

Seton Hall University

## eRepository @ Seton Hall

---

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses  
(ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

---

Fall 9-22-2021

# Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement

Frank Sutter

frank.sutter@student.shu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sutter, Frank, "Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement" (2021). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2933.

<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2933>

Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement

Frank Sutter

Dissertation Committee:  
Rong Chen, Ph.D. Chair  
Robert Kelchen, Ph.D.  
Nicole DiCrecchio, Ed.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

in the Department of Educational Leadership, Management and Policy

Seton Hall University  
2021

©2021 Frank Sutter  
All Rights Reserved



---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT & POLICY

---

### APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

**Frank Sutter** has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the Ed.D. during this Fall Semester.

#### DISSERTATION COMMITTEE (please sign and date)

<u>Dr. Rong Chen</u>	09-22-2021
Mentor	Date
<u>Dr. Robert Kelchen</u>	09-22-2021
Committee Member	Date
<u>Dr. Nicole DiCrecchio</u>	09-22-2021
Committee Member	Date

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

## **Abstract**

Research has shown that police officers are exposed frequently to events throughout their careers that can negatively impact their mental health and are at a level that could reach five times greater than that of the general population for post-traumatic stress symptoms. To address law enforcement officers' mental health issues, Attorney General Gurbir S. Grewal issued Directive NO. 2019-1, titled Promoting Law Enforcement Resiliency. New Jersey is the first state in the United States to take action and mandate mental health training for all law enforcement officers. On August 6, 2019, the New Jersey Attorney General's Office revealed that they developed the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (NJRP-LE). This study was conducted to evaluate the Train the Trainer Model developed in the NJRP-LE. In addition, this study surveyed the Master Resiliency Program Officers to obtain their perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program. The survey conducted covered the program's components, the Resiliency Program Officers' characteristics, their qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material components. The survey revealed a positive correlation between being interested in the program and volunteering for the assignment of Resiliency Officer. There was also a strong positive correlation between volunteering and the option to remain in the NJRP-LE.

*Keywords:* Resiliency, Train the Trainer, Resiliency Program Officer, Police Officer, Mental Health, New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (NJRP-LE)

## **Acknowledgments**

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the East Brunswick Police Department for supporting me while I completed my doctoral degree and furthered my education, leadership, and managerial abilities. Next, I want to acknowledge the FBINAA and the United States Air Force. They worked together to develop training which was developed into the FBINAA Law Enforcement Resiliency Train the Trainer Program. Next, I would like to acknowledge and thank Robert Czepiel Jr., former State Chief Resiliency Program Officer; David S. Leonardis, State Chief Resiliency Program Officer; and Holly Lees for approving and assisting in my research. The personnel and agencies who were instrumental in developing the New Jersey Resiliency Program should also be acknowledged. I want to recognize the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office; the Maple Shade Police Department; and Cherie Castellano, Clinician and Director of COP2COP at Rutgers University Behavioral Healthcare Center, Director of National Center for Peer Support. I want to thank all the Resiliency Program Officers for participating in the survey and making this research possible. Lastly, I would like to thank all of my professors at Seton Hall University for their dedication to higher education.

## **Dedication**

My dissertation is, first and foremost, dedicated to my loving wife, Kaelyn, and two children, Layla and Logan. I will forever be grateful to them for supporting me in my quest for higher education. Secondly, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to the hard-working men and women of the East Brunswick Township Police Department. They have a sincere commitment to serving our culturally, racially, and religiously diverse community as a team of highly motivated professionals distinguished by unwavering ethical and moral values. Police Departments exist to serve the community by protecting life and property, preventing crime, enforcing the laws, maintaining order for all citizens, and providing needed services as requested. Police officers strive to do their best to improve citizens' quality of life, and I believe we owe it to all the officers to do the same for them. Lastly, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my brothers and sisters in blue and their families who are suffering in silence or who lost their life or the life of a loved one because they didn't get the help that they desperately needed in time.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background Statement .....	1
Problem Statement .....	6
Purpose Statement.....	7
Significance of the Study .....	7
Research Questions .....	8
Research Design.....	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	11
Culture of Law Enforcement .....	11
Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 (H. R. 2228) .....	14
Law Enforcement Mental Health Programs and Research .....	16
Employee Assistance Program .....	18
COP2COP .....	22
Employers and the Promotion of Mental Health .....	23
Train the Trainer Model.....	26
Description of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement .....	28
Summary .....	33
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	35
Data Source and Study Population .....	35
Study Questions .....	36
Category I: Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications .....	36
Category II: Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers .....	37
Category III: Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers .....	37
Category IV: Evaluation of Course Material .....	37
Category V: Evaluation of New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Modules.....	37
Data Collection .....	38
Data Analysis Procedure.....	43



Limitations of the Study.....	43
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS .....	44
What Are the Overall Master Resiliency Trainer Characteristics?.....	44
What Are the Master Resiliency Trainer Qualifications?.....	46
What Is the General Interest Level of the Master Resiliency Trainers in the Train the Trainer Program?.....	51
How Do the Program’s Master Resiliency Trainers Perceive the Quality of the Resiliency Program Components?.....	57
To What Extent Are the Master Resiliency Trainers Confident That They Can Instruct Other Officers Utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?.....	63
Frequency of Training.....	66
Chapter Summary .....	73
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
Recommendation Category I: New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Curriculum Components and Lessons.....	75
Recommendation #1: Re-Evaluate the Program Components and Develop a Strategy to Improve Them .....	75
Recommendation #2: Re-Evaluate the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Lessons to Simplify and Condense the Program .....	77
Recommendation Category II: Selection of Resiliency Program Officers .....	79
Recommendation #1: Develop a More Explicit Guideline for the Selection Process of Resiliency Program Officers .....	79
Recommendation #2: Consider Establishing Criteria for the Resiliency Program Officer Qualifications.....	81
Recommendation #3: Diversify the Master Resiliency Trainer Racial and Ethnic Groups .....	83
Recommendation Category III: Concerns Expressed by Resiliency Program Officers.....	84
Recommendation #1: Address the Confidentiality Concerns Expressed by the Master Resiliency Trainers .....	84
Recommendation #2: Seek to Obtain More Command Staff Buy-In .....	85
Summary of Recommendations .....	86
Future Research .....	87

References .....	88
Appendix A .....	98
Appendix B .....	100
Appendix C .....	102
Appendix D .....	104
Appendix E .....	106
Appendix F.....	109

## List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Trainer Survey Variables and Measurements .....	42
Table 2. Characteristics of Trainers Who Participated in the Train the Trainer Program for New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68)....	46
Table 3. Qualifications of Trainers Who Participated in the Train the Trainer Program for New Jersey for New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68) .....	50
Table 4. Trainer Interest Level in New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68) .....	54
Table 5. Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I Am Interested in Being a Part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program vs. I Volunteered for This Assignment .....	55
Table 6. Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I Am Interested in Being a Part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program vs. Given the Option, I Would Remain a Resiliency Program Officer .....	56
Table 7. Trainer Interested Level Cross Tabulation: I Volunteered for This Assignment vs. Given the Option, I Would Remain a Resiliency Program Officer .....	57
Table 8. Trainer Perceptions of Quality, Usefulness, and Likelihood of Using The New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Components (n = 68) .....	60
Table 9. Trainer Perceptions of Importance and the Likelihood of Implementing the Individual New Jersey Resiliency Program Lessons During Training (n = 68) .....	63
Table 10. Trainer Confidence Level in New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68) .....	66

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Background Statement**

Police officers can face mental challenges in processing what has occurred to them or what they have experienced. Police officers are exposed frequently to events throughout their careers that can negatively impact their mental health (Fox et al., 2012). An officer can develop some of the effects of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), or have suicidal thoughts (Brooks, 2018). H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017, is the first legislation to address these issues. This bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 28, 2017, by Susan Brooks (R-IN), Val Demings (D-FL), Doug Collins (R-GA), Bill Pascrell (D-NJ), and Dave Reichert (R-WA). During the introduction, Susan Brooks stated that police officers cope and deal with trauma regularly. H.R. 2228 was enacted after being signed by President Donald Trump on January 10, 2018. During the introduction of H.R. 2228, everyone agreed, and there was little debate in the senate that police officers face numerous challenges not addressed in today's society. There are not many other jobs in the world that require a person to be on guard or combat-ready while they are called upon to play different roles, such as a counselor, priest, or social worker (Kirschman, 2017).

According to the Center for Treatment of Anxiety & Mood Disorders (2021), trauma is a psychological or emotional response to an event or an experience that is deeply distressing or disturbing. The Center for Treatment of Anxiety and Mood Disorders explained that events are viewed subjectively, and everyone can process a traumatic event differently. Police officers can be involved in many perceived traumatic events such as a murder scene, sexual assault, drug overdose, severe or fatal motor vehicle crash, child abuse, or a combat situation. The bottom line

is that officers go through traumatic events, and studies have revealed that this is a stressful job. The stress officers encounter can manifest in many signs and behaviors. some of which are depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, sleep deprivation, alcohol and drug use, the inability to manage finances, work performance issues, marital issues, lack of communication, emotional numbing, isolation, anger, irritability, risk-taking, gambling, infidelity, and sexual dysfunction (Krugel, 2016).

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA, 2018) stated that there are three types of trauma: war and combat, violence and abuse, and disaster and terrorism. According to the VA, combat exposure occurs when there is a life-threatening combat situation where the individual is at risk of death or injury. In some cases, the individual could have had to injure or kill another person. This specific type of trauma can cause the individual to be on alert for long periods. Injury involving violence and abuse can include cases of sexual assault, child abuse, and domestic violence. The final category, disaster and terrorism, covers events involving sudden mass casualty or disasters that can lead to death, injury, or distress. In addition to the three types of trauma mentioned, The Center for Treatment of Anxiety and Mood Disorders (2021) asserted the existence of a different kind of trauma: complex trauma. This type of trauma results from repeated exposure to multiple traumatic events and harm caused to the individual.

When officers start to experience the signs and symptoms of stress, they are not always aware of why they are occurring. According to The Center for Treatment of Anxiety and Mood Disorders (2021), shock and denial are typical reactions after a traumatic event. According to the VA, some symptoms may be minor and temporary, while others are more serious and chronic. Acute trauma symptoms are the result of a single event and could start within days and last weeks. Chronic trauma symptoms are the result of repeated and prolonged events. They usually

begin approximately 3 to 6 months later and can last several years or a lifetime (VA, 2018).

Officers may not know how to cope with the traumatic event(s) that have led them to this point. According to the American Psychological Association (2017), exposure to traumatic events can result in stress disorders, which cause problems in productivity, social and family functioning, and overall well-being.

As stress disorder symptoms become more challenging to manage, circumstances worsen if the officer abuses a substance. Cumulative stress puts officers at an increased risk for problem drinking, which they hope could control anxiety or stress. One study conducted by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism found that 11% of male officers and 16% of female officers working in an urban environment reported alcohol use levels that put them at risk for alcoholism (Ballenger et al., 2010). Mitchell and Everly (2001) stated that people suffering from PTSD and other stress disorders had not developed healthy coping strategies necessary for processing the stress or trauma they experienced. Instead, the officers turn to alcohol or other drugs to deal with their stress-related symptoms. Cross and Ashley (2004) stated that the lack of availability for officer training related to coping strategies amplified alcohol consumption as a coping mechanism. Officers must learn healthy coping strategies to regularly minimize their stress instead of masking it with substance abuse.

Since the reality of officers' stressful jobs is well established, the question may be asked: "Why doesn't the officer just go get the help that they need?" Unfortunately, this question is difficult to answer. The culture in law enforcement when it comes to mental health is hugely complicated. Some of the complications come from the persona that police officers are supposed to maintain; they are expected to be authoritarian, tough, and highly resistant. According to Fox et al. (2012), more than half of the officers who need treatment do not seek it. Fox et al.

explained that interventions should improve officers' resiliency before a critical incident and provide support services to those officers following significant events. However, Fox et al. further stated that improving resiliency has proved difficult due to the lack of high-quality studies demonstrating efficacy. Fortunately, there is a growing movement that emphasizes destigmatizing the mental health challenges that officers face.

Training programs have been established in the United States to combat mental health issues among law enforcement officers. On August 6, 2019, the State of New Jersey Attorney General issued Directive No. 2019-1, which promotes law enforcement resiliency. The first program of its kind in the United States, it mandates that law enforcement officers in New Jersey receive specialized training on mental health and resiliency through the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (NJRP-LE). "Resiliency" is used throughout this directive. It refers to law enforcement officers' ability to overcome particular adversity, such as a traumatic event. Attorney General Gurbir S. Grewal acknowledged in his order the tremendous risks at which law enforcement put themselves daily. Attorney General Grewal recognized law enforcement officers regularly encounter some of the most traumatic events experienced by a person. Because of these constant traumatic exposures, officers will more often than not be hyper-vigilant both on and off duty. Over time, this can dramatically affect the officers' emotional and mental well-being, accumulating as time goes on. This compounding stress contributes to a variety of both physical and mental health issues. Attorney General Grewal stated that the New Jersey Government has a responsibility to make sure that all of New Jersey's law enforcement officers have the necessary tools and resources to successfully deal with the stressors from the uniqueness of law enforcement work.

The Attorney General's Office developed the NJRP-LE in response to the need for a resiliency program. According to Directive 2019-1, the program addresses a law enforcement officer's mental health and wellness needs. Numerous outfits in academia, the U.S. military, and federal and state law enforcement officials developed the NJRP-LE training program. The purpose of this training program is to change the current culture of law enforcement and provide a more open and positive outlook on mental health. The NJRP-LE offers specific tools and resources to help officers cope with and recover from stressors and traumatic events. After all, mental health safety is just as important as physical safety and benefits the officers and their family, friends, and the communities they serve. Other parts of this directive show the Division of Criminal Justice's (DCJ's) commitment to changing law enforcement culture. Confidentiality is authorized for all interactions between a law enforcement officer and the Resiliency Program Officer (RPO) as long as the RPO is acting in their official capacity. Privacy would not apply in certain circumstances, such as requirements by law or an agency's internal policies and guidelines. However, anonymity is imperative for a law enforcement officer to come forward and seek help.

The NJRP-LE training program utilized the Train the Trainer Model to have all law enforcement officers in New Jersey trained in this program. To achieve the training Attorney General Grewal mandated a structure which officers would follow. Attorney General Grewal first appointed a Chief Resiliency Officer, which could have been a detective or a deputy attorney general from the Criminal Justice Division. He announced that Robert Czepiel Jr. would be the first-ever Chief Resiliency Officer for New Jersey. Now that a Chief Resiliency Officer was selected, their role was to ensure that the NJRP-LE was implemented correctly and monitored for efficiency and ultimately increase law enforcement officers' resiliency in New



Jersey. Therefore, this directive's implementation plan was to have state RPO trainers, county RPO trainers, and municipal RPOs identified. Officers selected to participate in the NJRP-LE Train the Trainer program were chosen by the agency's chief law enforcement officer, director, county prosecutor, or the New Jersey State Police superintendent. These participants could be current and active members, retired law enforcement officers, or an active or retired assistant prosecutor or deputy attorney general.

The trainer model was designed so that state, county, and specific municipal officers train as Master Resiliency Trainers. In turn, these officers can train and certify other trainers. The Master Resiliency Trainers' responsibility is to teach the local municipalities that fall within their jurisdiction the trainer program's primary purpose. Every municipal police agency in New Jersey must appoint minimally one officer as their RPO. After every state, county, and municipal agency complies with this directive, New Jersey will have approximately 1,000 RPOs statewide. According to Directive 2019-1, a municipal RPO's responsibilities are to train all the agency members in the blocks of instruction supplied by the Criminal Justice Division.

### **Problem Statement**

Before Directive 2019-1, New Jersey had no mandate for an officer to partake in mental health and resiliency training. Since the NJRP-LE is new and the first of its kind, it was unknown whether the program will be successful. Components of NJRP-LE have yet to be analyzed in any other setting. Currently, the level of quality, usefulness, or likelihood of use of the course material—which includes sequence and flow of the content, PowerPoint lecture slides, instructor notes for those slides, breakout sessions and instructor guide, Train the Trainer workbook, and the mental health handbook—is unknown. The other area for concern was the selection process for the RPOs. Directive 2019-1 advised the officials making the selection determinations to

consider the following criteria: specific needs of the agency, RPO Qualifications, years of law enforcement experience, past and current work assignments, interest in the position, and any other relevant training. The selection criteria are vast and do not offer criteria for acceptance or denial. Some problems that can arise from this selection process are RPOs who have little to no interest in the program and officers who do not have the necessary skills or experience to teach others.

### **Purpose Statement**

This study aims to evaluate the Train the Trainer Model for the NJRP-LE. This study will first analyze the overall Master Resiliency Trainer Characteristics and interest level. These characteristics will include agency type, sex, ethnicity, and age group. Getting an analysis of the RPOs' qualifications is also essential. It will consist of years of law enforcement experience, past and current work assignments, interest in the position, and any other relevant training. One of the most critical factors which will determine the success of the NJRP-LE will be the overall interest level of the RPOs in the program. This study will present an overview of the officers' interest level. The purpose of this study is to receive feedback and collect data on the overall quality of the NJRP-LE components and course material. Lastly, this study will present an overview of the Master Resiliency Trainers' overall confidence level after NJRP-LE. Finally, it is essential to see if the officer can instruct other officers while utilizing the Train the Trainer model of the NJRP-LE.

### **Significance of the Study**

Law enforcement officers today are faced with job-related stressors that contribute to severe physical and mental health issues. Law enforcement officers' problems include shift work, long hours, unpredictable schedules, exposure to critical incidents, being the constant

focus of public attention and criticism, various physical demands, and high rates of on-the-job injuries (Violanti et al., 2012). According to Violanti et al. (2012), law enforcement officers had significant concerns with high blood pressure, insomnia, heart disease, diabetes, PTSD, obesity, depression, anxiety, cancer, substance abuse, relational distress, and suicide. Percentage rates over the years have remained high and, in some cases, double or triple that of the general population. Fox et al. (2012) further stated that improving resiliency has proven difficult due to the lack of high-quality studies demonstrating efficacy. The NJRP-LE is the first mandated training for law enforcement officers dealing with mental health and resiliency. This study is the first comprehensive study that evaluates efficacy Fox et al. referenced. This study is significant because it gives a descriptive analysis of the NJRP-LE. This study identified the current success of the program at the Master Resiliency Trainer level. More importantly, the results identify problem areas that need to be addressed to make the program as successful as it can be. The research focuses on Master Resiliency Trainers and lays the groundwork to compare to the municipal RPOs.

### **Research Questions**

1. What are the overall Master Resiliency Trainer characteristics?
2. What are the Master Resiliency Trainer qualifications?
3. What is the general interest level of the Master Resiliency Trainer in the Train the Trainer Program?
4. How do the program's Master Resiliency Trainers perceive the quality of the Resiliency Program components?
5. To what extent are the Master Resiliency Trainers confident that they can instruct other officers utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?

## **Research Design**

This study is a descriptive quantitative design using survey data. Chapter 2, Literature Review, gives an overview of the problem statement, that there was no mandate for an officer to partake in mental health and resiliency training. Chapter 2 examines the possible barriers to why law enforcement officers have higher mental health issues than the general public. It discusses law enforcement culture, what training an officer receives before implementing the NJRP-LE, and the need for a change. The literature review also compares programs available to law enforcement officers, such as the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), COP2COP, and the benefits of promoting these programs. Lastly, the NJRP-LE and the Train the Trainer Model utilized are described in detail.

