139-167 in Winifred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker (Eds.), *Responding to Gangs: Evaluation and Research*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Available online at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/190351.pdf> .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, D. Wayne Osgood, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and Adrienne Freng. 2001. How Great is G.R.E.A.T.? Results from a quasi-experimental design. *Criminology & Public Policy* 1 (1): 87-118.

Winfree, L. Thomas, Jr., Dana Peterson Lynskey, and James R. Maupin. 1999. Developing Local Police and Federal Law Enforcement Partnerships: G.R.E.A.T. as a case study of policy implementation. *Criminal Justice Review* 24 (2): 145-168.

APPENDIX A

G.R.E.A.T. OFFICER TRAINING SYLLABUS (40-Hour) [Rev. 10/2006]

DAY 1

07:00 - 07:30 Staff Meeting

08:00 - 09:00 Welcome and Introductions

09:00 - 09:10 Break

09:10 - 09:50 Background of G.R.E.A.T.

09:50 - 10:00 Break

10:00 - 12:00 Educational Theory

12:00 - 01:00 Lunch

01:00 - 01:20 Photo

01:20 - 01:25 Break

01:25 - 02:25 Educational Theory (continued)

02:25 - 02:35 Break

02:35 - 03:25 Elementary Curriculum – Introduction and Lessons 1–2

03:25 - 03:35 Break

03:35 - 04:25 Elementary Curriculum – Lessons 3–6

04:25 - 04:30 Break

04:30 - 05:00 Team Meetings

05:00 - 05:30 Staff Meeting

DAY 2

07:30 - 08:00 Staff Meeting

08:00 - 08:05 Day's Objectives

08:05 - 12:05 National Gang Trends

12:05 - 01:05 Lunch

01:05 - 01:55 Overview Lesson #1

01:55 - 02:05 Break

02:05 - 02:40 Overview Lesson #2

02:40 - 02:50 Break

02:50 - 03:50 Model Lesson #3

03:50 - 04:00 Break

04:00 - 05:00 Model Lesson #4

05:00 - 05:30 Staff Meeting

DAY 3

07:30 - 08:00 Staff Meeting

08:00 - 08:05 Day's Objectives

08:05 - 08:55 Model Lesson #5

08:55 - 09:25 Overview Lesson #6

09:25 - 09:35 Break

09:35 - 10:25 Model Lesson #7

10:25 - 10:55 Overview Lesson #8

10:55 - 11:05 Break

11:05 - 11:55 Model Lesson #9

11:55 - 12:55 Lunch

12:55 - 01:25 Overview Lesson #10

01:25 - 01:55 Overview Lesson #11

01:55 - 02:05 Break

02:05 - 02:55 Model Lesson #12

02:55 - 03:05 Break

03:05 - 03:35 Overview Lesson #13

03:35 - 05:00 Team Meetings with assistance

Staff Meeting – will occur after teams receive their Lesson assignments and are reviewing their Lesson information

APPENDIX A

G.R.E.A.T. OFFICER TRAINING SYLLABUS (40-Hour) [Rev. 10/2006]

DAY 4

07:30 - 08:00 Staff Meeting
08:00 - 08:05 Day's Objectives
08:05 - 09:15 Test and Test Review
09:15 - 09:20 Break
09:20 - 10:20 Participant Presentation Lesson #3
10:20 - 10:30 Break
10:30 - 11:30 Participant Presentation Lesson #4
11:30 - 12:30 Lunch
12:30 - 01:30 Participant Presentation Lesson #5
01:30 - 01:40 Break
01:40 - 02:40 Participant Presentation Lesson #7
02:40 - 02:50 Break
02:50 - 03:50 Participant Presentation Lesson #9
03:50 - 04:00 Break
04:00 - 05:00 Participant Presentation Lesson #12
05:00 - 05:30 Staff Meeting

