HEIGHT
EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES

Analytic Services

Kinston Police Department
You & Five-O, LLC
(Pilot Evaluation)

Date: 7-27-22	M. Michaux Parker Ph.D.
	Criminologist

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The sample contained 64 participants. All analyses were conducted at the 95% confidence level (α= .05).

- Most of the participants were frontline personnel (74.6%, n= 44) and held a sworn position (82.5%, n=52).

- Most of the participants were male (75%, n= 45) and White (71.7%, n= 43).

- The average age of the participants was 33.5 (Md= 30) years old.

- The average years in service was 8.3 (Md= 4) years.

- Most participants strongly supported the You & Five-O (YFO) program in both impact ($\overline{X}$= 13.05, Md= 12) and delivery effectiveness ($\overline{X}$= 24.5, Md= 27).

- The vast majority of participants (90.6%, n=58) scored the program in the high impact category (See Figure-9).

- The vast majority (93.8%, n= 60) scored in the high delivery effectiveness category (See Figure-10).

- There were no statistically significant differences in the mean impact score (t= -1.326, p= .193) or delivery score (t= .277, p= .783) between male and female participants.

- There were no statistically significant differences in the mean impact (t= .145, p= .885) or delivery score (t= -1.209, p= .233) between frontline officers and supervisory officer.

- There was no statistically significant difference in impact score (t= .076, p= .940) between sworn and non-sworn employees.

- Non-sworn employees scored the program delivery statistically higher than sworn employees (t= -3.103, p= .004).

- There was no statistically significant difference in impact score (t= -.617, p= .541) between minority and non-minority participants.

- Minority participants scored the program delivery statistically higher than non-minority participants (t= -2.862, p= .006).

- A correlation analysis was conducted to determine if the high impact scores could have been correlated to the age or time in service of the participants.

- Neither impact score (r= .200, p= .221) nor delivery score (r= .234, p= .152) were statistically related to participant age.

- Neither impact score (r= .146, p= .381) nor delivery score (r= .016, p= .925) were statistically related to participant time in service.

Section-1	Introduction to the Analysis

The following analysis is of data collected during the You & Five-O (YFO) pilot training in Kinston, North Carolina. The sample contained 64 participants. All analyses were conducted at the 95% confidence level (α= .05). The analysis used two proprietary scales in the assessment: Program Impact and Delivery Effectiveness. The purpose of using scales was to measure the program effectiveness across multiple dimensions to get a more complete evaluation of the content and its delivery. The questions which comprised the two scales are listed below in Figure-1.

Figure-1	Scale Questions
Program Impact	1. Participating in the training helped me understand the YFO program in a different way.
	2. Participating in the helped me to better understand the YFO program.
	3. Participating in the program helped me think about possible solutions to the police community relational problems.
	4. Participating in the training helped motivate me to do something about the police community relational problems
Delivery Effectiveness	1. How informative was the session?
	2. How relevant was the session?
	3. How useful was the session?
	4. How comfortable were the physical surroundings of the session event?
	5. How accessible was the location of the session?
	6. How convenient was the scheduling of the session?
	7. How knowledgeable was the presenter(s) at the session?
	8. How respectful was the presenter(s) at the session?
	9. How professional was the presenter(s) at the session?

The questions were tested for validity and reliability. Both the program Impact scale ($\alpha=$ .956) and the delivery effectiveness scale ($\alpha=$ .950) exceeded the Cronbach's Alpha .700 threshold for reliability. A factor analysis was conducted to test the validity of the scale questions. Each question in both the program impact scale (EV= .912- .975) and delivery effectiveness scale (EV= .819- .894) exceeded the Eigenvalue threshold of .400 (See Table-1).

Table-1   Composite Variables

	Range	Items	α	EV Range
Program Impact	4-16	4	.956	.912- .975
Delivery Effectiveness	9-19	9	.950	.819- .894

Section-2	Characteristics of the Sample

Most of the participants were frontline personnel (74.6%, n= 44) and held a sworn position (82.5%, n=52) (See Figure-2 and Figure-3).

Figure-2		**Participant Rank**			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Frontline	44	68.8	74.6	
	Supervisor	15	23.4	25.4	
	Total	59	92.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	7.8		
Total		64	100.0		

Figure-3		**Non-Sworn Personnel**			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Sworn	52	81.3	82.5	
	Non-Sworn	11	17.2	17.5	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

Most of the participants were male (75%, n= 45) and White (71.7%, n= 43) (See Figure-4 and Figure-5). For the purpose of this analysis, the participants' ethnicities were collapsed in a binary category called Minority. Together, minority participants comprised 30.4% (n= 14) of the sample (See Figure-6).