Chapter 3, Methodology, explains how the collected data come from an electronic survey completed by the sample. This descriptive analysis is of a particular group of individuals that have completed the Master Resiliency Trainer Course. The survey data collected were analyzed and placed into a descriptive narrative, including means, frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and percentages to understand the answers to the research questions. The measurement levels used are nominal and ordinal. The survey that was administered has five categories and is comprised of 21 questions. The five categories are Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications, Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers, Evaluation of Course Material, Evaluation of NJRP-LE Modules, and the Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers. Chapter 4, Results, reports on the findings of the survey questions answered. The results are placed into nine tables. The results are translated into a descriptive analysis of the program to determine what portions need improvement. Chapter 5 reviews the descriptive analysis of the New Jersey Resiliency Program and identified the current success of

the program and the areas that needed improvement. Recommendations to improve the program were described and based on the positive correlation between being interested in the program and volunteering for the assignment of Resiliency Officer and the positive correlation between volunteering and the option to remain in the NJRP-LE.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Culture of Law Enforcement**

Creating and managing culture is crucial for leaders. According to Workman-Stark (2017), before a police leader can effectively influence and change police culture, they must first seek to understand it. Workman-Stark elaborated that culture is to a group as personality and character are to an individual. Schein (2010) added that personality and character guide behavior; similarly, culture guides group members' conduct. Culture has been significantly associated with psychological strain, employee retention, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Marchand et al., 2013). One of the positive elements found in police culture is that there is an overall sense of duty. According to Loftus (2010), being a police officer is not just a job but also a meaningful purpose. However, as many professions know and understand, there is a unique law enforcement culture, unlike in any other business.

The foregoing paragraph provided an essential and broad overview of what a culture is. Police culture has been evolving with the advancement of new technologies and programs. The police culture has many factors that are unique to law enforcement. Because of this culture and the concerns that have been mentioned in other sections, anonymity is imperative. According to Wilson (1968), police culture was first studied in the 1960s. This early research pointed to recruits who viewed violence as legitimate and were primarily concerned with "self-respect, proving masculinity, and not taking any crap." Other studies (Chan, 1997; Reiner, 2010; Kingshott et al., 2004) have described the police culture using such terms as "monolithic," "homogeneous," "authoritarian," "suspicious," "cynical," "pessimistic," "macho," "elitist," "distrustful," "socially isolated," and most essential yet unfortunate is "highly resistant to

change.” These attributes can be counterproductive when seeking help. A disproportionate number of police officers who need treatment do not seek it (Fox et al., 2012). This is a cultural phenomenon that needs to change for a solution to evolve.

Police culture is an occupational culture where recruits become socialized through socialization. To understand the culture, we need to turn to one of the thematic attitudes that has been documented in this profession, which is the “us vs. them” mentality where “them” are seen or observed as a society, criminals, or senior-ranking police officials (Wickersham, 2016). Police officers have beliefs that stem from working in a hostile work environment, but these beliefs are also reinforced through the socialization process (Crank, 1998). Police officers are trained to investigate; this practice is part of their job description and part of the nature of policing. This type of behavior can lead to solidarity and suspicion. On the one hand, a sense of solidarity can mean a brotherhood for police officers. On the other hand, the downside is that the police become isolated from society (Crank, 2004).

The socialization process takes place in several steps. Informal norms and values develop in two ways. First, they grow in either the recruitment stage of like-minded individuals or through on-the-job training (Crank & Caldero, 2010). Second, the recruits will learn about policing, paramilitary training, and law enforcement’s unique language during the police academy phase. Other norms are uniformity in appearance, attitude, behavior, and strict adherence to rules and procedures (Lindorff, 1999). The police academy experience strips recruits of their individual characteristics to prepare them to embrace the police organization (Albuquerque & Paes-Machado, 2004).

The role of individual characteristics and organizational culture shift in significance throughout an officer’s time on the police force. Carpenter and Raza (1987) researched variables

such as the demographic characteristics of applicants and interviewers to observe any effects of demographics on hiring decisions. They discovered no significant differences observed or identified between the characteristics of the police recruits and the general population's features. Interview outcomes were directly dependent on relevant variables, such as skill. However, interestingly enough, Crank (1998) discovered that once the rookie was exposed to the police occupation and culture, their attitudes and values significantly changed. This evidence suggests that the police culture, values, and beliefs are learned on the job (Lundman, 1980). The socialization process occurs in many professions, not just policing. According to Langton et al. (2016), there are three stages of socialization: pre-arrival, encounter, and metamorphosis. The pre-arrival step for a police officer would be arriving with their own set of values, attitudes, and police work expectations. The encounter stage occurs once a police officer is out of the police academy and arrives or "encounters" their police agency. At this point, they will determine if their preconceived notions of what they expected are accurate. Next is the metamorphosis stage, which will more than likely take the new officer's different perspectives, remove them, and replace them with the organization's (Lindorff, 1999).

Police work undoubtedly involves a physical as well as a psychological risk. The material risk fosters and reinforces a culture of masculinity. To uphold this masculine image, the officer is seen as being a dominant, brave, and reliable individual. In particular, male officers are expected to prove their masculinity to fit in (Ely & Meyerson, 2010). According to Sayles and Albritton (1999), when an officer displays any emotions other than anger, they could be viewed as weak, which would prevent an officer from speaking out about what they are experiencing. The reason for this could be that the officer fears ridicule from co-workers. In the police culture, rejection could mean isolation from co-workers. To avoid this, officers tend to overemphasize their



masculinity and repress their emotions so as not to appear vulnerable, weak, or feminine (Addis & Cohane, 2005). According to Spielman (2017), the Chicago Police Department was exploring the possibility of making the use of EAPs mandatory after significant events to combat the cultural stigma that prevents officers from utilizing them and obtaining the treatment that they require. This is a critical step in the right direction because it takes the stigma out of the situation and requires the officer to receive the help they need. The Chicago Police Department, similar to many others around the country, found that their officers feared getting help due to concerns about losing their jobs. Other officers reported that it would be viewed as a “sign of weakness” or that they would be “ostracized” if they were to obtain help, and their agency or co-workers discovered it. The one question not answered in the Chicago Police Department was defining a “significant” event.

The socialization process may produce both positive and negative outcomes for new police officers. If the more cynical officers influence the new officers, this can eliminate the positive influences learned through formal training (Ellwanger, 2012). The negative impact could also lead to officers displaying inappropriate and undesired behaviors. The police culture has had a negative persona, which indicates that officers abuse authority, discriminate, commit sexual harassment, and use excessive force (Brough et al., 2016). One aspect of the positive influences comes from senior officers or peer groups that support the positive values which contribute to learning the craft of policing (Paoline, 2001).

### **Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 (H.R. 2228)**

Blue H.E.L.P. (2021) National Suicide Statistics reports on law enforcement statistics specifically. According to Blue H.E.L.P., from 2016 to 2019, there have been approximately 840 verified officer suicides in the United States. The duty status and percentages for these deaths

included active duty (82%), retired (11%), medical leave (4%), and terminated (2%), administrative leave (1%), resigned (1%), and suspended (1%). The average age of officers was 42, with approximately 16 years on the job. According to the same statistics, 96% were male, and firearms accounted for an overwhelming suicide mean. Officers are issued a weapon in their duty performance, so this is understandable given that fact. The 2018 documented suicide rate for officers was 17 out of 100,000 people, while 13 out of 100,000 people in the general public committed suicide. Some of the reasons for suicide reported were psychological or physical pain, depression, anxiety, relationship problems, investigation, and alcohol or drug dependency.

The fact that law enforcement statistics for mental health have not improved has become a source of an intense debate in the nation. Recently, others have noticed the need for intervention, and legislation has been passed with H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017. This bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 28, 2017, by Susan Brooks (R-IN), Val Demings (D-FL), Doug Collins (R-GA), Bill Pascrell (D-NJ), and Dave Reichert (R-WA). In summary, H.R. 2228 is intended to help law enforcement officers appropriately deal with mental health.

According to the House Judiciary Committee Press Release of October 2017, the H.R.2228 bill gave direction to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of Defense (DOD), and the VA. The bill ordered them to develop resources that will enable local law enforcement to adequately address the obstacles officers face with mental health. Another section of H.R. 2228 requests specifically that the DOJ review, analyze, and determine the effectiveness of crisis hotlines and annual mental health checks. Under H.R. 2228, grants are available to fall under the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program. These grants were given to start plans for peer mentoring and pilot programs within the realm of state, local, or tribal law enforcement

agencies. Lastly, H.R. 2228 required the DOJ to engage in a coordinated effort with the Department of Health and Human Services. The concerted attempt aimed to develop resources for mental health providers specific to the law enforcement community.

These resources will help mental health providers get police officers closer to receiving the support and proper programs to keep them safe and cope with the daily trauma they see and experience. Police officers, as part of their jobs, put themselves in harm's way daily. The profession's demands can inevitably produce side effects that can be treated or prevented to some degree. Susan Brooks (R-IN) stated that through the enactment of the legislation, police officers would be closer to receiving the support they need and have access to mental health services that will help them. Another co-sponsor of the bill, Val Demings (D-FL), stated that police officers need these services to stay healthy and protect society. Another co-sponsor and fellow New Jersey resident, Bill Pascrell (D-NJ), said law enforcement officers put themselves in challenging, life-threatening situations daily. The bill's goal was to reduce the stress law enforcement officers encounter that affects their physical and mental well-being. This bill was vital in ensuring that officers' mental wellness is a priority throughout their career (Brooks, 2018).

### **Law Enforcement Mental Health Programs and Research**

In this section, I will cover several studies that illustrate law enforcement mental health statistics. First, I will discuss the law enforcement officer's mental health with relation to PTSD, depression, and alcohol abuse. Violanti et al. (2012) identified job-related stressors that can contribute to severe physical and mental health issues experienced by law enforcement officers. They included shift work, long hours, unpredictable schedules, exposure to critical incidents, being the constant focus of public attention and criticism, various physical demands, and high

rates of on-the-job injuries. Violanti et al. (2012) further explained his findings and stated that law enforcement officers had significant concerns with high blood pressure, insomnia, heart disease, diabetes, PTSD, obesity, depression, anxiety, cancer, substance abuse, relational distress, and suicide.

The next study that I will use as an example is *Mental-Health Conditions, Barriers to Care, and Productivity Loss among Officers in An Urban Police Department*. According to Fox et al. (2012), this study was conducted to determine, (a) the prevalence of PTSD, depression, and alcohol abuse; (b) patterns of and barriers to mental health services utilization; and (c) the impact these conditions have on productivity loss. The research studied 150 officers and discovered that among the officers were the following statistics: a high number suffered from PTSD (24%), depression (9%), and alcohol abuse (19%). According to a study cited by the National Alliance on Mental Illness (2021), 7% to 19% of police officers will experience post-traumatic stress symptoms—more than 3.5% of the general population. This astonishing statistic demonstrates that law enforcement officers could be five times more likely than the general population experience post-traumatic stress symptoms.

According to Fox et al. (2012), with respect to PTSD symptoms, 30% of officers reported having intrusive thoughts or nightmares, and 22% reported avoiding situations or places that reminded them of a traumatic event. When Fox et al. assessed alcohol abuse, they found that 14% of officers believed they should “cut down” on their drinking behavior, and 3.3% reported having an alcoholic beverage first thing in the morning to get rid of a hangover or steady their nerves. Of the three conditions assessed (PTSD, alcohol abuse, and depression), PTSD was the most common (23.8%), followed by alcohol abuse (18.7%) and depression (8.8%). Overall, 40.0% of respondents had at least one of the three mental health conditions.

Another study conducted by Violanti et al. (2006) found that in Buffalo, New York, PTSD symptoms were present in a majority of the law enforcement officers surveyed, and that many of them met the criteria for a screening diagnosis of depression. Violanti et al. (2008) also found that one in four law enforcement officers had suicidal ideation related to their degree of PTSD and depression. Finally, McCaslin et al. (2008) conducted a combined study involving three police departments: the New York City Police Department, one in San Francisco, and one elsewhere in California. The study revealed that depression (10.6%) and alcohol abuse (13.9%) were common among law enforcement officers.

### **Employee Assistance Program**

Currently, in New Jersey, there are no standardized procedures in place for dealing with an officer's mental health or wellness while they were on a traumatizing scene or once they left. During my search, the only program I found that was available to an officer who requested one was the EAP. An EAP is an employee benefit program that assists employees with personal problems and work-related problems that may impact their job performance, health, and mental and emotional well-being (The many benefits of an employee assistance program, 2020). In addition, EAPs generally offer free and confidential assessments, short-term counseling, referrals, and follow-up services for employees and their household members.

To better understand an officer's job and mental health and wellness aspects, we must know the signs and symptoms of a distressed officer. An officer who is exposed to a traumatic scene may not immediately show any signs. Signs may not appear for months or years after the incident (Grady, 2021). Some of the symptoms and behaviors that have been identified are depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, sleep deprivation, alcohol and drug use, financial unmanageability, work performance issues, marital issues, and lack of communication,

emotional numbing, isolation, anger, irritability, risk-taking, gambling, infidelity, and sexual dysfunction (Krugel, 2016, p. 30).

According to Handrick (2018), 93% of large employers and 77% of all employers offer EAPs. This translates into most, if not all, universities, colleges, and law enforcement agencies that have medical insurance providing an EAP to their employees. In brief, an EAP is a work-based intervention program designed to identify and assist employees in resolving personal problems (e.g., marital, financial, or emotional problems; family issues; and substance/alcohol abuse) that may adversely affect the employees' performance. In addition, the plan may include a wide array of other services, such as nurse advice, telephone access, essential legal assistance, referrals, adoption assistance, or assistance finding elder care services. EAP services are usually made available to the employee and the employee's spouse, children, and non-marital partner living in the same household (Employee Assistance Program, 2014).

The question for this section would be, "Why don't law enforcement officers use their agencies' EAP?" With the provided definition above, we now know what an EAP is. Still, before we get into studies and statistics, I would like to explore the advantages and disadvantages of an EAP. Theoretically, if the employee feels good and is not struggling with personal or professional issues, they should perform better. Next, Reddy (2018) explained that an employee who is satisfied and has a reduced stress level will be a focused and dedicated employee. Albrecht (2014) added that employees need to be continually educated about their EAP. He explained that it is confidential and that there is no need for an employee to ask permission, tell anyone, or go through human resources to access the service.

Other resources corroborated these advantages and added some further insight. For example, Cantwell (2019) stated that the benefits of an EAP are that they will lead to increased

productivity, are affordable for employers to implement, help the agencies save money, encourage a positive work environment, and lead to increased employee retention. According to Cantwell (2019), when an EAP is implemented and offered, not only does productivity increase, but sick time usage can decrease by 33%, lost time reduces by 40%, and work-related accidents decrease by up to 65%. These were just some of the advantages that were mentioned in numerous articles. Now we will focus on some of the disadvantages of EAPs.

According to Redman (2018), the first disadvantage cited is that EAPs are limited. Some EAPs have limited resources and can stop at any time. Although having an EAP is better than having nothing at all, EAPs can be redundant, and the employee's service may not be specific to them. According to Redman, one of the disadvantages is that law enforcement officers do not know enough about EAPs. Therefore, fear and stigma prevent officers from seeking help. Redman developed a list of eight myths that keep law enforcement officers seeking support through counseling. These significant myths are:

1. Departments/agencies have the right to obtain information about officers that seek help from licensed mental health professionals.
2. Rights to privacy change if you use your insurance or EAP.
3. There is no reason to see a licensed professional because the rules are precisely the same as a peer support team.
4. The department or agency automatically has a right to know if an officer receives a mental health diagnosis or takes medication.
5. If an officer seeks help from a hospital or a rehabilitation facility voluntarily, the department automatically has the right to this information.

6. If an officer is placed on an involuntary medical hold, he or she automatically loses their right to carry and possess a firearm.
7. If an officer seeks a licensed mental health professional's support, that automatically means that the officer is not fit for duty.
8. Counseling is the same as a fit-for-duty evaluation.

The study by Fox et al. (2012) gave great insight into mental health statistics for law enforcement officers and officers seeking mental health services. Fox et al. reported that only 46.7% of law enforcement officers had ever sought mental-health services; the most commonly cited barriers to accessing services were concerns regarding confidentiality and the potential negative career impact. According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness (2021), this percentage is in alliance with the general population, stating that only half of all Americans experiencing an episode of major depression receive treatment. While researching the intricacies of mental health services and how often they are utilized, I realized that the officers held common concerns. Interestingly enough, according to Fox et al., of the 46.7%, a large portion of that percentage (35.7%) sought help from a source outside their own EAP. Additionally, the results of the study identified that officers who screened positive for PTSD (45%) and alcohol abuse (40%) primarily used a non-EAP program.

According to Fox et al. (2012), those officers who admitted and reported depression were more likely to use an EAP through their employer. The concerns that officers had about their EAP were the confidentiality of the services (35%), potential negative impact on their career (16.7%), and the stigma that is associated with utilizing the EAP services (13.3%). It was not surprising that among the law enforcement officers who did not have PTSD, depression, or alcohol abuse, the preferred care method was using their agency's EAP (75%). A



disproportionate number of police officers who need treatment do not seek it or use a non-EAP source. Using a non-EAP source is negative because it demonstrates that the officers fear their employers finding out that they sought treatment. This prevents officers from coming forward and asking for help. This is a cultural phenomenon that drastically affects officers. Fortunately, a growing movement is emphasizing destigmatizing the mental health challenges that officers face. According to Donnelly et al. (2015), EAPs are essential to increasing a law enforcement officer's knowledge and understanding of how vital the officer's mental health is. They further stated that police agencies should consider a more comprehensive approach to mental health and wellness to ensure the law enforcement officers get the help they need.

### **COP2COP**

COP2COP is an alternative to an EAP and is free and confidential. In 2000, Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care (UBHC) was contracted by the Department of Personnel to provide crisis intervention services to the law enforcement community. From this collaboration, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences developed the COP2COP program. COP2COP was the first program in the nation because it focused specifically on suicide prevention and mental health support for law enforcement officers. COP2COP is a professionally managed telephone helpline available to all New Jersey law enforcement officers and their families. The toll-free number can be called 24 hours a day to help officers or their families deal with personal or job-related stress and behavioral healthcare issues. According to the COP2COP, when officers call, they will speak to someone trained to handle law enforcement's unique problems. They also have a retired law enforcement officer who is now a clinical professional. In addition, COP2COP utilizes the Question, Persuade, and Refer to assistance (QPR) Model when they believe an officer is in distress.

COP2COP's primary features are peer support, clinical assessments, and critical incident stress management services. The peer support feature allows the officer to speak with a retired law enforcement officer who is better equipped to understand what the officer may be going through. The former officers or volunteers are professional counselors. Suppose it is decided that an additional referral or follow-up is needed. In that case, they are the ones that will assist the officers or their families and provide them with a police clinical network provider. The last prominent feature of this program is critical incident stress management. When officers are involved in a police-related shooting or another significant event, COP2COP provides a debriefing service. This service and assessment are for officers who are engaged in critical and traumatic incidents. COP2COP has been one of the most successful law enforcement programs in New Jersey. They have averted over 300 suicides since the program's inception.