DAY 5

07:30 - 08:00 Staff Meeting
08:00 - 08:05 Day's Objectives
08:05 - 08:50 Families Component
08:50 - 09:00 Break
09:00 - 09:45 Summer Component
09:45 - 09:55 Break
09:55 - 10:40 Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern
10:40 - 11:00 Final Evaluation
11:00 - 12:00 Graduation
12:00 - 12:30 Staff Meeting

APPENDEX B: 80-hour G.O.T. SCHEDULE

DAY 1

07:00 – 07:30	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 09:00	Welcome/Introduction/Orientation
09:00 – 09:10	Break
09:10 – 10:10	Background of G.R.E.A.T.
10:10 – 10:20	Break
10:20 – 11:20	Transitions
11:20 – 12:20	Lunch
12:20 – 01:20	Transitions (cont.)
01:20 – 01:30	Break
01:30 – 04:30	Public Speaking
04:30 – 05:00	Team Meetings
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meeting

DAY 2

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 12:00	Learning Theory/Instructional Methodologies
12:00 – 01:00	Lunch
01:00 – 03:30	Learning Theory/Instructional Methodologies
03:40 – 05:00	Team Meetings/Participant Assistance
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meetings

DAY 3

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 12:00	Demonstration Speeches
12:00 – 01:00	Lunch
01:00 – 01:20	Photo
01:20 – 02:05	Overview Lesson #1
02:05 – 02:15	Break
02:15 – 03:15	Model Lesson #2
03:15 – 03:25	Break
03:25 – 04:25	Model Lesson #3
04:25 – 04:35	Break
04:35 – 05:00	Team Meetings
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meetings

DAY 4

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 09:05	Model Lesson #4
09:05 – 09:15	Break
09:15 – 10:15	Model Lesson #5
10:15 – 10:25	Break
10:25 – 11:25	Model Lesson #6
11:25 – 12:25	Lunch
12:25 – 01:25	Model Lesson #7
01:25 – 01:35	Break
01:35 – 02:35	Model Lesson #8
02:35 – 02:45	Break
02:45 – 03:45	Model Lesson #9
03:45 – 03:55	Break
03:55 – 04:55	Model Lesson #10
04:55 – 05:00	Wrap-up

APPENDIX B: 80-hour G.O.T. SCHEDULE

DAY 5

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 09:05	Model Lesson #11
09:05 – 09:15	Break
09:15 – 10:15	Model Lesson #12
10:15 – 10:25	Break
10:25 – 11:25	Overview Lesson #13/Test Preview
11:25 – 12:25	Lunch
12:25 – 01:45	Test and Test Review
01:45 – 01:55	Break
01:55 – 02:35	Elementary Component – Intro & Overview Lessons 1-2
02:35 – 02:45	Break
02:45 – 03:25	Elementary Component – Overview Lessons 3-6
03:25 – 03:35	Break
03:35 – 04:20	Family Component
04:20 – 05:00	Team Meeting/Lesson Assignments/Homework
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meeting

DAY 6

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:10	Day's Objectives
08:10 – 12:10	National Gang Trends
12:10 – 01:10	Lunch
01:10 – 02:10	Summer Component
02:10 – 02:20	Break
02:20 – 02:50	Model of Walk-Through
02:50 – 05:00	Team Meetings/ Walk-Throughs
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meeting

DAY 7

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 11:45	20 Minute Coaching of Lesson Facilitations
11:45 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 03:00	20 Minute Coaching of Lesson Facilitations
03:00 – 05:00	Team Meeting/Participant Assistance
05:00 – 05:30	Staff Meeting

DAY 8

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 12:00	Final Lesson Facilitations
12:00 – 01:00	Lunch
01:00 – 05:00	Final Lesson Facilitations

DAY 9

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 12:00	Final Lesson Facilitations
12:00 – 01:00	Lunch
01:00 – 05:00	Final Lesson Facilitations

DAY 10

07:30 – 08:00	Staff Meeting
08:00 – 08:05	Day's Objectives
08:05 – 09:05	Issues of G.R.E.A.T. Concern
09:05 – 09:15	Break
09:15 – 09:40	Final Evaluation
10:00 – 11:00	Graduation
11:15 – 12:00	Staff Meeting