Figure-4		**Participant Sex**			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Female	15	23.4	25.0	
	Male	45	70.3	75.0	
	Total	60	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	4	6.3		
Total		64	100.0		

Figure-5		Participant Ethnicity			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Asian	2	3.1	3.3	
	Black/ Af. American	13	20.3	21.7	
	Hispanic/ Latinx	1	1.6	1.7	
	White	43	67.2	71.7	
	Other	1	1.6	1.7	
	Total	60	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	4	6.3		
Total		64	100.0		

The average age of the participants was 33.5 (Md= 30). Additionally, the average years in service was 8.3 (Md= 4). It should be noted that neither of these variables were skewed. The data skew does not invalidate the data it only denotes that there was more than a 5-point difference between the mean and the median caused by extreme values in the data set (See Figure-7).

Figure-7			Participant Age	Years in Law Enforcement
N	Valid		56	53
	Missing		8	11
Mean			33.55	8.36
Median			30.00	4.00
Std. Deviation			9.914	9.268

Section-3	Impact Testing

Analysis of the data found that most participants strongly supported the YFO program in both impact ($\bar{X}$= 13.05, Md= 12) and delivery effectiveness ($\bar{X}$= 24.5, Md= 27). Neither of these two variables were skewed since there was not a 5-point difference between the mean and median scores (See Figure-8).

Figure-8

		Program Impact (4-16, greatest amount of impact)	Program Delivery (9-27, most effective delivery)
N	Valid	59	62
	Missing	5	2
Mean		13.0508	24.5806
Median		12.0000	27.0000
Std. Deviation		2.24702	3.23175

The impact and delivery scores were standardized into high and low categories. The vast majority of participants (90.6%, n=58) scored the program in the high impact category. Additionally, the vast majority (93.8%, n= 60) scored in the high delivery effectiveness category (See Figure-9 and Figure-10).

Figure-9   **High Impact**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Low Impact (Score= 4-10)	6	9.4	9.4	
	High Impact (Score= 11-16	58	90.6	90.6	
	Total	64	100.0	100.0	

Figure-10		High Delivery Effectiveness			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Low Delivery (Score= 9-18)	4	6.3	6.3	
	High Delivery (Score= 19-27)	60	93.8	93.8	
	Total	64	100.0	100.0	

Next, this assessment conducted a means analysis to determine if all categories of participants had experienced the program content and delivery to similar degrees. While the data above showed that the program was highly scored in both impact and delivery, it was still necessary to determine if the program's content and delivery were universally valued by different groups of people.

This analysis used an Independent Sample T-test to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in impact or delivery scoring occurred between male, female, sworn, non-sworn, minority or non-minority participants. Table-2 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean impact score (t= -1.326, p= .193) or delivery score (t= .277, p= .783) between male and female participants.

Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean impact (t= .145, p= .885) or delivery score (t= -1.209, p= .233) between frontline officers and supervisory officer. These findings strongly suggest that male and female participants, as well as supervisors and patrol officers all scored the YFO program statistically the same (See Table-2).

Table-2   Means Analysis-1

		$\overline{X}$	Sd	t	p
Impact Score	Female	12.44	2.242	-1.326	.193
	Male	13.59	2.312		
Delivery Score	Female	24.88	2.420	.277	.783
	Male	24.51	3.817		
Impact Score	Frontline	13.24	2.278	.145	.885
	Supervisor	13.13	2.445		
Delivery Score	Frontline	24.23	3.936	-1.209	.233
	Supervisor	25.33	2.160		

Table-3 shows that there was no statistically significant difference in impact score (t= .076, p= .940) between sworn and non-sworn employees. However, non-sworn employees scored the program delivery statistically higher that sworn employees (t= -3.103, p= .004). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in impact score (t= -.617, p= .541) between minority and non-minority participants. However, minority participants scored the program delivery statistically higher than non-minority participants (t= -2.862, p= .006) (See Table-3).

Table-3   Means Analysis-2

		$\overline{X}$	Sd	t	p
Impact Score	Sworn	13.216	2.393	.076	.940
	Non-Sworn	13.142	1.951		
Delivery Score	Sworn	24.26	3.651	-3.103	.004
	Non-Sworn	26.42	.975		
Impact Score	Non-Minority	13.06	2.337	-.617	.541
	Minority	13.53	2.295		
Delivery Score	Non-Minority	23.87	3.818	-2.862	.006
	Minority	26.21	1.672		

Section-4	Correlation Analysis

Due to the high impact and delivery scores, it was important to determine if these high scores could have been influenced by other factors outside of the program content and delivery. A correlation analysis (Pearson's Product Moment Correlation) was conducted to determine if the high impact scores could have been correlated to the age or time in service of the participants. Table-4 shows that neither impact score ($r = .200$, $p = .221$) nor delivery score ($r = .234$, $p = .152$) were statistically related to participant age. Similarly, neither impact score ($r = .146$, $p = .381$) nor delivery score ($r = .016$, $p = .925$) were statistically related to participant time in service.

The only correlation that was statistically significant was the relationship between participant age and time in service ($r = .745$, $p = .000$). This relationship showed that as age increased, so did time in service. This relationship was unremarkable and expected (See Table-4). Due to the lack of correlation with other factors, the data strongly suggest that the high Impact and Delivery scores must have occurred due to the program content and delivery methods alone not external factors such as age or time in grade.