### **Employers and the Promotion of Mental Health**

This section will cover the topic of employers and the mental health of their employees. Given that we spend 60% of our waking time at work (World Health Organization [WHO], n.d.), law enforcement agencies need to become more active in promoting mental health. This is easier said than done due to various factors, such as available resources and police culture. According to a survey conducted by the American Psychological Association in 2016, under 50% of working adults in the United States felt that their companies supported their employees' well-being. However, an agency can take positive steps to promote mental health and understand its dynamics within the law enforcement community. According to Hougan (2018), agencies should implement initiatives that enhance communication, training resources, and treatment. Hougan further stated that by using specific resources, the agencies can promote awareness and provide management with the training they need to identify issues and efficiently handle them. The last

suggestion that Hougan gave is that employees should be provided with self-help tools and programs. The theory behind this is that technology is playing an intricate role in training today. It would give employees access to help before a face-to-face therapy session or even medication.

According to the WHO, 1 in 5 adults in the United States experience mental illness in any given year, but only 41% receive treatment. Hougan (2018) stated that promoting mental health initiatives in an organization will reduce stigma and create a positive workplace. More specifically, the effort should be early intervention and prevention. To address this, the Attorney General's Office issued Directive 2018-3, which makes it mandatory that every police agency in New Jersey have an early warning system in place. Many different measures can be taken of employees' performance, whether these measurements take into account actions or behaviors. These measures can be regularly examined for patterns that may indicate potential problems. These performance measures include, but are not limited to the following documented indicators: internal complaints, whether initiated by another employee or by a member of the public and regardless of outcome; civil actions filed against an officer, regardless of outcome; criminal investigations or complaints made against an employee; any use of force by an officer that is formally determined or adjudicated to have been excessive, unjustified or unreasonable; domestic violence investigations in which the employee is an alleged subject; an arrest of an employee, including a driving under the influence charge; sexual harassment claims against an employee; vehicular collisions involving an officer that are formally determined to have been the fault of the officer; a positive drug test of an officer; cases or arrests by the officer that are rejected or dismissed by a court; cases in which evidence obtained by an officer is suppressed by a court; insubordination by the officer; neglect of duty by the officer; vehicular pursuits; unexcused absences or sick time abuse; and any other indicators that the particular agency deems

necessary. This was a positive step to identify when a problem is developing with a specific officer, and it gives the agency involved an opportunity to resolve flagged issues with officers.

According to Hougan (2018), when employees are more physically and mentally fit, they tend to be healthier, and therefore their productivity increases. In addition, improving an employee's mental health can improve their thinking, decision-making, and relationships at work. The previous paragraphs have explained what can be done to help employees, but another question that has to be asked is, "How does the organization benefit?" According to Hougan, by promoting mental health, the organization will reduce its cost and risk. The way this occurs is by reducing absenteeism and presentism. In addition, employers are learning that by having a healthier workforce, they will have lower medical costs (Welter, 2017). According to the WHO, mental illness costs the U.S. economy approximately \$193.2 billion in lost earnings each year. According to the WHO, another incentive for employers is that every \$1 invested in increasing treatment availability of care can lead to a return of \$4 in better health, productivity, and ability to work (Kessler et al., 2008).

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2021), suicide is the 10th leading cause of death in the United States for all ages and takes the lives of over 44,965 Americans every year. They reported that approximately 123 Americans die by suicide every day, and there is one death by suicide every 12 minutes. There is one suicide for every estimated 25 suicide attempts. According to the CDC, depression affects 20–25% of Americans ages 18 or older in a given year. Only half of all Americans experiencing an episode of major depression receive treatment (Mental health by the numbers, 2021). However, the American Psychiatric Association stated that depression is among the most treatable of all mental disorders. Between

80% and 90% percent of people with depression eventually respond well to treatment and gain relief from their symptoms (What is depression?, n.d.).

Depression and anxiety are the two most common mental disorders that affect an employee's work and productivity (WHO, n.d.). The CDC has reported that depression alone is estimated to result in over 200 million lost workdays every year. Building on this statistic, the WHO (n.d.) estimated that if mental health treatment were not increased, the world would lose approximately 12 billion workdays to depression and anxiety disorders by 2030. By creating a healthier workforce, an organization will accomplish several goals. First, they will boost morale and contribute to a positive culture, something I believe the law enforcement community could improve (Welter, 2017). Second, once a positive culture is established in an organization, the employer will attract and retain quality employees. Statistically, happy employees are 12% more productive than unhappy employees (WHO, n.d.). The last point that I would like to make about implementing initiatives is that they have to be supported and shared from the top of the hierarchy down; otherwise, the employees will not feel supported by managers (Wright, 2018).

### **Train the Trainer Model**

Abraham Maslow was a psychologist who analyzed the learning process (Gleeson, 2019). According to Gleeson (2019), Maslow's (1943) research determined that how well students learned depended on satisfaction of both the teachers and students in the learning process. He stated that when students and teachers enjoyed the process and felt fulfilled, students learned faster and retained the information better. The train the trainer Model has reflected this theory as well. According to Gleeson, a train the trainer model is a training strategy widely used in many fields of employment. The trainer will be a subject-matter expert. They will train others in the particular program while simultaneously teaching them how to train others in the same program.

Gleeson added that the trainer method's training has advantages over other training models because trainees will typically learn faster and retain the information better than in other teaching models; this phenomenon bears out principles in Maslow's research.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2019) stated that a train the trainer model is meant to engage master trainers in coaching new trainers who are less experienced with a particular topic, skill, or overall training. A train the trainer workshop can build competent instructors who can then teach the material to other people. Unlike in other programs with just one instructor who teaches a course for an extended period, multiple trainers teach the same class simultaneously. A new student will typically get to watch an experienced trainer teach, complete the exercises, and then practice teaching segments to other participants. According to the CDC (2019), the model's primary goal is to prepare instructors to present information effectively, respond to participant questions, and lead activities that reinforce learning. Other plans include ensuring that trainers can direct participants to supplementary resources and reference materials, lead discussions, listen effectively, make accurate observations, and help students relate the training to their current job. Trainer participants also learn the importance of creating and maintaining eye contact, portraying a positive attitude, speaking clearly, gesturing correctly, and keeping students interested.

According to Gleeson (2019), the model's advantage is that participants learn a subject and simultaneously learn how to teach it to others. This can provide them with feelings of satisfaction and fulfillment, more so than in other teaching models. The train the trainer model has reportedly been instrumental in the corporate environment (Gleeson, 2019). Corporate programs are developed to be concise and last anywhere from 1 day to 2 weeks. The advantage of this model is that personnel are not away from work for long periods. This model is also well-

suited for disseminating information quickly. According to Gleeson, other models have successfully taught leadership skills to employees preparing to enter management roles.

Contrary to advantages, there are limitations to the train the trainer model as well. The California Endowment conducted an analysis and found that a train the trainer model was used to teach organizing and other skills to community activists. Their research revealed that the participant levels of satisfaction were high. However, they were higher for trainer respondents than for those taking the courses. According to Gleeson (2019), another criticism of the model is that it can be a top-down teaching method. It is challenging to teach a subject and simultaneously teach others to teach the same topic. This dynamic can leave a limited amount of classroom time for trainees to gather and organize the subject material themselves. Several courses that use the model include interactive activities but are also structured as lectures.

### **Description of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement**

The Resiliency Directive was initially started with the efforts of representatives from the DCJ, Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, Ocean County Prosecutor's Office, New Jersey State Police, Acadia Healthcare, New Jersey Chaplains Association, Atlantic County Sheriff's Department, Maple Shade Police Department, and New Jersey Division of Mental Health and Addiction Services. Due to the rise in reported police suicides nationwide, Attorney General Grewal issued law enforcement Directive 2019-1. This directive promoted law enforcement resiliency and implemented the NJRP-LE. The NJRP-LE was a first-in-the-nation statewide program that would train officers in resiliency, helping them to become better equipped to handle police work's daily stress that, according to the directive, if left unchecked, may lead to physical ailments, depression, and burnout. Designating an RPO has never been done before. New Jersey

will be the first state to require that all law enforcement agencies select one. They will be specifically trained in and ultimately train their departments in resiliency.

On August 6, 2019, the State of New Jersey Attorney General issued Directive No. 2019-1, which promotes law enforcement resiliency. The term *resiliency* is used throughout this directive and is referred to as a law enforcement officer's ability to overcome inevitable adversity, such as a traumatic event. Attorney General Grewal acknowledged the critical risk factor that law enforcement put themselves in daily in his directive. According to Attorney General Grewal, it is recognized that law enforcement officers regularly encounter some of the most traumatic events that a person can experience. Because of these constant traumatic exposures, officers will more often than not be hyper-vigilant both on and off duty. Over time, this can dramatically affect the officers' emotional and mental well-being, accumulating as time goes on. This compounding stress has been attributed to a variety of both physical and mental health issues. Attorney General Grewal also stated that the New Jersey Government has a responsibility to make sure that all of New Jersey's law enforcement officers have the necessary tools and resources that they require to successfully deal with the stressors from the uniqueness of law enforcement work.

The Attorney General's Office developed the NJRP-LE in response to a resiliency program's need. According to Directive 2019-1, this program addresses a law enforcement officer's mental health and wellness needs. The purpose of this training program is to change the current culture of law enforcement and provide a more open and positive outlook on mental health. In addition, the NJRP-LE offers specific tools and resources to help officers cope with and recover from stressors and traumatic events. After all, mental health safety is just as



important as physical safety and benefits the officers and their family, friends, and the communities they serve.

First and foremost, confidentiality is authorized for all interactions between a law enforcement officer and the RPO as long as the RPO is acting in their official capacity. Confidentiality would not apply in certain circumstances, such as with respect to requirements of by-laws or an agency's internal policies and guidelines. However, anonymity is imperative for a law enforcement officer to come forward and seek help. The NJRP-LE training program utilizes the Train the Trainer Model to accomplish the task of having all law enforcement officers in New Jersey trained in this program. Attorney General Grewal mandated a structure that is to be followed to achieve the training. Attorney General Grewal first appointed a Chief Resiliency Officer, who is a detective or a deputy attorney general from the Criminal Justice Division. Next, he announced that Robert Czepiel Jr. would be the first-ever Chief Resiliency Officer for New Jersey. Czepiel is a well-known and renowned instructor in the State of New Jersey.

Czepiel was responsible for the training and implementation of curriculums in the State of New Jersey. His responsibilities have included supervising and updating training for law enforcement officers and prosecutors in New Jersey. He has created curriculums for numerous courses offered by the DCJ and the Police Training Commission, which train new police officers. Czepiel has lectured extensively and taught police and prosecutors on approximately 20 different criminal justice topics. This is not the first time Czepiel has been responsible for conducting a large-scale training operation. In 2016, Czepiel was accountable for supervising the curriculum creation that became required for all police officers through the CLEAR Institute and addressed important topics such as dealing with an emotionally disturbed person.

The role of the Chief Resiliency Officer is to ensure that the NJRP-LE is implemented correctly and monitored for efficiency and ultimately increase our law enforcement officers' resiliency in New Jersey. Therefore, this directive's implementation plan was to have state RPO trainers, county RPO trainers, and municipal resiliency police officers identified. The state RPO Trainers will have representatives from all the state agencies in New Jersey. These officers are selected to participate in the NJRP-LE Train the Trainer program by the agency's chief law enforcement officer, director, or the superintendent of the New Jersey State Police. These participants can be current and active members, retired law enforcement officers, or active or retired assistant prosecutors or deputy attorneys general. Thirteen state agencies and seven bi-state police agencies (which share a border with a neighboring state) operate in New Jersey.

Similarly, the county RPO trainers are selected by the county prosecutor. They can be current and active members, retired law enforcement officers, or active or former assistant prosecutors. The county law enforcement officers comprised the 21 county prosecutors' offices, 24 county sherriffs' offices and county police agencies, and the 21 county correctional agencies. There are 18 other agencies for both state universities and county colleges throughout New Jersey in addition to these agencies. Each state agency and county prosecutor's office must produce a minimum of five officers who will be RPO trainers. The state and county RPO trainers' responsibility is to train the local municipalities within their jurisdiction, hence the Train the Trainer program.

Every municipal police agency in New Jersey will be required to appoint at a minimum one officer as their RPO. After every state, county, and municipal agency complies with this directive, it will give at a minimum approximately 1,000 RPOs statewide. According to Directive 2019-1, an RPO's responsibilities are to train all the agency members in the blocks of instruction

supplied by the Criminal Justice Division. This program is unique because the RPOs will also make themselves available to any New Jersey officer who requests them. The RPO assignment mandates that they answer questions and connect the officer with the contact information for a particular support service. Several programs currently exist for law enforcement in New Jersey, such as COP2COP, Police Chaplains Program, and EAPs. One of the NJRP-LE Program goals is not to take the place of any one of these programs but to bring them all together to work in conjunction with one another to better support the officer.

The implementation time frame of RPOs according to Directive 2019-1, is clearly defined. Within 60 days of this directive issued on August 6, 2019, a Chief Resiliency Officer and all RPOs were appointed. How the RPOs are selected is subjective and falls on the appointing official of that particular agency. The directive states that this decision is crucial because of the task bestowed upon the RPOs and will inevitably determine the NJRP-LE program's success. Directive 2019-1 advises the officials making the selection determinations to consider the following criteria: specific needs of the agency, RPO qualifications, years of law enforcement experience, past and current work assignments, interest in the position, and any other relevant training. The method used by the DCJ to obtain the names and contact information of RPOs was similar to a chain of command.

The local municipalities forward the RPO information to their respective county prosecutor's office. They would then forward their data and that of the municipalities in their county to the DCJ Prosecutors Supervision and Training Bureau. Similarly, the state agencies would do the same except for the New Jersey State Police, who would forward the information to their Office of Law Enforcement Professional Standards, delivering it to the DCJ. The DCJ is responsible for maintaining and distributing a list of all RPOs and their contact information,

which are to be stored on a non-public server. This allows an officer to identify and contact their RPO or any RPO in the State of New Jersey.

The next phase of NJRP-LE would be the implementation of the training program itself. On October 10–11, 2019, The New Jersey Office of the Attorney General, DCJ, held its first resiliency training symposium. The resiliency symposium was held at the War Memorial in Trenton, New Jersey, and required all RPOs, county RPO trainers, and State RPO Trainers to attend. The symposium provided the RPOs with an overview of Directive 2019-1 and the NJRP-LE. Now that the RPOs had been appointed and attended the symposium, the next step was for the DCJ to create a 2-day Train the Trainer Program. The 2-day program was held on March 10–11, 2020. The goal was to have all state and county RPO Trainers take this course before December 31, 2020, which was accomplished. Once this was completed, the county RPOs were tasked to train all municipal RPOs in their respective county. Once the local municipal RPOs are trained, they teach the personnel within their respective agencies. According to this Directive, all law enforcement in New Jersey must be trained on NJRP-LE by December 31, 2022.

### **Summary**

In Chapter 2, I discussed how law enforcement mental health has come to the forefront of legislation and has become the subject of nationwide debate, starting with the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017. First, I covered literature and statistics that explained the origins of why this research is so important. Next, the culture of law enforcement was examined and detailed. Following this, I gave a detailed overview of some of the mental health-related problems law enforcement officers have historically faced and why. Next, I explained the current mental health programs available to officers, such as EAPs and COP2COP. Also

discussed were the benefits to both the employee and the employer of promoting mental health. Lastly, I addressed the Train the Trainer model utilized by the NJRP-LE.

The NJRP-LE is a first-in-the-nation statewide program that would train officers in resiliency to become better equipped to handle police work's daily stress, causing physical ailments, depression, and burnout. Because New Jersey is the first state in the country to require that all state, county, and municipal law enforcement officers go through resiliency training, it is crucial to assess the quality and effectiveness of the program. The results from the study will be helpful for the further development of such programs nationwide. In addition, the approach used in this study can be beneficial for future research evaluating similar programs in the field.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The methodology chapter will cover how I gathered, processed, and analyzed my research data. Covered in this chapter is the source of my data as well as the study population. Study questions are examined and broken down into their respective categories, which are explained in detail. Data collection and analysis are also discussed and demonstrated. Lastly, the limitations of this study are covered. My research questions are:

1. What are the overall Master Resiliency Trainer characteristics?
2. What are the Master Resiliency Trainer qualifications?
3. What is the general interest level of the Master Resiliency Trainer in the Train the Trainer Program?
4. How do the program's Master Resiliency Trainers perceive the quality of the Resiliency Program components?
5. To what extent are the Master Resiliency Trainers confident that they can instruct other officers utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?

#### **Data Source and Study Population**

This study design used a survey research methodology. A survey was designed and administered to all Resiliency Trainers who attended the Train the Trainer Conference hosted by the New Jersey Attorney General's Office on March 10–11, 2020. These Master Resiliency Trainers were explicitly trained to train other RPOs to conduct "Resiliency" training for all officers at their agencies. The Resiliency Trainers are comprised of New Jersey state, county, and municipal officers, and individual civilians. In addition, the survey was sent to the 148

Master Resiliency Trainers who are currently active within New Jersey. Of the 148 Master Resiliency Trainers, 68 responses were received, equating to a 45.94% response rate.

### **Study Questions**

The survey that was administered has five categories and is comprised of 21 questions. The five categories are Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications, Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers, Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers, Evaluation of Course Material, and Evaluation of NJRP-LE Modules. Of the 21 questions, 7 are Matrix Table questions, which have a Likert scale as an answer choice to rate the Resiliency Trainers' opinion. Therefore, when taking into consideration the sub-questions, the survey has a total of 71 questions. The survey was distributed to the Resiliency Trainers through Qualtrics via email and only by invitation. Preliminary testing revealed that the survey would take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Responses to the survey questions provided information about the following categories.

#### **Category I: Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications**

1. What are the Resiliency Trainers' characteristics, including sex, race/ethnicity, type of agency, and current age?
2. What are the Resiliency Trainers' qualifications, including the number of years in their profession or law enforcement?
3. What is the Resiliency Trainer's educational level?
4. To what extent have the Resiliency Trainers been to a Method of Instruction Course or have teaching/coaching experience?
5. How many instructor certifications and work assignments have the Resiliency Trainers had?

## **Category II: Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers**

6. To what extent are the Resiliency Trainers interested in participating in the Resiliency Program?

## **Category III: Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers**

7. What is the overall confidence level of Resiliency Trainers?
8. How comfortable are they speaking in front of their peers?
9. How satisfied are they with the skills they learned, and have their expectations of the training been met?

## **Category IV: Evaluation of Course Material**

10. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived quality of the Resiliency Program components, including the sequence and flow, PowerPoint lecture slides, instructor notes, breakout sessions, Train the Trainer workbook, and the mental health workbook?
11. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived usefulness of the Resiliency Program components?
12. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived likelihood of use of the Resiliency Program components?

## **Category V: Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement**

### **Modules**

13. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived importance level for each of the 12 lessons?
14. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived likelihood of implementation for each of the 12 lessons?
15. What is the Resiliency Trainers' perceived time frame of how often these lessons should be given to New Jersey law enforcement officers?



16. Please tell me what can be done to improve the program, what would you do differently?

### **Data Collection**

The data were collected through a quantitative, electronically scored survey sent to all 148 Resiliency Trainers who attended the March 10–11, 2020, training. The New Jersey Attorney General’s Office records the Master Resiliency Trainers’ email addresses has provided me with the list. The survey link was sent to the specific email addresses that were received. The survey was developed to facilitate subsequent acceptance of the data and use it for future analysis of other trainers in this program. The data provide a descriptive analysis that can guide the Attorney General’s Office to make necessary adjustments to deliver the most efficient and effective curriculum possible. Moreover, this program’s documentation can be used to repeat procedures and compare the Master Resiliency Trainers’ and RPOs’ data in the future. The completed survey for the NJRP-LE is in the appendix.

Section I of the survey asked Master Resiliency Trainers about characteristic data and qualifications. This included their sex, race/ethnicity, type of agency, and current age. This section utilized the statistical techniques of frequency distribution and percentages. It was essential to get an overview of the characteristics of the Master Resiliency Trainers and examine them. This section tells us the gender makeup of the current Master Resiliency Trainers and their ethnicity: White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, or Other. Also covered in this section was the type of agency where the Master Resiliency Trainer is employed. These options were state, county, or municipal government. Lastly, this section gathered the current age groups. The choices were broken down into six options: 18–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, and 65 or older.

This section also asked the Master Resiliency Trainers about their qualifications. The qualifications guideline in selecting a trainer was outlined in the Attorney General's Directive No. 2019-1. The directive gave guidance in making selections. First, it advised the appointing official to consider the specific needs and circumstances of the agency. The appointing officials were not surveyed, so considering the agency's specific needs and circumstances was not possible for this study. Second, the directive advised that the appointing official consider the candidates' qualifications, including years of law enforcement experience, past and current work assignments, interest in the position, and relevant training.

This section of the survey also asked trainers to select the number of years in law enforcement. The choices were broken down into six options of years: 0–5, 6–10, 11–15, 16–20, 21–25, and 26 or more. Next, trainers were asked to select their level of education. Because of the different levels of law enforcement, there is a wide range of criteria for education. The trainers had the options: high school graduate or equivalent, some college, 2-year degree, 4-year degree, professional degree, and doctorate. The next series of questions asked about relevant training, including teaching, coaching, and instructor certifications. The number of work assignments was the last question in this section, but it needed clarification. I interpreted the work assignment's guidance for this study and characterized it as working in a different division, rank, or position within their agency. Having an overview of these characteristics will allow future trainers' selection process to be more narrowly focused.

Section II of the survey addressed the interest level of the Master Resiliency Trainers in the program. The questions utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's interest in the program. The Likert scale for these questions included the range: strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree.

The survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they would agree with a statement. The statements were designed to elicit the trainer's genuine interest in the program. The series of questions asked about this issue aims to discover whether they volunteered, and whether they would stay in the program given the option.

Section III of the survey addressed the confidence level of the Master Resiliency Trainers in the program. The series of questions utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's confidence in their participation as Master Resiliency Trainers in the program. The Likert scale for these questions included the range: strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree. First, the survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they would agree with a statement. Next, the participants were asked a series of questions on whether they believed they received the appropriate information and skills during this training to teach others. The last portion of this section inquired whether their training expectations were met and whether they feel their skills have improved after completing the training.

Section IV related to the quality of the NJRP-LE. First, trainers were asked to rate the overall quality of the NJRP-LE. The trainers rated the different components separately to provide an overview of their perception of the program's total quality. The components were identified as the sequence and flow, PowerPoint lecture slides, instructor notes, breakout sessions, Train the Trainer workbook, and the mental health workbook. These questions utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's overall perception of the components' quality. The Likert scale for these questions ranged from; excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. Next, the trainers will be surveyed on the overall usefulness of the components. These questions will utilize a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's overall perception

of the usefulness of the components. The Likert scale for these questions included the range: extremely useful, very useful, moderately useful, slightly useful, and not at all useful. Lastly, the trainers were asked to rate each component's overall likelihood of use for this section. These questions utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's overall perception of the components' likelihood of use. The Likert scale for these questions included the range: extremely likely, very likely, moderately likely, a little likely, and not at all likely.

Section V sought to gather the perceived level of importance and likelihood of implementation for each of the trainers' lessons now that the trainers are responsible for teaching others. There are 12 lessons in the NJRP-LE curriculum, which include Resiliency Overview; Counting Blessings; Accomplishing Goals; ABC Model; Check Your Playbook; Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking; Capitalizing on Strengths; Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning-Making; Spiritual Resilience; Physical Resilience; Interpersonal Problem Solving and Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR). Questions asked about the level of importance utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's overall perception of the level of importance of each of the lessons.

The Likert scale was used for these questions included the range: extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, and not at all important. Similarly, the questions that asked about the likelihood of implementation utilized a Matrix Table and a five-point Likert scale to assess the trainer's overall perception of the likelihood of implementation for each of the lessons. Again, the Likert scale was used for these questions and included the range: definitely not, probably not, not sure, probably, and definitely yes. After the trainers rated the level of importance and likelihood of implementation for each of the lessons, they were asked to decide how often they think the training modules should be taught to New Jersey law

enforcement officers. They chose from the options: never, one time only, semiannual, annual, biennial, triennial, and four years or longer. This question is important because this is a new program, and there is no set time frame for how often officers are trained on resiliency, if officers are to be retrained at all following the initial training.

Table 1 gives a summary of trainer survey variables and my methods of measurements.

**Table 1**

***Summary of Trainer Survey Variables and Measurements***

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Measurement Level</b>	<b>Metric</b>
Sex	Nominal	Category Frequency
Race/ethnicity	Nominal	Category Frequency
Age	Nominal	Category Frequency
Resiliency Program Officer agency type	Nominal	Category Frequency
Years of law enforcement experience	Nominal	Category Frequency
Educational level	Nominal	Category Frequency
Number of past and current work assignments	Nominal	Category Frequency
Ever taught or coached anyone outside of law enforcement	Nominal	Yes/No
Ever attended a Methods of Instruction Course or one similar	Nominal	Yes/No
Ever taught a law enforcement block of instruction	Nominal	Yes/No
Number of instructor certifications	Nominal	Category Frequency
Trainer Interest Level in NJRP-LE	Ordinal	1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
Trainer Confidence Level in NJRP-LE	Ordinal	1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)
Trainer Perceived Quality of the NJRP-LE Components	Ordinal	1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)
Trainer Perceived Usefulness of the NJRP-LE Components	Ordinal	1 (Not at all useful) to 5 (Extremely useful)
Trainer Perceived Likelihood of use for the NJRP-LE Components	Ordinal	1 (Not at all useful) to 5 (Extremely useful)
Trainer Perception of Importance of the Individual NJRP Lessons during training	Ordinal	1 (Not at all important) to 5 (Extremely important)
Likelihood of Implementing the Individual NJRP Lessons during training	Ordinal	1 (Definitely not) to 5 (Definitely yes)

### **Data Analysis Procedure**

Data analysis is the most critical part of any research and summarizes the collected data. Given the descriptive nature of the study, the data analyses are conducted in specific steps. First is data management, which involves listwise deletion to remove missing data and then recoding of variables. Listwise deletion occurs for any individual in a data set who is deleted from analysis if they miss any variable in the analysis. Second, data analysis involves interpreting data gathered through analytical and logical reasoning to determine patterns, relationships, or trends. Statistical techniques such as frequencies, means, cross-tabulations, and percentages will convert the Resiliency Trainers survey responses to a descriptive analysis to establish correlations. These data will be processed through SPSS software, a widely used statistical analysis program in social science.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The NJRP-LE is the first program in the country to mandate resiliency training for all of its law enforcement officers. The first limitation of this study is the limited scope. New Jersey is the only state that currently has this program, leaving nothing for comparison. The program is set up so that it originally trained Master Resiliency Trainers. According to records, there are approximately 148 active Master Resiliency Trainers. Although these trainers will train hundreds of other officers to be RPOs, the study focuses only on Master Resiliency Trainers. With this fact, the second limitation of the study is the small sample size. However, given the descriptive nature of the analysis, the research is still solid and gives us insight into the unique program that has not been assessed before.

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As described above, the results of this study were used to give a descriptive analysis of the NJRP-LE and guide the Attorney General's Office to make any required adjustments to deliver the most successful curriculum possible. The survey was sent to all 148 Master Resiliency Trainers in the State of New Jersey. Of the 148 Master Resiliency Trainers, 68 responded, equating to a 45.94% response rate. The information from the survey was gathered, processed, and placed into nine tables. In addition to these tables, a section analyzed the one open-ended question that was asked. From the open-ended question, categories and themes were developed to improve the NJRP-LE. The effectiveness of the NJRP-LE was assessed on the foundation of the following research questions:

1. What are the overall Master Resiliency Trainer characteristics?
2. What are the Master Resiliency Trainer qualifications?
3. What is the general interest level of the Master Resiliency Trainer in the Train the Trainer Program?
4. How do the program's Master Resiliency Trainers perceive the quality of the Resiliency Program components?
5. To what extent are the Master Resiliency Trainers confident that they can instruct other officers utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?

#### **What Are the Overall Master Resiliency Trainer Characteristics?**

The first research question was placed in Table 2, which identifies the characteristics of the Master Resiliency Trainers. Table 2 is comprised of the Master Resiliency Trainers' sex, race/ethnicity, age group, and the type of agency with whom they are employed. Table 2 gives

the number of respondents for a particular question along with the corresponding percentage. The sex of the respondents was either male or female. No respondent selected other. Males comprised 76.47% (52) of the respondents, while females comprised 23.53% (16). Thus, there were over three times as many males as there were females. As for the race/ethnicity question, by far, the highest percentage of respondents were White, accounting for 85.30% (58), followed by Black or African American, which comprised 7.35% (5). The Hispanic and Latino option was equal with the Asian option. Both had two respondents, and each made up 2.94% of the category. The last choice was Other and was selected by only one respondent (1.47%).

The respondents' age was broken down into categories instead of getting their exact age at the time of the survey. The age groups of 35 to 44 and 45 to 54 were tied with the highest percentage of 39.71% (27) each. These facts illustrate that 79.42% of the respondents fall between the ages of 35 and 54 years old. The next highest was the 25 to 34 years old category, equating to 10.29% (7) respondents. The 55 to 64 years old category had 6 respondents (8.82%). Only 1 respondent was 65 or older, and no respondents were recorded in the 18 to 24 years old category. The last portion of the characteristics section of the survey was the officer's agency type. There were only three options to select from, state, county, or municipal. County was recorded as having the highest number of Resiliency Officers in the program. The county was recorded as having 27 of the 68 respondents (39.71%). The second highest was the municipal Resiliency Officers. They were recorded as having 23 of the 68 respondents (33.82%). Lastly, the state was recorded as having only 18 of the 68 respondents (26.47%).



**Table 2*****Characteristics of Trainers Who Participated in the Train the Trainer Program for New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68)***

Characteristic of Trainers	Number	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Male	52	76.47
Female	16	23.53
Other	0	0.00
Race/ethnicity		
White	58	85.30
Black or African American	5	7.35
Hispanic or Latino	2	2.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00
Asian	2	2.94
Other	1	1.47
Age		
18 to 24	0	0.00
25 to 34	7	10.29
35 to 44	27	39.71
45 to 54	27	39.71
55 to 64	6	8.82
65 or older	1	1.47
Resiliency Program Officer agency type		
State	18	26.47
County	27	39.71
Municipal	23	33.82

**What Are the Master Resiliency Trainer Qualifications?**

The second research question was placed in Table 3, which elaborates on the qualifications of the Master Resiliency Trainers. Table 3 is comprised of the Master Resiliency Trainers' years of law enforcement experience, their educational level, and the number of past and current work assignments. I sought to understand if the Master Resiliency Trainers have ever taught or coached anyone outside law enforcement. For example, the Method of Instructions Course is a law enforcement class that teaches officers how to teach someone and prepare a lecture. I wanted to know how many Master Resiliency Trainers have ever taken this course or

one similar. Along the same line of questioning, I wanted to know if the Master Resiliency Trainers have ever taught any law enforcement block of instruction and how many instructor certifications they possess. These questions are essential because the Master Resiliency Trainers are the ones that teach other officers how to train the officers in their agency. The summary data of these questions were captured in Table 3.

The first question that was examined is the number of years of law enforcement experience the respondents have. The highest number of respondents was from the 16 to 20 years category and was 22 (32.35%). The second was the 21 to 25 years category with 17 (25.00%), followed by the 11 to 15 years category with 13 (19.12%) respondents. These data show that 76.47% of respondents have a minimum of 11 years and a maximum of 25 years of law enforcement experience. Only 11 (16.18%) respondents had 10 years or less of law enforcement experience. Not many respondents had 26 or more years. This category was recorded at only 5 (7.35%) respondents. Next, the Master Resiliency Trainers' educational level was evaluated by category. The most significant number of respondents, 25 of 68 (36.76%), had a 4-year degree. Surprisingly, the next highest was a professional degree with 21 (30.88%) respondents. This statistic is surprising because it is not always required to have college to become a law enforcement officer. Thus, over 69% of the respondents have a 4-year degree or higher. Similarly, approximately 31% of the respondents have a 2-year degree or less. More specifically, 17.65% of the respondents do not currently have any college degree.

The number of past and current work assignments was explicitly explained in the survey. I designated one numeric value for every different rank someone held, a different division they were assigned to, and any other assignment they were worked on. This question was grouped into categories as well. First, the majority (36.76%) of respondents (25) selected they have had

between 5 to 6 work assignments in their career. Second, 23 (33.82%) respondents reported that they had between 3 to 4 work assignments. Nearly 84% of the respondents had a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 6 work assignments. Only 11 (16.18%) respondents had 7 or more work assignments.

The next series of questions deal with teaching, coaching, or instructing. This includes the approximate number of instructor certifications the Master Resiliency Trainers have. First, the Master Resiliency Trainers were asked if they had ever taught or coached anyone outside law enforcement. Of the 68 respondents, 60 (88.24%) stated that they have. Only 8 (11.76%) respondents said they have never taught or coached someone outside law enforcement. Next, respondents were asked if they had ever taken a Methods of Instruction Course or a similar course. Three quarters of the respondents (51) stated that they have, compared to the 17 (25.00%) who said they had not taken one of these courses. This information tells us that one quarter of the Master Resiliency Trainers have not taken a course that prepares them to prepare and teach a class.

The follow-up question to the Method of Instruction Course question asked whether the Master Resiliency Trainers had ever taught a law enforcement block of instruction. A large majority of respondents, 57 of 68 (85.07%), stated that they had instructed a law enforcement block of instruction. So, even though only 75% of the respondents have been to a Method of Instruction Course or one similar, some who have not attended the course could still teach a block of instruction. The last section of this table captured the number of instructor certifications the Master Resiliency Trainers have. This question was also grouped into categories. Half of the respondents (34) stated that they had between 1 and 2 instructor certifications. The subsequent

bulk of responses (18) fell in the 3 to 4 category, accounting for 26.48%. This tells us that 76.48% of the respondents have between 1 and 4 instructor certifications.

**Table 3*****Qualifications of Trainers Who Participated in the Train the Trainer Program for New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68)***

Qualifications of Trainers	Number	Percentage (%)
Years of Law Enforcement Experience		
0 to 5	2	2.94
6 to 10	9	13.24
11 to 15	13	19.12
16 to 20	22	32.35
21 to 25	17	25.00
26 or more	5	7.35
Educational level		
High school graduate or Equivalent	3	4.41
Some college	9	13.24
2-year degree	9	13.24
4-year degree	25	36.76
Professional degree	21	30.88
Doctorate	1	1.47
Number of past and current work assignments		
1 to 2	9	13.24
3 to 4	23	33.82
5 to 6	25	36.76
7 to 8	8	11.77
9 or more	3	4.41
Ever taught or coached anyone outside of law enforcement		
Yes	60	88.24
No	8	11.76
Ever attended a Methods of Instruction Course or one similar		
Yes	51	75.00
No	17	25.00
Ever taught a law enforcement block of instruction		
Yes	57	85.07
No	10	14.93
Number of instructor certifications		
1 to 2	34	50.00
3 to 4	18	26.48
5 to 6	5	7.35
7 to 8	3	4.41
9 or more	8	11.76

## **What Is the General Interest Level of the Master Resiliency Trainer in the Train the Trainer Program?**

The third research question asked the Master Resiliency Trainer's general interest level in the Trainer Program. Table 4 captured the Resiliency Trainers' overall perceived interest level in the NJRP-LE. For each of the following interest level statements, the survey assessed to what degree the respondent agreed with a statement. A five-point Likert Scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = strongly agree) was used to assess the following statements: I am interested in being a part of NJRP; I volunteered for this assignment; Given the option, I would remain an RPO; This training will help someone in my agency; In my opinion, this program will be successful; and I would take this course if it were not mandatory.

Having an interest in a program is very important when you are expected to train individuals who teach others. When respondents were asked about their agreement that they were interested in being a part of the NJRP, 46 of 68 (67.65%) strongly agreed, while 13 (19.12%) somewhat agreed. Only 5 (7.35%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Comparatively, 2 (2.94%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 2 respondents (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agreed (46) and somewhat agreed (13), it appeared that approximately 86.77% of the respondents were interested in being a part of the NJRP-LE.

The respondents were asked if they volunteered for the assignment as an RPO. Of 68 respondents, 44 (64.71%) strongly agreed that they did, while 11 (16.18%) somewhat agreed with the statement. For this statement, 7 (10.29%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree that they volunteered. Lastly, 6 (8.82%) respondents said that they disagree about

volunteering for the assignment. No respondent strongly disagreed that they volunteered to be part of the program. When I combined the strongly agreed (44) responses and somewhat agreed (11), approximately 80.89% of the respondents volunteered for this assignment.

Respondents were asked if, given the option, they would remain an RPO. Of the 68 respondents, 47 (69.12%) strongly agreed that they would stay, and an additional 12 (17.65%) somewhat agreed they would remain. Only 4 (5.88%) respondents selected neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Lastly, 3 (4.41%) stated that they somewhat disagreed with the statement, while 2 (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agreed (47) and somewhat agreed (12), it appeared that approximately 86.77 % of Master Resiliency Trainers would remain in the program.

The following statement given to the respondents was that this training would help someone in their agency. I wanted to see if they believed the training they were receiving would help someone other than themselves. Of the 68 respondents, 47 (69.12%) strongly agreed that the NJRP-LE would help someone in their agency, and an additional 11 (16.18%) somewhat agreed that it would. Only 5 (7.35%) respondents selected neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Lastly, 4 (5.88%) stated that they somewhat disagreed with the statement, while 1 (1.47%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agreed (47) and somewhat agreed (11), it appeared that approximately 85.30% of Master Resiliency Trainers believe that this training would help someone in their agency.

I wanted to know the opinion of the Master Resiliency Trainers on whether they believed the program would be successful given the fact that they are now trainers. Only 29 (42.65%) respondents, less than half, strongly agreed with this statement. Another 26 (38.24%) respondents somewhat agreed that the program would be successful. Only 6 (8.82%) respondents

selected that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Lastly, 5 (7.35%) stated that they somewhat disagreed with the statement, while 2 (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agreed (29) and somewhat agreed (26), it appeared that approximately 80.89% of Master Resiliency Trainers believe that this program will be successful.