Table-4   Person's Correlation

	Impact	Delivery	Age	Time
Impact	1	.179	.200	.146
Delivery		1	.234	.016
Age			1	.745*
Time				1

*P≥ .05, **P≥ .01

Section-4	Qualitative Analysis

This analysis contained two qualitative questions about the program. The qualitative responses are listed below. (NOTE: The qualitative comments have been printed as entered by participants. Any spelling, grammatical or colloquial error are present as recorded.)

Q1: How could we make the YFO police training better?

Valid

* Presentation was even-handed and honest * Challenges to viewpoints were accepted into conversations * Consider beginning the trainin

add a few more slides of police interactions

Be more specific when speaking about examples. KP sniff used and the example made it seem like KP issue

Bring in community w/police officers during training

Do the class at the same time with the community at the same time as law enforcement

Have in person conversations (someone who has dealt with either police brutality or treated unethically) come in & tell their stories.

Have your videos working

Having LEO's only in class will help people speak more freely

I don't know

I don't see any room for improvement

I enjoyed the class felt it was informative

I think everything was very well put together and explained thoroughly

I wouldn't, I think it's needed & timely

Include police relations with other marginalized community members such as the LGBT. Several gay and trans individual have negative in

Incorporate Hands-On scenarios/practicals

Information on specific cities whre training is.

It was great maybe bring in & involve community stakeholders

More facts about situatons

More videos of car area?

N/A

No, it's really great

Not having public in the same roon as officers. The reaction from non officers can shift emotions

Not making the training an us vs. them mentatlity

Nothing

Nothing to add

Open debate with community members. Let community members see officers outside the uniform and understand intent of officers. Let offi

Participant wrote several notes on back of survey. Notes:

Presentation can be shorter

Stop using derogaroty slang terms like PoPo add facts & statistics vs perceived reality use the facts & statistics perceptions

The training I feel spot on

The training is fine
Training was very satisfactory
Understanding the community where I work
video base situation

Q₂: Were there any parts of the session that you didn't like?

Valid	
	Amount of repetitive information
	Can't choose what race your officer responding is whether balck or white you should be able to hear what another is saying. Shouldn't take having to hear it from a Black person
	Liked it all
	Mental health portion
	N/A
	N0
	No
	No.I enjoyed the session
	None
	None
	none overall
	None, continue developing the programs, it's a good concept.

none, showed me, showed me how to look at both sides empathy & compassion

Note written to explain 't resonse to 8b: I don't think that community members nor Council members should have been allowed in the same class as officers. I don't feel that we

Pleasantly surprised much better than anticipated

see 19d

Some material was gone over multiple times in different wasys, and not needed

Very Informative

APPENDIX
Individual Question Analysis

Participating in the training helped me understand the YFO program in a different way.				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	6.3	6.3
	Agree	40	62.5	63.5
	Strongly Agree	19	29.7	30.2
	Total	63	98.4	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.6	
Total		64	100.0	

Participating in the helped me to better understand the YFO program				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	6.3	6.3
	Agree	39	60.9	61.9
	Strongly Agree	20	31.3	31.7
	Total	63	98.4	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.6	
Total		64	100.0	

Participating in the program helped me think about possible solutions to the police community relational problems.				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	7.8	8.2
	Agree	33	51.6	54.1
	Strongly Agree	23	35.9	37.7
	Total	61	95.3	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.7	
Total		64	100.0	

Participating in the training helped motivate me to do something about the police community relational problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Disagree	7	10.9	11.5	
	Agree	32	50.0	52.5	
	Strongly Agree	22	34.4	36.1	
	Total	61	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	4.7		
Total		64	100.0		

How informative was the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	1	1.6	1.6	
	Somewhat	25	39.1	39.7	
	Very	37	57.8	58.7	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
	Total	64	100.0		

How relevant was the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	2	3.1	3.2	
	Somewhat	21	32.8	33.3	
	Very	40	62.5	63.5	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How useful was the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	3	4.7	4.8	
	Somewhat	23	35.9	36.5	
	Very	37	57.8	58.7	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How comfortable were the physical surroundings of the session event?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	2	3.1	3.2	
	Somewhat	13	20.3	20.6	
	Very	48	75.0	76.2	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How accessible was the location of the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Somewhat	11	17.2	17.5	
	Very	52	81.3	82.5	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How convenient was the scheduling of the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	2	3.1	3.2	
	Somewhat	13	20.3	20.6	
	Very	48	75.0	76.2	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How knowledgeable was the presenter(s) at the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Not at All	1	1.6	1.6	
	Somewhat	17	26.6	27.0	
	Very	45	70.3	71.4	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How respectful was the presenter(s) at the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Somewhat	6	9.4	9.5	
	Very	57	89.1	90.5	
	Total	63	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.6		
Total		64	100.0		

How professional was the presenter(s) at the session?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Somewhat	7	10.9	11.3	
	Very	55	85.9	88.7	
	Total	62	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.1		
Total		64	100.0		