The last portion of this category asked the Master Resiliency Trainers if they would take the NJRP-LE training if it were not mandatory. Some 43 (63.24%) respondents selected that they strongly agree that they would take this course. Additionally, 11 (16.18%) specified that they somewhat agreed. Five (7.35%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed. The number of respondents that somewhat disagreed was 6 (8.82%), followed by 3 (4.41%) who strongly disagreed that they would take this course. When I combined the responses of strongly agreed (43) and somewhat agreed (11), it appeared that approximately 79.42% of Master Resiliency Trainers would take this course if it were not mandatory. The data from the interest level statements can be observed in Table 4, Trainer Interest Level in New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement.



**Table 4*****Trainer Interest Level in New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68)***

Interest Level Statements	Perceived interest*	Interest Level (%)				
		Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I am interested in being a part of NJRP	4.46 (0.96)	2.94	2.94	7.35	19.12	67.65
I volunteered for this assignment	4.37 (0.98)	0.00	8.82	10.29	16.18	64.71
Given the option I would remain a RPO	4.46 (0.99)	2.94	4.41	5.88	17.65	69.12
This training will help someone in my agency	4.46 (0.96)	1.47	5.88	7.35	16.18	69.12
In my opinion this program will be successful	4.10 (1.03)	2.94	7.35	8.82	38.24	42.65
I would take this course if it was not mandatory	4.25 (1.18)	4.41	8.82	7.35	16.18	63.24

\* Mean (standard deviation); 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = strongly agree

After the results were obtained for the interest levels of the Master Resiliency Trainers, I completed three cross-tabulations. First, I compared the statement “I am interested in being a part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program” with the statement “I volunteered for this assignment.” I discovered that among those Master Resiliency Trainers who were strongly interested in being a part of the NJRP-LE, 87% also said they strongly agreed that they volunteered for this assignment. The cross-tabulation of these two statements showed a positive correlation. The data from the cross-tabulation of these two statements can be observed in Table 5, Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I am interested in being a part of New Jersey Resiliency Program vs. I volunteered for this assignment.

**Table 5*****Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I Am Interested in Being a Part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program vs. I Volunteered for This Assignment***

<b>New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement</b>		<b>I volunteered for this assignment</b>				
		<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
I am interested in being a part of NJRP	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%
	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	0.0%	23.1%	15.4%	46.2%	15.4%
	<b>Strongly agree</b>	0.0%	2.2%	4.3%	6.5%	87.0%

In the second cross-tabulation, I completed compared the statement “I am interested in being a part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program” with the statement “Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer.” I discovered that among those Master Resiliency Trainers who were strongly interested in being a part of the NJRP-LE, 95.7% of them also said they strongly agreed that given the option, they would remain an RPO. The cross-tabulation of these two statements is a positive correlation. The positive correlation between these two statements was the second highest of the three cross-tabulations. The data from the cross-tabulation of these two statements can be observed in Table 6, Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation of I am interested in being a part of New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement vs. Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer.

**Table 6*****Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I Am Interested in Being a Part of the New Jersey Resiliency Program vs. Given the Option, I Would Remain a Resiliency Program Officer***

<b>New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement</b>		<b>Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer</b>				
		<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
I am interested in being a part of NJRP	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%
	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	0.0%	7.7%	15.4%	69.2%	7.7%
	<b>Strongly agree</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	95.7%

The third and final cross-tabulation that I completed compared the statement “I volunteered for this assignment” with the statement “Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer.” I discovered that among those Master Resiliency Trainers who strongly agreed that they volunteered for this assignment, 97.7% of them also said they strongly agreed that they would remain an RPO given the option. The cross-tabulation of these two statements is a positive correlation. The positive correlation between these two statements was the strongest of the three cross-tabulations. The data support the theory that those who volunteered for the assignment were more likely to stay in the program than those who did not volunteer. The data from the cross-tabulation of these two statements can be observed in Table 7, Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I volunteered for this assignment vs. Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer.

**Table 7*****Trainer Interest Level Cross Tabulation: I Volunteered for This Assignment vs. Given the Option, I Would Remain a Resiliency Program Officer***

New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement		Given the option, I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer				
		Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I volunteered for this assignment	Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Somewhat disagree	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	28.6%
	Somewhat agree	9.1%	0.0%	18.2%	63.6%	9.1%
	Strongly agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	97.7%

**How Do the Program's Master Resiliency Trainers Perceive the Quality of the Resiliency Program Components?**

The responses pertaining to the fourth research question are presented in two tables. The first table is Table 8: Trainers' Perceived Quality, Usefulness, and Likelihood of Using the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Components. For each of the following components, the survey assessed the overall quality (1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent), overall usefulness (1 = not at all useful, 2 = slightly useful, 3 = moderately useful, 4 = very useful, 5 = extremely useful), and the overall likelihood of use (1 = not at all likely, 2 = a little likely, 3 = moderately likely, 4 = very likely, 5 = extremely likely) of the following components of the program: Sequence and flow of material, PowerPoint lecture slides, Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides, Breakout sessions, Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions, Train the Trainer workbook and the Mental health handbook. The mean ratings ranged from 1 to 5 and were at least 3.49 for perceived quality, at least 3.39 for perceived usefulness, and at least 3.59 for the perceived likelihood of use.

The first section of the table examines the overall perceived quality of the NJRP-LE components. The component with the highest quality rating was Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 3.72, SD = 0.93). Even though this was rated the highest, only 13 (19.40%) respondents selected excellent. A large majority of respondents (30) said that they were very good (44.78%), followed by good (17, 25.37%). This top-rated component was followed by Breakout sessions (Mean = 3.71, SD = .095), PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 3.67, SD = 1.02), Mental health handbook (Mean = 3.65, SD=1.07), Sequence and flow of material (Mean = 3.58, SD = 0.95), and Train The trainer workbook (Mean = 3.51, SD = 0.94). The lowest quality rated component was the instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions (Mean = 3.49, SD = 0.95). Only 8 (11.94%) said that they were excellent. Over 73% of respondents said they were either good (20, 29.85%) or very good (29, 43.28%). Eight (11.94%) respondents said they were fair, while 2 (2.99%) said they believed the quality was poor.

The second section of the table examines the overall perceived usefulness of the NJRP-LE components. The component with the highest usefulness rating was PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 3.73, SD = 0.84). Like the quality section of the components, even though this was rated the highest, it only had 11 (16.42%) respondents select that they were extremely useful. A large majority of respondents (32) said that they were very useful (47.76%), followed by moderately useful (20, 29.85%). This top-rated component was followed by Sequence and flow of material (Mean = 3.72, SD = 0.88), Breakout sessions (Mean = 3.70, SD = 0.91), Mental health handbook (Mean = 3.68, SD = 0.94), Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 3.63, SD = 0.90) and the Train the Trainer workbook (Mean = 3.58, SD = 0.90). The lowest usefulness rated component was the instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions (Mean = 3.39, SD = 0.98). Only 5 (7.46%) said that they were extremely useful. Over 76% of respondents (51)

said they were either moderately useful (29.85%) or very useful (46.27%). Seven (10.45%) respondents said that they were slightly useful, while 4 (5.97%) said they believed it was not at all useful.

The last section of this table addresses the overall perceived likelihood of using a component in the NJRP-LE training program. The component with the highest likelihood of use rating was PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 4.01, SD = 0.98). The PowerPoint lecture slides had 23 (34.33%) respondents select that it was extremely likely they would use it. A large majority of respondents (29) said it was very likely (43.28%), followed by moderately likely (11, 16.42%). This top-rated component was followed by Sequence and flow of material (Mean = 3.82, SD = 1.02), Mental health handbook (Mean = 3.75, SD = 1.07), Train the Trainer workbook (Mean = 3.74, SD = 1.03), Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides (Mean = 3.72, SD = 1.05) and Breakout sessions (Mean = 3.67, SD = 1.06). The lowest likelihood of the use rated component was the instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions (Mean = 3.59, SD = 1.06). Only 12 (18.18%) said they were extremely likely to use the instructor guidelines for breakout sessions. Nearly 65% of respondents (43) said they were either moderately likely (14, 21.21%) or very likely (29, 43.94%) to use the instructor guidelines for breakout sessions. Eight (12.12%) respondents said that they were a little likely, while 3 (4.55%) said they believed it was not at all likely they would use the instructor guidelines for breakout sessions. In summary, the component with the highest quality, usefulness, and likelihood of use rating was Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides. The component with the lowest quality, usefulness, and likelihood of use rating was Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions.

**Table 8*****Trainer Perceptions of Quality, Usefulness, and Likelihood of Using the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Components (n = 68)***

Component	Quality, (*) Mean (SD)	Usefulness, (+) Mean (SD)	Likelihood of Use (~), Mean (SD)
Sequence and flow of material	3.58 (0.95)	3.72 (0.88)	3.82 (1.02)
PowerPoint lecture slides	3.67 (1.02)	3.73 (0.84)	4.01 (0.98)
Instructor notes for PowerPoint Lecture Slides	3.72 (0.93)	3.63 (0.90)	3.72 (1.05)
Breakout sessions	3.71 (0.95)	3.70 (0.91)	3.67 (1.06)
Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions	3.49 (0.95)	3.39 (0.98)	3.59 (1.06)
Train the Trainer workbook	3.51 (0.94)	3.58 (0.90)	3.74 (1.03)
Mental health handbook	3.65 (1.07)	3.68 (0.94)	3.75 (1.07)
Total scale score	3.61 (0.97)	3.63 (0.90)	3.75 (1.03)

(\*) Rating scale used: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent

(+) Rating scale used: 1 = not at all useful, 2 = slightly useful, 3 = moderately useful, 4 = very useful, 5 = extremely useful

(~) Rating scale used: 1 = not at all likely, 2 = a little likely, 3 = moderately likely, 4 = very likely, 5 = extremely likely

The second table associated with this research question is Table 9: Trainer Perceptions of Importance and the Likelihood of Implementing the Individual NJRP-LE Lessons during training. For each of the following lessons, the survey assessed the perceived importance (1 = not at all important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, 5 = extremely important) and the likelihood of implementation (1 = definitely not, 2 = probably not, 3 = not sure, 4 = probably yes, 5 = definitely yes) for the following 12 lessons of the program: Resiliency Overview; Counting Blessings; Accomplishing Goals; ABC Model; Check Your Playbook; Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking; Capitalizing on Strengths; Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning-Making; Spiritual Resilience; Physical Resilience; Interpersonal Problem Solving; and Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR).

The first section of the table examines the perceived importance of the NJRP-LE lessons. The top 25% of the lessons with the highest importance rating were Counting Blessings (Mean = 4.06, SD = 0.77), Accomplishing Goals (Mean = 3.97, SD = 0.78), and Capitalizing on Strengths

(Mean = 3.95, SD = 0.77). Counting Blessings was the only lesson to receive over 4.00 in the perceived importance category. Counting Blessings had 17 (26.98%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. More than double the respondents (37) said that the lesson was very important (58.73%). Five (7.94%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important, while an additional 4 (6.35%) believed it was slightly important. Second to the top was Accomplishing Goals. This lesson had 14 (22.22%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. Nearly triple the respondents (36) said that the lesson was very important (57.14%). Eleven (17.46%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important, while 1 respondent (1.59%) believed it was slightly important. Additionally, 1 respondent (1.59%) thought it was not at all important. The third from the top lesson was Capitalizing on Strengths. Capitalizing on Strengths had 13 (20.97%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. Nearly triple the respondents (37) said that the lesson was very important (59.68%). Eight (12.90%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important, while an additional 4 (6.45%) believed it was slightly important.

The fourth through the ninth lesson in order of importance are Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (Mean = 3.92, SD = 0.81), Interpersonal Problem Solving (Mean = 3.90, SD = 0.76), Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking (Mean = 3.87, SD = 0.83), Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning-Making (Mean = 3.87, SD = 0.84), Resiliency Overview (Mean = 3.79, SD = 0.88) and Physical Resilience (Mean = 3.72, SD = 0.93). The bottom-ranked 25% of the lessons are ABC Model (Mean = 3.65, SD = 0.89), Check Your Playbook (Mean = 3.65, SD = 0.93), and the last rated in importance is Spiritual Resilience (Mean = 3.62, SD = 0.96). The ABC Model had only 9 (14.29%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. Over triple the number, 30 respondents, said that the lesson was



very important (47.62%). Nineteen (30.16%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important and 3 respondents (4.76%) believed it was slightly important, while an additional 2 respondents (3.17%) thought it was not at all important. The next to last rated lesson was Check Your Playbook. Check Your Playbook had only 11 (17.46%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. More than double the respondents (26) said that the lesson was very important (41.27%). Twenty-one (33.33%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important and 3 respondents (4.76%) believed it was slightly important, while an additional 2 respondents (3.17%) thought it was not at all important. The last and least important lesson, according to the Master Resiliency Trainers, is Spiritual Resilience. The Spiritual Resilience lesson had only 10 (16.39%) respondents select that the lesson was extremely important. Nearly triple the respondents (27) said that the lesson was very important (44.26%). Seventeen (27.87%) respondents said that the lesson was moderately important and 5 respondents (8.20%) believed it was slightly important, while an additional 2 respondents (3.28%) thought it was not at all important.

The respondents' perceived importance level of the New Jersey Resiliency lessons correlated with their likelihood of implementation. The top 25% of the lessons with the highest likelihood of implementation were the same top 25% in the perceived importance rating. However, they were in a different order. The order was Accomplishing Goals (Mean = 4.57, SD = 0.71), Counting Blessings (Mean = 4.56, SD = 0.85), and Capitalizing on Strengths (Mean = 4.52, SD = 0.73). The bottom 25% were slightly different. The bottom three lessons that were least likely to be implemented were Check Your Playbook (Mean = 4.27, SD = 0.93), Physical Resilience (Mean = 4.25, SD = 0.85), and the last rating in the likelihood of implementation was Spiritual Resilience (Mean = 4.11, SD = 1.09).

**Table 9*****Trainer Perceptions of Importance and the Likelihood of Implementing the Individual New Jersey Resiliency Program Lessons During Training (n = 68)***

New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Lessons	Perceived Importance*	Likelihood of Implementation (%)				
		Definitely Not	Probably Not	Not Sure	Probably Yes	Definitely Yes
1. Resiliency Overview	3.79 (0.88)	0.00	1.59	6.35	31.74	60.32
2. Counting Blessings	4.06 (0.77)	1.59	3.17	4.76	19.05	71.43
3. Accomplishing Goals	3.97 (0.78)	1.59	0.00	3.17	30.16	65.08
4. ABC Model	3.65 (0.89)	1.59	3.17	6.35	39.68	49.21
5. Check your Playbook	3.65 (0.93)	3.17	1.59	9.52	36.51	49.21
6. Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking	3.87 (0.83)	1.59	1.59	6.35	34.92	55.56
7. Capitalizing on Strengths	3.95 (0.77)	1.59	0.00	4.76	31.75	61.90
8. Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning Making	3.87 (0.84)	1.59	3.17	4.76	38.10	52.38
9. Spiritual Resilience	3.62 (0.96)	4.76	3.17	15.87	28.57	47.62
10. Physical Resilience	3.72 (0.93)	0.00	4.76	12.70	34.92	47.62
11. Interpersonal Problem Solving	3.90 (0.76)	0.00	1.59	6.35	31.75	60.32
12. Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR)	3.92 (0.81)	1.59	1.59	4.76	33.33	58.73

\* Mean (standard deviation); 1 = not at all important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, 5 = extremely important

**To What Extent Are the Master Resiliency Trainers Confident That They Can Instruct****Other Officers Utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?**

The fifth research question asked about the Master Resiliency Trainer's perceived confidence level in the NJRP-LE. Table 10, Trainer Confidence Level in NJRP-LE, captured this information. For each of the following confidence level statements, the survey assessed to what degree the respondent agreed with a statement. A five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = strongly agree) was used to assess the following statements: I am confident that I have all the information needed to train others; I am comfortable speaking in front of my peers; I am satisfied with the

skills I have learned from this training; I feel qualified to instruct this training; My expectations of this training were met; I feel that my knowledge has improved from taking this course.

Having an adequate confidence level to instruct a course is very important when one is expected to train individuals who teach others. When respondents were asked if they are confident that they have all the information needed to train others, only 16 of 68 (23.53%) strongly agreed, and more than double (34) that number somewhat agreed (50.00%). Seven (10.29%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Nine (13.24%) somewhat disagreed, and another 2 respondents (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agree (16) and somewhat agree (34), it appeared that approximately 73.53% of the respondents feel confident that they have all the information needed to train others.

Being able to speak among peers is also vital to teaching a course. When respondents were asked if they are comfortable speaking in front of their peers, 25 of 68 (36.77%) strongly agreed, slightly more than that number somewhat agreed (27, 39.71%). Only 7 (10.29%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Seven (10.29%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 2 respondents (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the strongly agree (25) responses and somewhat agree (27), approximately 76.48% of the respondents felt comfortable speaking in front of their peers.

Respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the skills they had learned from this training. Only 18 of 68 (26.47%) respondents strongly agreed, while 29 (42.65%) somewhat agreed. Twelve (17.65%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Seven (10.29%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 2 respondents (2.94%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the strongly agree (18) responses and

somewhat agree (29), approximately 69.12% of the respondents felt satisfied with the skills they have learned from this training.

Similar to the question asked of respondents about being confident they have all the information needed to train others, this question asked them if they feel qualified to instruct this training. When they were asked, 21 of 68 (30.88%) strongly agreed, followed by the same number (21) who somewhat agreed (30.88%). Nearly a quarter (23.53%) of respondents (16) stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. In addition, 6 (8.82%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 4 respondents (5.89%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the strongly agree (21) responses and somewhat agree (21), approximately 61.76% of the respondents felt qualified to instruct this training.

I wanted to know if the Master Resiliency Trainers' expectations of this training were met. When asked, 17 respondents (25.37%) strongly agreed, while 27 (40.30%) respondents somewhat agreed. Less than half of this number, 12 respondents (17.91%), stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Eight (11.94%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 3 respondents (4.48%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the responses of strongly agree (17) and somewhat agree (27), it appeared that approximately 65.67% of the respondents felt that their expectations of this training were met.

The last statement in this segment asked the respondents if they feel that their knowledge has improved from taking this course. When they were asked, 22 of 68 (32.35%) strongly agreed, followed by 30 respondents who somewhat agreed (44.12%). Only 8 (11.77%) respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Five (7.35%) respondents somewhat disagreed, and another 3 respondents (4.41%) strongly disagreed with the statement. When I combined the strongly agree (22) responses and somewhat agree (30),

approximately 76.47% of the respondents felt that their knowledge had improved from taking this course.

**Table 10**

***Trainer Confidence Level in New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (n = 68)***

New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Confidence Level Statements	Perceived Confidence*	Confidence Level (%)				
		Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I am confident that I have all the information needed to train others	3.78 (1.04)	2.94	13.24	10.29	50.00	23.53
I am comfortable speaking in front of my peers	3.97 (1.07)	2.94	10.29	10.29	39.71	36.76
I am satisfied with the skills I have learned from this training	3.79 (1.04)	2.94	10.29	17.65	42.65	26.47
I feel qualified to instruct this training	3.72 (1.16)	5.88	8.82	23.53	30.88	30.88
My expectations of this training were met	3.70 (1.11)	4.48	11.94	17.91	40.30	25.37
I feel that my knowledge has improved from taking this course	3.93 (1.06)	4.41	7.35	11.76	44.12	32.35

\* Mean (standard deviation); 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = strongly agree

### **Frequency of Training**

The NJRP-LE seeks to implement this curriculum in the Police Training Commissions recruit training for new officers. This will mean that every officer that is going through the police academy will receive this training. The second from last question on the survey asked the respondents how often they thought the NJRP-LE training lessons should be given to New Jersey law enforcement officers. This question had the choices of Never, One time only, Semi-annual, Annual, Biennial, Triennial, or Every 4 or more years. Of the 63 respondents for this question, 21 (33.33%) said they believe the training should be given annually. The second highest selected choice had 15 (23.81%) respondents, who chose Biennial. These respondents believe that the training should be provided every 2 years. The next highest selected choice was the Triennial.

Ten (15.87%) respondents chose this choice. Both Semi-annual and Every 4 or more years were selected by 6 (9.52%) respondents. The remaining two choices were one time only, with 4 (6.35%) respondents, and the least selected option, never, had only 1 (1.59%) respondent. When I combined the two highest responses of Annual (21) and Biennial (15), it appeared that approximately 57.14% of the Master Resiliency Trainers believe that this training should be recurring and fall somewhere between every 1 and 2 years.

#### Respondents' Recommendations for Improving the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement

The survey's final question was an open-ended question asking what could be done to improve the NJRP-LE. The question allowed the respondents to answer in open text format and answer based on their knowledge, feeling, and understanding of the program. After reading through all of the responses, I captured and identified categories and themes that emerged from the data. The themes that I developed from the data were: Command Staff Buy-in with the Resiliency Program; Confidentiality Concerns; Resiliency Program Officer Responsibilities; Partnering with Mental Health Professionals; Lessons of the Resiliency Program; and the Components and Delivery of the Resiliency Program. This section will only discuss the themes mentioned above and the opinions of the Master Resiliency Trainers to improve the NJRP-LE.

The first theme that was identified and labeled was Command Staff Buy-in. The Master Resiliency Trainers believed that too many Chiefs and Command Staff personnel were not buying into the NJRP-LE. One respondent said that they are calling this program the "Pussification of Police." It appears that the Resiliency Trainers are looking for consistency and commitment from their administration. A few respondents touched on changing law enforcement culture, which ties directly into the upper echelon of an agency. Regardless of the administrative changes, the value of the NJRP-LE should be supported and implemented. This implementation would slowly be bred into every organization's culture, creating the paradigm shift required to be

truly successful. Respondents believe that the buy-in would trickle down to front-line officers and become a grassroots movement to keep continued momentum. Some believe that continually integrating resiliency training into the law enforcement culture could eventually have every officer trained to be an RPO who could practice, exercise, and advocate with the skills they obtained.

The second theme that was identified and labeled was Confidentiality Concerns. The New Jersey Attorney General published Directive 2019-1: Directive Promoting Law Enforcement Resiliency. This directive states that all the interactions between a law enforcement officer and an RPO are confidential while acting in their official capacity. The second portion of the confidentiality statement further states that it will remain confidential unless disclosure is otherwise required by applicable laws, guidelines, or an agency's internal policies. It appears there is a gap and areas of concern due to clarity. Some respondents said that officers would not open up to an RPO or COP2COP unless they know for sure they will not lose their job or be deemed unfit for duty. One of the respondents stated they asked for clarification on this topic and were told that something needs to be placed in their departmental policy. The complaint was that there is nothing in their departmental policy to guide them when an issue arises. Lastly, there were several concerns about the Attorney General and the current law enforcement atmosphere about confidentiality. Some respondents believed in the program but had negative feelings about the NJRP-LE facilitated by the Attorney General's Office, given the current climate with recent conflicts between law enforcement in New Jersey and the Attorney General.

The third theme is the Resiliency Program Officer Responsibilities. This theme relates to the statement in the survey where I asked the respondents to what degree they volunteered for this assignment. It was evident from reading the responses that some respondents did not know

what the training entailed or the responsibilities that come with it. One respondent specifically explained how they found out they were now responsible for teaching their peers and numerous members throughout their county after being sent to the training. They did not feel they were prepared, nor could they accomplish the training in the same fashion as the expert speakers did during the Master Resiliency Training. Other respondents stated that the program should focus more on the RPOs and guide them. The guidance comments were translated into more training on teaching, being approachable, and listening to others.

The results from the open-ended question correspond with what I observed in the descriptive statistics. Specifically, when the respondents were asked to what degree they volunteered for this assignment, 6 (8.82%) stated that they disagreed they volunteered. These statistics would explain why similarly, when the respondents were asked, given the option, would they remain an RPO, 3 (4.41%) somewhat disagreed while 2 (2.94%) strongly disagreed. This total of 7.35% would not stay an RPO given the option. If respondents feel they did not volunteer for the assignment but were given it regardless, speaking in front of peers could be problematic. When I combined the somewhat disagree (7) and strongly disagree (2) responses, approximately 13.23% of the respondents did not feel comfortable speaking in front of their peers.

The fourth theme that I identified was Partnering with Mental Health Professionals. Respondents mentioned that they believed true partnerships should be with licensed mental health professionals who have demonstrated competency with public safety populations. The hope was that these professionals could help with peer support and decipher when an officer is in crisis or needs therapy. Some respondents had concerns with forwarding officers to COP2COP because, in their opinion, they are not mental health professionals but a resource number.



Contrarily, some respondents said that because COP2COP has been in place for so long and has shown proven success, we should be investing in that program and building it up. Finally, respondents wanted to see more mental health professionals in the breakout sessions.

The fifth theme I labeled was Lessons of the Resiliency Program. The overwhelming recurring theme for this section was that the overall training was too long. Respondents felt that the 12 lessons were redundant and could be condensed. In addition, they stated that the audience was becoming lost throughout the day. As for reducing the number of lessons, one respondent suggested that we should combine lessons. They indicated that lessons 4 and 5 (ABC Model, Check Your Playbook) and 11 and 12 (Interpersonal Problem Solving, Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding) could be combined to make only two lessons. Respondents also spoke about the complexity of the program. Many said they felt the training was too clinical and was not well received because of the language and terms. One respondent said they felt this was more like an undergraduate-level psychology course than a law enforcement training.

When analyzing the descriptive statistics, I observed that some disagreeable statements could be connected to the above comments. For example, the respondents' description of their degree of confidence that they have all the information needed to train others is reflected in their belief about the shortcomings of the NJRP-LE training. When I combined the somewhat disagree (9) and strongly disagree responses (2), approximately 16.18% of the respondents did not feel confident that they had all the information needed to train others. Another statement I analyzed to gain further insight into respondents' disagreeable statements toward the program is whether the respondents were satisfied with the skills they have learned from the program. When I combined the somewhat disagree (7) and strongly disagree (2) responses, approximately 13.23% of the respondents did not feel satisfied with the skills they had learned. Using the same method

above, 16.42% (11) of respondents expressed that their training expectations were unmet. Therefore, 14.71% (10) respondents do not feel qualified to instruct the NJRP-LE training. The next statement is: In my opinion, this program will be successful. When I combined the somewhat disagree (5) and strongly disagree (2) responses, approximately 10.29% of the respondents felt that the program would not be successful. Additionally, when I combined somewhat disagree (6) and strongly disagree (3) responses, approximately 13.23% of the respondents would not take this course if it were not mandatory.

The sixth and final theme for the open-ended question is Components and Delivery of the Resiliency Program. Respondents felt that the flow of the presentations could be adjusted to make the exercises more engaging and less redundant. They asked that organizers consider integrating activities into the lectures instead of doing them in breakout sessions. Respondents further explained that once they get to the breakout sessions, the instructor notes needed significant improvement. Some respondents felt they did not have enough information to utilize the Train the Trainer manual to instruct the breakout sessions. A few respondents said that the program should address the suicide rate in law enforcement but more clearly integrate critical stress management into the lessons. They felt that the essential inclusion of stress management would better benefit the NJRP-LE. According to the respondents, the inclusion could address how stressors should not be brought home to affect the family dynamic, solutions are not found at the bottom of a bottle, and resolutions should not be sought at the end of a barrel.

The term *delivery* is meant to discuss not what is being taught, rather how something is being taught. The COVID-19 pandemic struck right at the time the Master Resiliency Training was completed. COVID-19 did not allow time for Master Resiliency Trainers to utilize the skills they had just learned. Many respondents said there should be a refresher course specifically for

them to implement and instruct at the lower levels. Numerous respondents felt that the training should be given in a smaller, more intimate environment with fewer students. Limiting the number of students would accomplish several goals. For example, limiting a course to 25 students would increase interpersonal communication and improve conversations during the breakout sessions. The breakout sessions could then be broken down into teams that could then teach the material. Respondents said they needed to learn how to teach the material. According to some, this would build better relationships in the room and help the participants get to know each other better. Respondents said there was apparent resistance from some in the room when they entered the breakout sessions. Another recurring theme was improving the breakout sessions. I already addressed the instructor notes for breakout sessions. However, one respondent offered the idea of having instructors who have had traumatic experiences tell their stories. The respondent believed that this would help students relate to circumstances and make them feel that they are not alone in dealing with what they are experiencing.

To further expand on the comments made by the respondents, I utilized the descriptive statistics found in both the quality and usefulness of the NJRP-LE training components. When I combined the quality of fair (6) and poor (2) responses, approximately 12.12% of the respondents felt that the quality of the PowerPoint slides did not rise to the level of good. When I combined the quality of fair (6) and poor (1) responses, approximately 10.45% of the respondents felt that the quality of the instructor notes for PowerPoint slides did not rise to the level of good. In comparison, 6 (8.96%) found that the instructor notes on the slides were slightly useful, while 1 (1.49%) found them to be not at all useful. In addition, 14.93% (10) of respondents felt that the guideline quality was not good about the instructor guidelines for breakout sessions. When I combined the slightly useful (7) and not at all useful (4) responses,

approximately 16.42% of the respondents felt that the usefulness of the instructor guidelines for breakout sessions did not rise to the level of moderately useful. Respondents also spoke about the Train the Trainer manual. Of respondents, 14.93% (10) believed that the quality of the manual was fair but not good. Similarly, 13.43% (9) of respondents found that it was only slightly useful. The last component that will be discussed is the mental health handbook. When I combined the quality of fair (6) and poor (3) responses, approximately 13.64% of the respondents felt that the quality of the mental health handbook did not rise to the level of good. Lastly, 7 (10.61%) found that the mental health handbook was slightly useful, while 1 (1.52%) found it to be not at all useful.

### **Chapter Summary**

The results of the survey have shed light on the NJRP-LE's intricacies. The survey provided a detailed analysis of the Master Resiliency Trainer Characteristics, Qualifications, Interest Level in the Train the Trainer Program, their perceived quality of the NJRP-LE, and their Confidence Levels to instruct other officers utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the NJRP-LE. In addition to the survey questions, the open-ended question uncovered problematic issues that were not previously considered when the program was implemented. Chapter 5 will cover the recommendations I have developed to improve the NJRP-LE utilizing the survey results and the trainers' suggestions.

## CHAPTER 5

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations for the NJRP-LE are derived from the statistical analysis of the survey results. The recommendations have been listed in categories similar to my research questions. The research questions asked were:

1. What are the overall Master Resiliency Trainer characteristics?
2. What are the Master Resiliency Trainer qualifications?
3. What is the general interest level of the Master Resiliency Trainer in the Train the Trainer Program?
4. How do the program's Master Resiliency Trainers perceive the quality of the Resiliency Program components?
5. To what extent are the Master Resiliency Trainers confident that they can instruct other officers utilizing the Train the Trainer Model of the Resiliency Program?

The following categorical recommendations illustrated specific needs for improvement and possible ways to improve the efficiency of the NJRP-LE. The recommendations were placed into three categories. The first category is recommendations for the NJRP-LE curriculum, including the program components and lessons. The second category is recommendations for the selection of RPOs. The third category addresses concerns expressed by RPOs.

## **Recommendation Category I: New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement**

### **Curriculum Components and Lessons**

#### **Recommendation #1: Re-Evaluate the Program Components and Develop a Strategy to Improve Them**

This set of recommendations is based on the research question that asked how the Master Resiliency Trainers perceived the quality of the program components. This section covered the trainers Perceived Quality, Usefulness, and Likelihood of Using the New Jersey Resiliency Program Components, which were: Sequence and flow of material, PowerPoint lecture slides, Instructor notes for PowerPoint lecture slides, Breakout sessions, Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions, Train the Trainer workbook, and the Mental health handbook.

My overall recommendation would be to evaluate the program components and develop a strategy to improve them. An example of this is the Instructor's notes for PowerPoint lecture slides, which had the highest quality rating. Only 19.40% of the trainers selected that they were excellent; however, approximately 12.12% of the respondents felt that the quality of the PowerPoint slides did not rise to the level of good. Master Resiliency Trainers thought that the flow of the presentations could be adjusted to make the exercises more engaging and less redundant. This pattern was observed throughout the components for quality. As mentioned previously, the lowest quality rated component was the Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions. The Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions seemed to need the most significant improvement, with 14.93% of Master Resiliency Trainers stating that the guideline quality was not good. It appeared that the trainers felt there was no strong guidance on how they were supposed to instruct using the guidelines provided.

The usefulness ratings led to similar findings. The component with the highest usefulness rating was PowerPoint lecture slides. Although it was rated the highest, only 16.42% of the trainers selected extremely useful for this resource. Once again, the lowest-rated component in usefulness was the Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions. Over 16% of respondents said that they were slightly useful or not at all useful. The Instructor guidelines for the breakout sessions scored as the component with the lowest likelihood of use. Some of the Master Resiliency Trainers recommended integrating activities into the lectures instead of doing them in breakout sessions. I would have to disagree with this recommendation and suggest that the Attorney General's Office first attempt to edit and make the instructions for the breakout sessions better and more user-friendly before discontinuing breakout sessions. I believe that the breakout sessions serve a purpose and can be helpful if they are administered correctly.

The common perception among parents, teachers, and policymakers is that larger class sizes negatively impact student development (Maasoumi et al., 2005). The Master Resiliency Trainers felt that the training should be given in smaller groups, with fewer students. By limiting the number of students, they believed that it could increase interpersonal communication, improve conversations during the breakout sessions, and have teams of students teach the material to each other. This method is already being used in New Jersey in other instructor courses, such as the Drug Recognition Expert Instructor Course. To become an instructor, participants must teach instruction blocks to each other before becoming certified in this curriculum. Some concerns about teaching the material could be alleviated by implementing smaller class sizes and using this method in the NJRP-LE. The class size and student achievement have mixed results, although hundreds of studies have been completed on this topic.

Boozer and Rouse (2001) found statistically significant adverse effects of larger classes.

Similarly, and to this point, Krueger (2003) discovered a positive impact of smaller class sizes.

## **Recommendation #2: Re-Evaluate the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law**

### **Enforcement Lessons to Simplify and Condense the Program**

This set of recommendations I offer deal directly with the NJRP-LE Lessons which are: Resiliency Overview; Counting Blessings; Accomplishing Goals; ABC Model; Check Your Playbook; Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking; Capitalizing on Strengths; Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning-Making; Spiritual Resilience; Physical Resilience; Interpersonal Problem Solving; and Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR). Due to COVID-19, the Master Resiliency Trainers did not get a chance to utilize the skills they had just learned. My first recommendation would be to host a refresher course, specifically to implement and instruct participants at the lower levels.

Master Resiliency Trainers explained that the program in its present state is too complex. As mentioned previously, many stated they felt the training was too clinical, and the language and terms used were advanced. This assumption was illustrated in the statistical analysis when Master Resiliency Trainers were asked if they felt qualified to instruct this training. Only 61.76% of them agreed that they felt qualified to conduct this training. Once again, when the Master Resiliency Trainers were asked if they were confident that they had all the information needed to train others, only 73.53% stated that they felt confident that they had all the information needed to train others. In my opinion, these are staggering percentages, which could cripple the program if it is allowed to continue without correction.

The NJRP-LE lessons were evaluated in terms of importance. Chapter 4 discussed the top 25% of the lessons with the highest importance rating: Counting Blessings, Accomplishing



Goals, and Capitalizing on Strengths. The bottom-ranked 25% of the lessons were ABC Model, Check Your Playbook, and Spiritual Resilience. The last and least important lesson, according to the Master Resiliency Trainers, was Spiritual Resilience. The Spiritual Resilience lesson had only 16.39% of respondents select that the lesson was extremely important, and it was rated as the least likely to be implemented. These facts bring me to my following recommendation that the lessons of the NJRP-LE are too long. Master Resiliency Trainers felt that some of the lessons were redundant and could be condensed. One of the opinions stated was that the audience was becoming lost throughout the day. Combining the lessons would not only streamline the course but would alleviate redundancy. One recommendation would be to consider integrating lessons 4 and 5 (ABC Model, Check Your Playbook) and lessons 11 and 12 (Interpersonal Problem Solving, Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding) and make two new lessons from these four, bringing the total to 10. The Resiliency Overview may not be necessary and could also be combined into Counting Blessings to get the total down to 9 overall lessons.

When statistics prove that only 69.12% of the Master Resiliency Trainers feel satisfied with the skills they have learned from this training and that only 76.47% think their knowledge has improved from taking this course, the curriculum needs to be improved. Only 65.67% of the Master Resiliency Trainers felt that their training expectations were met without course corrections. Only 79.42% of the Master Resiliency Trainers stated that they would take the NJRP-LE training if it were not mandatory. These percentages reflect what the program is experiencing when the foundational Master Resiliency Trainers have difficulty accepting the course in its present form. Suppose the Attorney General's Office takes at least some of these recommendations and works toward improving the program. In that case, I believe the 10.29% of the Master Resiliency Trainers who feel that the program will not be successful will change their

beliefs and begin to have higher expectations of the program. Theoretically, the interest and confidence levels of the Master Resiliency Trainers, along with the quality of the program, would all increase.

### **Recommendation Category II: Selection of Resiliency Program Officers**

#### **Recommendation #1: Develop a More Explicit Guideline for the Selection Process of Resiliency Program Officers**

This set of recommendations is based on the research question that asked about the Master Resiliency Trainer's general interest level in the Trainer Program. As I stated earlier, I firmly believe that interest in a program is very important for a program participant who will train individuals to teach others. According to the survey results, approximately 86.77% of the trainers were interested in being part of the NJRP-LE. According to Lawton et al. (2020), there is an association between volunteering and well-being. Specifically, volunteering has been shown to benefit a person in reference to their health and well-being (Konrath, 2014). When the trainers were asked if they volunteered for the assignment as an RPO, only approximately 80.89% stated that they volunteered. These statistics show that there is a gap in the screening process for RPOs. Not everyone is given the option to become a resiliency trainer of their own accord. Binder and Freytag (2013) found many positive outcomes besides those mentioned, including a sense of self-worth. However, having officers in a program they do not wish to be in is problematic and counterproductive to a program where the premise is mental health and well-being.

The Attorney General's Office set a guideline for the selection process of RPOs in Directive 2019-1: Directive Promoting Law Enforcement Resiliency. In Section II. Implementation of Directive, subsection B. (Appointment of Resiliency Program Officers), the Attorney General explained the guidance for selecting RPOs. It was acknowledged that the

selection process is critical to law enforcement officers and the program's success. As stated earlier, the Attorney General's Office expected the appointing official to consider the specific needs and circumstances of the agency and the qualifications of the NJRP-LE candidates. This section included years of law enforcement experience, past and current work assignments, interest in the position, and any other relevant training. However, the guidelines are not specific enough to ensure that the officers communicate their interest or disinterest in the program. My recommendation would be to make the selection process much more precise and transparent. Officers who are selected should be fully aware of the details of program and the responsibilities that come with it, but most importantly, all of the officers in the program should be volunteers.

A consequence for not assuring that all participants are volunteers is that officers will leave the program at their first opportunity, or they will not put forth the appropriate effort in teaching it, which will hinder the program's purpose. According to survey results, these problems could soon surface in the NJRP-LE. Although some of the percentages seem high, we have to consider that the Master Resiliency Trainers are the first foundational block of the program and should have the most elevated and qualified trainers. The latter want to be a part of the program. To further expand on the importance of this point, 85.30% of Master Resiliency Trainers believe that the training would help someone in their agency. This percentage alone demonstrates a need for the NJRP-LE.

One criterion I believe is missing from the NJRP-LE selection process is speaking in public. The Council of the European Union (2018) recommended that all higher education institutions consider providing students with presentation skills. According to Gray (2010), professionals beginning their careers have inadequate public speaking skills. As I stated earlier, having an adequate confidence level to instruct a course is very important. According to Kerby

and Romine (2009), being able to present is a core competence for higher educated professionals across all areas of expertise, including law enforcement. The program needs RPOs who can talk amongst their peers and teach the class. Approximately 76.48% of the Master Resiliency Trainers felt comfortable speaking in front of their peers. However, 13.23% of the respondents expressed that they do not feel comfortable speaking in front of their peers. Clearly, the number of RPOs who do not feel comfortable speaking in front of their peers is significant. My recommendation would be to add a block to the selection process that addresses the ability to speak in front of peers and instruct a course confidently.

### **Recommendation #2: Consider Establishing Criteria for the Resiliency Program Officer Qualifications**

This set of recommendations is based on the research question asking what the Master Resiliency Trainer Qualifications were. The data showed that 76.47% of respondents had a minimum of 11 years and a maximum of 25 years of law enforcement experience. The percentage demonstrated that the program has obtained over three quarters of its instructors with significant law enforcement experience. Similarly, over 69% of the Master Resiliency Trainers had a 4-year degree or higher, which is commendable because college is not always required to enter law enforcement. Therefore, I do not see any adjustments for this section and would not recommend any changes to this category.

The next portion of this research question was related to teaching, coaching, or instructing. According to the survey results, 88.24% of the trainers have taught or coached someone outside law enforcement, while 85.07% stated they had instructed a law enforcement block of instruction. These percentages demonstrate that the trainers that are selected have some form of teaching experience. However, having teaching experience does not necessarily mean an

individual knows to prepare a lecture and curriculum. The Methods of Instruction Course or one similar would teach the trainers how to accomplish this and use some of the components mentioned in this study. Unfortunately, one quarter of the Master Resiliency Trainers have not taken a course that prepares them to prepare and teach a class. Therefore, my recommendation would be to consider adding a Methods of Instruction course or one similar as a prerequisite to or requirement for becoming an RPO. According to Bankowski (2010), this recommendation was confirmed when it was explained that comprehensive courses leave instructors with little time to teach oral presentation skills. This problem forces many trainers to acquire the skill set through self-learning, which has occurred in the NJRP-LE.

After reviewing the survey results for the open-ended question, it was abundantly clear from the responses that some Master Resiliency Trainers were unaware of what the training entailed or the responsibilities that come with it. After taking the course, they did not feel prepared and did not feel they could accomplish the training they had been taught. I recommend that every RPO candidate have the program explained to them in detail, so what is expected of them is clear. Master Resiliency Trainers could not have felt prepared for various reasons, one of which could be because they do not know how to teach and are never taught these techniques. Master Resiliency trainers explained in the survey results that they believed the program should focus more on the RPOs and guide them. Some Master Resiliency Trainers wanted the training to focus on teaching, being approachable, and listening to others. These comments lead me to believe that teaching and instructing need to be considered a qualification when considering a candidate for an RPO.

### **Recommendation #3: Diversify the Master Resiliency Trainer Racial and Ethnic Groups**

This set of recommendations is based on the research question asking what the overall Master Resiliency Trainer characteristics were. The gender results showed that the program was comprised of 76.47% males and 23.53% females. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, criminal justice information services division in 2019, the makeup U.S. law enforcement forces was 87.2% male and 12.8% female. Law enforcement is a predominately male profession, given the statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Women are the minority gender; the fact that the NJRP-LE over-represents this group, should be viewed as a positive attribute. The percentages for the national law enforcement compared to the NJRP-LE are slightly similar. Still, overall, I believe that the gender makeup of the NJRP-LE does not need to be adjusted.

As for the race and ethnicity breakdown, the NJRP-LE trainers were 85.30% White. 7.35% Black or African American followed this percentage, then Hispanic or Latino and Asian, each making up 2.94% of the category. According to the DOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2015), more than a quarter (27%) of full-time local police officers were members of a racial or ethnic minority group in 2013. The Master Resiliency Trainers are comprised of 13.23% identifying from a racial or ethnic group other than White. That would mean that the program could increase the representation of these groups to approximately 14% to match the national averages. I would recommend that the Attorney General's Office consider adding around 10 more Master Resiliency Trainers from a racial or ethnic group other than White.

The final portion of the characteristics section that I will discuss is the officer's agency type. County officers were recorded as having the highest number of resiliency officers in the program. As stated in the statistical analysis, the county officers comprised 39.71% of the Master

Resiliency Trainers. Given that the county officers will train the municipal officers in resiliency, who will teach the remaining officers in their respective agency, it is logical that they would have the highest percentage. The second highest was the municipal Resiliency Officers, with 33.82%. Again, this is logical since the municipal officers will be assisting the county prosecutors' offices in training all the law enforcement officers in their county. Therefore, my recommendation is that there is no need for a change in agency representation.

### **Recommendation Category III: Concerns Expressed by Resiliency Program Officers**

#### **Recommendation #1: Address the Confidentiality Concerns Expressed by the Master Resiliency Trainers**

The first recommendation that I have refers to confidentiality concerns. When the New Jersey Attorney General's Office published Directive 2019-1: Directive Promoting Law Enforcement Resiliency, they included a section touching on confidentiality. The directive explains explicitly that all the interactions between a law enforcement officer and an RPO are confidential while acting in their official capacity. However, there is a second portion to this paragraph. The second portion stated that it would remain confidential unless disclosure is otherwise required by applicable laws, guidelines, or an agency's internal policies. This becomes problematic when mentioning an agency's internal policies due to the number of police agencies in the State of New Jersey. The Attorney General's Office will need to clarify this section and make its application more standard. Master Resiliency Trainers said officers would have trouble opening up to an RPO unless they were assured there would be no repercussions, including job loss or fitness for duty evaluation. In the last chapter, I explained a trainer's story when they asked for clarification on the topic and were told something needed to be placed in their departmental policy. The problem came to light that there is no mandate for an agency to

establish something in their internal policies, undermining the purpose of the RPOs. My recommendation would be to address the confidentiality concerns mentioned above and specify more precise guidelines for agencies to follow.

### **Recommendation #2: Seek to Obtain More Command Staff Buy-In**

Command staff buy-in was identified as being a problem when I evaluated the open-ended question. It was clear that the Resiliency Trainers seek consistency and commitment from their administration. Master Resiliency Trainers spoke of changing the law enforcement culture, starting at the top and working downward. The percentage of Master Resiliency Trainers who believe that their agency does not buy into the NJRP-LE is unknown due to the question not being asked. However, implementation is mandatory and could be slow-moving into an organization's culture. The paradigm shift that I discussed previously is critical for the program to be successful. Although there could be various reasons why a Master Resiliency Trainer would not believe the program would be successful, this could be one of them. And if, as the survey results indicate, only 80.89% of Master Resiliency Trainers believe that this program will be successful, action needs to be taken. The first step is to continually integrate resiliency training into law enforcement culture and explicitly target the upper echelon of agencies. These individuals will make a difference and contribute to whether the program is successful.

As stated earlier, the NJRP-LE is looking at the possibility of implementing this curriculum in the Police Training Commissions recruit training. This method would make every officer going through the police academy aware of and allow them to receive resiliency training. One of the critical questions is how often this training should be given after the initial training. The respondents' answers to this question were obtained using the statistics from the survey. It appeared that 57.14% of the Master Resiliency Trainers believed that the training should be



recurring and fall somewhere between 1 and 2 years. Given the complexity of the training course, it is my recommendation that the training be given biennially, or every 2 years after the initial training.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

The NJRP-LE is a groundbreaking concept that will ultimately help law enforcement officers and save lives. New Jersey is the first state in the United States to take action and mandate mental health and resiliency training for all law enforcement officers. What New Jersey has accomplished is nothing short of a monumental step in the right direction. This study was significant because it gave a descriptive analysis of the NJRP-LE and identified the current success of the program and the areas that need improvement. Currently, there is an opportunity for the Attorney General's Office to refine the program and set the example for other states to model after. The descriptive information I provided in this study is meant to enlighten the Attorney General's Office on the program and prompt them to reexamine it utilizing my recommendations. The anticipated outcome will be a more efficient and effective program to help law enforcement officers cope with the frequent events throughout their careers that can negatively impact their mental health.

This study was conducted to evaluate the Train the Trainer Model developed in the NJRP-LE. In addition, it surveyed the Master Resiliency Program Officers to obtain their perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program. Finally, the research covered the program's components, the RPOs' characteristics, qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components. Now that the Master Resiliency Trainers have been studied, the groundwork has been established to compare them to other RPOs.

## **Future Research**

Future research should analyze the municipal RPOs. The municipal RPOs are the next level down in instruction from all 21 counties in New Jersey. Their numbers are much greater than those of the Master Resiliency Trainers. Depending on when the future study is conducted will depend on what should be studied. The future research will consider whether the Attorney General's Office has made any improvements to the NJRP-LE. Either way, a future study should focus on the RPOs' perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program; RPOs' characteristics, qualifications, interest and confidence levels; and the course material's components. The study results should compare the Master Resiliency Trainers to the RPOs to see if their perspective and levels of confidence increased, stayed the same, or decreased. If the Attorney General's Office does make corrections to the NJRP-LE, we could use a revised program for comparison. The revised program should be compared to the first version with no modifications to test whether the revisions made had any impact on the RPOs' perception of the program's quality.

One last consideration for future research derives from the open-ended question in the survey. I asked the Master Resiliency Officers to tell me what can be done to improve the program and what they would do differently. The answers that I received were put into themes and should be addressed in future research by developing a series of questions that focuses on the concerns expressed by RPOs. Specific lines of questioning should be designed to explore the Resiliency Program Officers Command Staff and the perception they have about the NJRP-LE. The sequence of exploration should seek to understand what is being done at the upper echelons of an agency. We need to understand better whether the program has acceptance and approval at the highest levels of an agency. As I stated earlier, this could explain why RPOs would believe

the program will not be successful and could ultimately be a deciding factor in the success of the NJRP-LE.

## References

- Addis, M. E., & Cohane, G.H. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61(6), 633–647.
- Albrecht, S. (2014, February 7). Why don't employees use EAP services? *Psychology Today*.  
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-act-violence/201402/why-dont-employees-use-eap-services>
- Albuquerque, C. L., & Paes-Machado, E. (2004). The hazing machine: The shaping of Brazilian military recruits. *Policing & Society*, 14(2), 175–192.
- American Psychological Association. (2016). *Workplace well-being linked to senior leadership support, new survey finds*. <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2016/06/workplace-well-being>
- American Psychological Association. (2017). *Clinical practice guideline for the treatment of PTSD*. <https://www.apa.org/ptsd-guideline/ptsd.pdf>
- Ballenger, J. F., Best, S. R., Metzler, T. J., Wasserman, D. A., Mohr, D. C., Liberman, A., Delucchi, K., Weiss, D. S., Fagan, J. A., Waldrop, A. E., & Marmar, C. R. (2010). Patterns and predictors of alcohol use in male and female urban police officers. *The American Journal on Addictions*, 20(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1521-0391.2010.00092.x>
- Binder, M., & Freytag, A. (2013). Volunteering, subjective well-being and public policy. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 34, 97–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2012.11.008>
- Blue H.E.L.P. (2021, August 31). *The numbers*. <https://bluehelp.org/the-numbers/>

- Boozer, M. A., & Rouse, C. (2001). Intraschool variation in class size: patterns and implications. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 50,163–189.
- Brooks, Susan. (2018, January 10). *All info - H.R.2228 - 115th Congress (2017-2018): Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017*.  
<https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/2228/all-info>
- Brough, P., Brown, J., & Biggs, A. (2016) *Improving criminal justice workplaces: Translating theory and research into evidence-based practice*. Routledge.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2015). *National Crime Victimization Survey, 1995–2014*. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cantwell, K. (2019). 5 key benefits of employee assistance programs. *Montridge Advisory Group*. <https://blog.montridge.com/benefits-of-employee-assistance-programs>
- Carpenter, B. N., & Raza, S. M. (1987). Personality characteristics of police applicants: comparisons across subgroups and with other populations. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15(1), 10–17
- Center for Treatment of Anxiety & Mood Disorders. (2021).  
<https://centerforanxietydisorders.com/>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *Understanding the training the trainers model*. [https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/tths/train\\_trainers\\_model.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/tths/train_trainers_model.htm)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). *Facts about suicide*.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/suicide/facts/index.html>
- Chan, J. (1997). *Changing police culture: policing in a multicultural society*. Cambridge University Press.

- The Council of the European Union. (2018). Council recommendation of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning (Text with EEA relevance). *Official Journal of the European Union*, 61, 1–13. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C\\_.2018.189.01.0001.01.ENG](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2018.189.01.0001.01.ENG)
- Crank, J. P. (1998). *Understanding police culture*. Anderson Publishing.
- Crank, J. P. (2004) *Understanding police culture* (2nd ed.). Anderson Publishing.
- Crank, J., & Caldero, M. (2010) *Police ethics: The corruption of noble cause*. Mathew Bendre and Company.
- Cross, C. L., & Ashley, L. (2004). Police trauma and addiction: Coping with the dangers of the job. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e311382005-006>
- Donnelly, E., Valentine, C., & Oehme, K. (2015). Law enforcement officers and Employee Assistance Programs. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38(2), 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-11-2014-0116>
- Ellwanger, S. (2012) How police officers learn ethics. In M. Braswell & B. McCarthy (Eds.), *Justice, crime and ethics* (7th ed., pp 45–71). Elsevier.
- Ely, R., & Meyerson, D. (2010) An organizational approach to undoing gender: the unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30(C), 3–34.
- Employee Assistance Program (EAP): General: What is an employee assistance program? (2014). *SHRM*. <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-samples/hr-qa/pages/whatisaneap.aspx>
- Fox, J., Desai, M. M., Britten, K., Lucas, G., Luneau, R., & Rosenthal, M. S. (2012). Mental-health conditions, barriers to care, and productivity loss among officers in an urban police department. *Connecticut Medicine*, 76(9), 525–531.

- Gleeson, P. P. D. (2019, February 5). What is the train the trainer model? *Work*.  
<https://work.chron.com/train-trainer-model-5463.html>
- Grady, L. (2021). June is Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month. *Lifeologie Counseling*.  
<https://wefixbrains.com/raleigh/the-counselors-blog/june-is-post-traumatic-stress-awareness-month/>
- Gray, F. E. (2010). Specific oral communication skills desired in new accountancy graduates. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 73(1), 40–67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569909356350>
- Handrick, L. (2018, October 24). What is an EAP (employee assistance program) & how does it work? *Fit Small Business*. <https://fitsmallbusiness.com/what-is-an-eap-employee-assistance-program/>
- Hayes, C. (2018, April). Silence can be deadly. *USA Today*.
- Hilton, M. F., Scuffham, P. A., Sheridan J., Cleary, C. M., Vecchio, N., & Whiteford, H. (2009). The association between mental disorders and productivity in treated and untreated employees. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 51(9), 996–1003.
- Hougan, S. (2018, July 25). 5 reasons companies should promote mental health at work. *Starling*.  
<https://www.starlingminds.com/5-reasons-companies-should-promote-mental-health-at-work/>
- Kerby, D., & Romine, J. (2009). Develop oral presentation skills through accounting curriculum design and course-embedded assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(3), 172–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320903252389>
- Kessler, R. C., Heeringa, S., Lakoma, M. D., Petukhova, M., Rupp, A. E., Schoenbaum, M., Wang, P. S., & Zaslavsky, A. M. (2008). The individual-level and societal-level effects

- of mental disorders on earnings in the United States: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 165(6), 703–711.
- Kingshott, B. F., Bailey, K., & Wolfe, S. E. (2004) Police culture, ethics and entitlement theory. *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law and Society*, 17(2), 187–202.
- Kirschman, E. (2017, June). Cops and PTSD: Why you should care, what you can do. *Psychology Today*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/cop-doc/201811/cops-and-ptsd>
- Konrath, S. (2014). The power of philanthropy and volunteering. In F. Huppert & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Wellbeing: A complete reference guide* (Vol. VI, pp. 387–427). Wiley.
- Krueger, A. B. (2003). Economic considerations and class size. *Economic Journal*, 113(485), F34–F63.
- Krugel, M. (2016). Your call. *New Jersey Cops Magazine*, 29–32.
- Langton, N. A., Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2016) Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications (6th ed.). Pearson Education Canada.
- Lawton, R. N., Gramatki, I., Watt, W., & Fujiwara, D. (2020). Does volunteering make us happier, or are happier people more likely to volunteer? Addressing the problem of reverse causality when estimating the wellbeing impacts of volunteering. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(2), 599–624. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00242-8>
- Lindorff, D. (1999). Police culture. *Nation*, 268(20), 20.
- Loftus, B. (2010). Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 20(1), 1–20.
- Lundman, R. (1980). *Police and policing: An introduction*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.



Maasoumi, E., Millimet, D. L., & Rangaprasad, V. (2005). Class size and educational policy: Who benefits from smaller classes? *Econometric Reviews*, 24(4), 333–368.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07474930500405485>

The many benefits of an employee assistance program. (2020, February 2). *Session Magazine*.

<https://sessionmagazine.com/services/the-many-benefits-of-an-employee-assistance-program/>

Marchand, A., Haines, V. Y., & Dextras-Gauthier, J. (2013). Quantitative analysis of organizational culture in occupational health research: A theory-based validation in 30 workplaces of the organizational culture profile instrument. *BMC Public Health*, 13, 443–454.

McCaslin, S. E., Inslicht, S. S., Metzler, T. J., Henn-Haase, C., Maguen, S., Neylan, T. C., Choucroun, G., & Marmar, C. R. (2008). Trait dissociation predicts posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in a prospective study of urban police officers. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 196(12), 912–918.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31818ec95d>

Mitchell, J. T., & Everly, G. S., Jr. (2001). *The basic critical incident stress management course: Basic group crisis intervention* (3rd ed.). International Critical Incident Stress Foundation.

National Alliance on Mental Illness. (2021). *Mental health by the numbers*.

<https://www.nami.org/mhstats>

Paoline, E. (2001). *Rethinking police culture: Officers' occupational attitudes*. LFB Scholarly Publishing.

- Reddy, C. (2018, June 26). Employee assistance program advantages and disadvantages. *Wisestep*. <https://content.wisestep.com/employee-assistance-program-advantages-disadvantages/>
- Redman, J. (2018, January 23). Why do cops avoid counseling? Eight myths about law enforcement officers and mental health treatment. *Counseling Today*. <https://ct.counseling.org/2018/01/why-do-cops-avoid-counseling-eight-myths-about-law-enforcement-officers-and-mental-health-treatment/>
- Reiner, R. (2010). *The politics of the police* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Sayles, S. L., & Albritton, J. S. (1999). Is there a distinct subculture in American policing? In J. D. Sewell (Ed.), *Controversial issues in policing* (pp 154–171). Allyn and Bacon.
- Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed). Jossey-Bass.
- Spielman, F. (2017, May 1). CPD seeks to remove stigma for officers seeking mental health aid. *Chicago Sun Times*. <https://chicago.suntimes.com/news/cpd-seeks-to-remove-stigma-for-officers-seeking-mental-health-aid/>
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2018, September 14). *Types of trauma*. <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/PTSD/understand/types/index.asp>.
- Violanti, J. M., Burchfiel, C. M., Miller, D. B., Andrew, M. E., Dorn, J., Wactawski-Wende, J., Beighley, C. M., Pierino, K., Joseph, P. N., Vena, J. E., Sharp, D. S., & Trevisan, M. (2006). The Buffalo Cardio-Metabolic Occupational Police Stress (BCOPS) pilot study: Methods and participant characteristics. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 16(2), 148–156.
- Violanti, J. M., Charles, L. E., Hartley, T. A., Mnatsakanova, A., Andrew, M. E., Fekedulegn, D., Vila, B., & Burchfiel, C. M. (2008). Shift-work and suicide ideation among police officers. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 51(10), 758–768.

- Violanti, J. M., Fekedulegn, D., Andrew, M. E., Charles, L. E., Hartley, T. A., Vila, B., & Burchfiel, C. M. (2012). Shift work and the incidence of injury among police officers. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 55(3), 217–227.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22007>
- Welter, C. (2017, January 20). Why you should care about your employees' mental health. *StartUp Mindset*. <https://startupmindset.com/why-you-should-care-about-your-employees-mental-health-2/>
- What is depression? (n.d.). *American Psychiatric Association*.  
<https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/depression/what-is-depression#:~:text=Depression%20is%20among%20the%20most,some%20relief%20from%20their%20symptoms>
- Wickersham, M. E. (2016, February 16). Spotlight on police culture. *ICMA*.  
<https://icma.org/articles/pm-magazine/spotlight-police-culture>
- Wilson, J. Q. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities*. Harvard University Press.
- Workman-Stark, A. L. (2017) Understanding police culture. In A. L. Workman-Stark (Ed.), *Inclusive policing from the inside out* (pp. 19–35). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53309-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53309-4_2)
- World Health Organization. (n.d.). *Mental health in the workplace*.  
<https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/promotion-prevention/mental-health-in-the-workplace>.

Wright, K. (2018, April 19). How companies are learning to talk about mental health, and how your company can too. *Headspace*. <https://www.headspace.com/blog/2018/04/11/mental-health-in-the-workplace/>

## **Appendix A**

### **Authorization Letter from the New Jersey Attorney General's Office**



PHILIP D. MURPHY  
*Governor*

SHEILA Y. OLIVER  
*Lt. Governor*

*State of New Jersey*  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY  
DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
PO BOX 085  
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0085  
TELEPHONE: (609) [REDACTED]

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
*Attorney General*

VERONICA ALLENDE  
*Director*

January 8, 2021

Frank Sutter  
Seton Hall University

**Re: NJ Resiliency Program**

Dear Mr. Sutter:

Thank you for your interest in the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Officers. As we have previously discussed, this letter memorializes our consent permitting you to conduct research on the implementation and effectiveness of the program. I am authorizing the release of and you are granted permission to use the email addresses from the March 2020 Master Resiliency Trainer Program to conduct your research. I would request that before releasing any email information or personal identifying information in your research that I be contacted. I would also request that the findings of your research be released to me before any paper is published.

Thank you again and I look forward to your involvement with the program.

Very truly yours,

[REDACTED]

Robert H. Czepiel, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
State Chief Resiliency Officer

cc: David Leonardis, Training & Outreach Liaison  
Holly Lees, Administrative Assistant



*New Jersey Is An Equal Opportunity Employer • Printed on Recycled Paper and Recyclable*

**Appendix B**

**Approval for Dissertation Proposal**



### APPROVAL FOR DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

Candidate, Frank Sutter, has successfully completed all requisite requirements. This candidate's proposal has been reviewed and the candidate may proceed to collect data according to the approved proposal for dissertation under the direction of the mentor and the candidate's dissertation committee.

If there are substantive differences between what has been approved and the actual study, the final dissertation should indicate, on separate pages in the Appendix, the approval of the committee for those changes.

#### Title of Proposed Dissertation:

EVALUATION OF THE NEW JERSEY RESILIENCY PROGRAM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

#### Dissertation Committee:

Rong Chen

Mentor (Print Name)

11/9/2020

Signature/Date

Robert Kelchen

Committee Member (Print Name)

11/9/2020

Signature/Date

Nicole DiCrecchio

Committee Member (Print Name)

11/9/2020

Signature/Date

Committee Member (Print Name)

Signature/Date

Committee Member (Print Name)

Signature/Date



## **Appendix C**

### **Institutional Review Board Application Approval Letter**



January 15, 2021

Frank Sutter  
Seton Hall University

Re: 2021-161

Dear Frank,

The Research Ethics Committee of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your research proposal entitled, "Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement" as resubmitted. This memo serves as official notice of the aforementioned study's approval as exempt. If your study has a consent form or letter of solicitation, they are included in this mailing for your use.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol, informed consent form or study team must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You will receive a communication from the Institutional Review Board at least 1 month prior to your expiration date requesting that you submit an Annual Progress Report to keep the study active, or a Final Review of Human Subjects Research form to close the study. In all future correspondence with the Institutional Review Board, please reference the ID# listed above.

Sincerely,

Mara C. Podvey, PhD, OTR  
Associate Professor  
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

Phyllis Hansell, EdD, RN, DNAP, FAAN  
Professor  
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

**Office of the Institutional Review Board**

Presidents Hall · 400 South Orange Avenue · South Orange, New Jersey 07079 · Tel: 973.275.4654 · Fax 973.275.2978 ·  
[www.shu.edu](http://www.shu.edu)

WHAT GREAT MINDS CAN DO

## **Appendix D**

### **Solicitation Email Text**



## Solicitation Email Text

Dear Survey Participant:

My name is Lieutenant Frank Sutter of the East Brunswick Police Department. I am a Master Resiliency Trainer as well, and I am currently completing my Education Doctorate at Seton Hall University.

I am requesting your participation in a research study I am currently conducting on the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement (NJRP-LE). Your participation in this research study will entail responding to a survey. The data gathered will provide input into completing a descriptive analysis of NJRP-LE. The purpose of this research study is to examine the Master Resiliency Program Officers to obtain their perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program. The survey that will be conducted will cover the Resiliency Program Officers' characteristics, qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components.

The survey questions solicit information regarding your perceptions of the NJRP-LE. The survey responses will be anonymous. The survey takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and I appreciate your time and participation. The results will only be reported in aggregate form, ensuring your participant confidentiality. The information gathered from you responding to the survey will be used in statistical calculations for the research being conducted. Lastly, the survey data will be kept secure, preserving the anonymity and confidentiality of every participant.

To access the survey, please use the following URL:

[https://shu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_dhbs7nxoGbr7oZn](https://shu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dhbs7nxoGbr7oZn)

Thank you in advance for your time and input. Should you require additional information, I can be reached via email at [REDACTED] or by cell phone at [REDACTED]

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

Lieutenant Frank Sutter  
East Brunswick Police Department  
Office of Professional Standards

**Appendix E**  
**Informed Consent Form**



## Informed Consent Form

**Title of Research Study:** Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement

**Principal Investigator:** Frank Sutter, Ed.S.

**Department Affiliation:** Education Leadership, Management, and Policy

**Sponsor:** This research is supported by Seton Hall University, Education Leadership, Management, and Policy.

**Summary and purpose of this research study:**

You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a Master Resiliency Trainer and attended the training on March 10-11, 2020. The following summary of this research study helps you decide whether you want to participate in the study. This study will cover the program's components, the characteristics of the Resiliency Program Officers, your qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components. The purpose of this research study is to examine the Master Resiliency Program Officers to obtain their perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program.

**What you will be asked to do:**

You will be asked to complete a survey that will cover the Resiliency Program Officers' characteristics, qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components. The primary risk of participation is minimal. Your participation in this research study will include: Filling out an online survey, which will ask questions to obtain your perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program. The survey is 20 questions and will take the participants approximately 10 minutes to complete.

**Your rights to participate, say no, or withdraw:**

Participation in research is voluntary. You can decide to participate or not participate. You can choose to participate in the research study now and then choose to leave the research at any time. Your choice will not be held against you. The person in charge of the research study can remove you from the research study without your approval. Possible reasons for removal include non-compliance with the study procedures.

**Potential benefit:** The main benefit of participation is that you will help shape the future course material and resiliency program officers' selection process.

**Potential risks:**

The risks associated with this study are minimal.

**Confidentiality and privacy:**

Efforts will be made to limit the use or disclosure of your personal information. This information may include the research study documents or other source documents used to conduct the study, consisting of demographic data with no identifiers. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that oversee research safety may inspect and copy your information, including the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, which oversees the safe and ethical conduct of research at this institution. This survey is being hosted by Qualtrics and involves a secure connection. Terms of service, addressing confidentiality, may be viewed at <https://www.shu.edu/web/terms-of-service.cfm>. Upon receiving the results of your survey, any possible identifiers will be deleted by the investigator. You

OnlineConsent.v1.2020-2021



## Informed Consent Form

will be identified only by a unique subject number, and your email address will be stored separately from your survey data. All information will be kept on a password-protected computer only accessible by the research team. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

**Data sharing:** Data collected from this study will not be shared with anyone outside of the study team.

**Cost and compensation:** There is no payment for your time to participate in this study.

**Conflict of interest disclosure:** The principal investigator and members of the study team have no financial conflicts of interest to report.

**Contact information:**

Suppose you have questions, concerns, or complaints about this research project. In that case, you can contact the Principal Investigator: Frank Sutter at [REDACTED] or the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board ("IRB") at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

If you wish to participate, please click the "I Agree" button, and you will be taken to the survey.

If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select exit the browser.

## **Appendix F**

### **New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement Survey**



# Frank Sutter: Survey of NJRP-LE

---

## Start of Block: Consent Form

### Consent

Title of Research Study: Evaluation of the New Jersey Resiliency Program for Law Enforcement

Principal Investigator: Frank Sutter, Ed.S.

Department Affiliation: Education Leadership, Management, and Policy

Sponsor: This research is supported by Seton Hall University, Education Leadership, Management, and Policy.

### Summary and purpose of this research study:

You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a Master Resiliency Trainer and attended the training on March 10-11, 2020. The following summary of this research study helps you decide whether you want to participate in the study. This study will cover the program's components, the characteristics of the Resiliency Program Officers, your qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components. The purpose of this research study is to examine the Master Resiliency Program Officers to obtain their perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program.

### What you will be asked to do:

You will be asked to complete a survey that will cover the Resiliency Program Officers' characteristics, qualifications, interest and confidence levels, and the course material's components. The primary risk of participation is minimal. Your participation in this research study will include: Filling out an online survey, which will ask questions to obtain your perspective on the quality, usefulness, and likelihood of using the materials utilized in this program. The survey is 20 questions and will take the participants approximately 10 minutes to complete.

### Your rights to participate, say no, or withdraw:

Participation in research is voluntary. You can decide to participate or not participate. You can choose to participate in the research study now and then choose to leave the research at any time. Your choice will not be held against you. The person in charge of the research study can remove you from the research study without your approval. Possible reasons for removal include non-compliance with the study procedures.

Potential benefit: The main benefit of participation is that you will help shape the future course material and resiliency program officers' selection process.

Potential risks:

The risks associated with this study are minimal.

Confidentiality and privacy:

Efforts will be made to limit the use or disclosure of your personal information. This information may include the research study documents or other source documents used to conduct the study, consisting of demographic data with no identifiers. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that oversee research safety may inspect and copy your information, including the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, which oversees the safe and ethical conduct of research at this institution. This survey is being hosted by Qualtrics and involves a secure connection. Terms of service, addressing confidentiality, may be viewed at <https://www.shu.edu/web/terms-of-service.cfm>. Upon receiving the results of your survey, any possible identifiers will be deleted by the investigator. You will be identified only by a unique subject number, and your email address will be stored separately from your survey data. All information will be kept on a password-protected computer only accessible by the research team. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

Data sharing: De-identified data from this study may be shared with the research community at large to advance knowledge. We will remove or code any personal information to identify you before files are shared with other researchers. This method will ensure that no one will identify you from the information we share by current scientific standards and known procedures. Despite these measures, we cannot guarantee the anonymity of your personal data.

Cost and compensation: There is no payment for your time to participate in this study.

Conflict of interest disclosure: The principal investigator and members of the study team have no financial conflicts of interest to report.

Contact information:

Suppose you have questions, concerns, or complaints about this research project. In that case, you can contact the Principal Investigator: Frank Sutter at [REDACTED] or the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board ("IRB") at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

If you wish to participate, please click the "I Agree" button, and you will be taken to the survey.

If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select exit the browser.

☐ I Agree (1)

End of Block: Consent Form

---

Start of Block: Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications

Q1 What is your sex?

- ☐ Male (1)
  - ☐ Female (2)
  - ☐ Other (3)
- 

Q2 What is your race/ethnicity?

- ☐ White (1)
  - ☐ Black or African American (2)
  - ☐ Hispanic or Latino (3)
  - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (4)
  - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
  - ☐ Asian (6)
  - ☐ Other (7)
-

Q3 What is your current age?

- ☐ 18 - 24 (1)
  - ☐ 25 - 34 (2)
  - ☐ 35 - 44 (3)
  - ☐ 45 - 54 (4)
  - ☐ 55 - 64 (5)
  - ☐ 65 or older (6)
- 

Q4 I am a Resiliency Program Officer (RPO) for what type of agency?

- ☐ State (1)
  - ☐ County (2)
  - ☐ Municipal (3)
- 

Q5 Select the number of years you have in your profession/Law Enforcement:

- ☐ 0-5 (1)
  - ☐ 6-10 (2)
  - ☐ 11-15 (3)
  - ☐ 16-20 (4)
  - ☐ 21-25 (5)
  - ☐ 26 or more (6)
-

Q6 Select your level of education:

- ☐ High school graduate or Equivalent (1)
  - ☐ Some college (2)
  - ☐ Two year degree (3)
  - ☐ Four year degree (4)
  - ☐ Professional degree (5)
  - ☐ Doctorate (6)
- 

Q7 How many different law enforcement work assignments have you had?  
different rank = 1, different division = 1, different assignment = 1

- ☐ 1 to 2 (1)
  - ☐ 3 to 4 (2)
  - ☐ 5 to 6 (3)
  - ☐ 7 to 8 (4)
  - ☐ 9 or more (5)
- 

Q8 Have you ever taught or coached anyone outside of your law enforcement profession?

- ☐ Yes (1)
  - ☐ No (2)
-

Q9 Have you attended a Methods of Instruction Course or one similar?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

---

Q10 Have you ever taught a law enforcement block of instruction?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

---

Q11 How many instructor certifications do you have?

☐ 1 to 2 (1)

☐ 3 to 4 (2)

☐ 5 to 6 (3)

☐ 7 to 8 (4)

☐ 9 or more (5)

---

End of Block: Resiliency Program Officer Characteristics and Qualifications

Start of Block: Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers

Q12 Please indicate the extent you would agree with the following interest level statements:

	Strongly disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
I am interested in being a part of the NJRP- LE. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I volunteered for this assignment. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given the option I would remain a Resiliency Program Officer. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This training will help someone in my agency. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my opinion this program will be successful. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would take this course if it was not mandatory. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Interest Level of the Resiliency Program Officers

Start of Block: Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers

Q13 Please indicate the extent you would agree with the following confidence level statements:

	Strongly disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
I am confident that I have all the information needed to train others. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am comfortable speaking in front of my peers. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the skills I have learned from this training. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel qualified to instruct this training. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My expectations of this training were met. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that my knowledge has improved from taking this course. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Confidence Level of the Resiliency Program Officers

Start of Block: Evaluation of Course Material



Q14 Please rate the quality of the NJRP-LE components:

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)
Sequence and flow of material for the NJRP-LE (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PowerPoint lecture slides for NJRP-LE (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor notes on slides (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Breakout sessions (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor guidelines for breakout sessions (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Train the trainer workbook (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health handbook (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Q15 Please rate the usefulness of the NJRP-LE components:

	Not at all useful (1)	Slightly useful (2)	Moderately useful (3)	Very useful (4)	Extremely useful (5)
Sequence and flow of material for the NJRP-LE (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PowerPoint lecture slides for NJRP-LE (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor notes on slides (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Breakout sessions (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor guidelines for breakout sessions (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Train the trainer workbook (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health handbook (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Q16 Please rate your likelihood of use for the NJRP-LE components:

	Not at all likely (1)	A little likely (2)	Moderately likely (3)	Very likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)
Sequence and flow of material for the NJRP-LE (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PowerPoint lecture slides for NJRP-LE (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor Notes on slides (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Breakout sessions (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructor guidelines for breakout sessions (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Train the trainer workbook (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health handbook (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Evaluation of Course Material

Start of Block: Evaluation of NJRP-LE Modules

Q17 Please rate the level of importance for each Lesson:

	Not at all important (1)	Slightly important (2)	Moderately important (3)	Very important (4)	Extremely important (5)
Lesson 1: Resiliency Overview (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 2: Counting Blessings (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 3: Accomplishing Goals (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 4: ABC Model (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 5: Check your Playbook (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 6: Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 7: Capitalizing on Strengths (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 8: Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning Making (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 9: Spiritual Resilience (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 10: Physical Resilience (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 11: Interpersonal Problem Solving (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 12: Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR) (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q18 Please rate the likelihood of Implementation for each Lesson:

	Definitely not (1)	Probably not (2)	Not sure (3)	Probably yes (4)	Definitely yes (5)
Lesson 1: Resiliency Overview (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 2: Counting Blessings (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 3: Accomplishing Goals (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 4: ABC Model (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 5: Check your Playbook (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 6: Balance Your Thinking & Instant Balance Your Thinking (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 7: Capitalizing on Strengths (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 8: Acceptance Strategies Mindfulness & Meaning Making (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 9: Spiritual Resilience (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 10: Physical Resilience (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 11: Interpersonal Problem Solving (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson 12: Good Listening & Active Constructive Responding (ACR) (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 How often do you think the NJRP-LE training lessons should be given to New Jersey Law Enforcement Officers?

- ☐ Never (1)
- ☐ One time only (2)
- ☐ Semi annual (3)
- ☐ Annual (4)
- ☐ Biennial (5)
- ☐ Triennial (6)
- ☐ Every 4 or more years (7)

---

Q20 Please tell me what can be done to improve the program, what would you do differently?

---

---

---

---

---

End of Block: Evaluation of NJRP-LE Modules

---