LOYOLA UNIVERSITY MARYLAND

— 1852 —

FINAL REPORT

LEADING FORWARD: TRAINING SELF-ADVOCATE EDUCATORS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

July 2021

Prepared For:

Maryland Department of Disabilities
Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council

&
Saylor Alliance Steering Committee

Prepared By:

Dr. Lisa Schoenbrodt
Professor
Department of Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

Dr. Leah Katherine Saal
Co-Director of Literacy Program
Associate Professor of Literacy

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY MARYLAND

— 1852 —

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Project Summary & Description

The LEAD Model is a three-pronged program that supports individuals with Intellectual Disabilities and/or Developmental Disabilities (ID/DD) to serve as Self-Advocate Educators/Trainers for first responders. For the 2019-2021 program, LEAD leveraged local resources and supports of First Responder Departments (Municipal Police Academy - Prince George's Community College, Baltimore Police Department, and Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service), Academic Institutions (LUM), and Community Based ADvocacy Organizations for Individuals with ID/DD (Best Buddies Maryland and Special Olympics of Maryland by creating strategic partnerships.

As designed, all three prongs worked together at the local level to recruit, equip, support, and evaluate **twelve (12) new self-advocate educators for first responders**, provide **maintenance training for six (6) veteran self-advocate educators** for first responders from cohort 1, and **train two (2) veteran SAEs as co-trainers**. Despite immense challenges resulting of the COVID-19 pandemic, the LEAD Model was able to adapt to continue to provide high-quality training for SAEs, and, in turn, first responders in Maryland. The LEAD program, and its staff, has also continued to work closely with the Saylor Alliance Steering Committee to ensure the LEAD programs alignment with its mission and vision.

B. Original Contract & No-cost Extension

The original contract timeline was July 2019 to December 2020. However, the following circumstances led to the need for a no-cost extension of the grant period to June of 2021. First, the scope of work was scheduled to begin in July of 2019. Due to delays in the contract execution, we were unable to begin work until October 2019. Second, the later start date delayed the collaboration and planning necessary for other deliverables. Third, during the COVID-19 pandemic, all work involving in-person self-advocate educators was placed on hold as a result of their status as a vulnerable population. Finally, COVID-19 related cessation of work delayed several of the in-person training deliverables.

To address challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Primary Investigators (PI) flipped the model of training for SAEs to online synchronous via video conferencing software. Concurrently, Baltimore Police Department and Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service moved all of their trainings online. The LEAD Model was able to flexibly meet the needs of our program partners through adaptability and increased online maintenance training (small group) for SAEs.

C. Trainings and Metrics

In total, the **LEAD Model was implemented in nineteen (19) trainings with first responders** as part of the 19-21 contract. Perhaps most impressively, while six (6) trainings were held face-to-face (F2F) as planned, the remaining thirteen (13) were held in an online, synchronous format through the use of video-conferencing software. The self-advocate educators learned, implemented, and evaluated new skills for both technology and communication through this major, unplanned delivery shift. **226 law enforcement personnel** (209 new recruits/academy cadets and 17 comparative compliance) and **172 fire and rescue (EMS) personnel** were trained for a total of **398 first responders** trained. Please see the Scope of Work Completed sections III.A, III.B, and III.C for more information. Trainees overwhelmingly reported positive experiences with the LEAD Model and SAEs. See III.3 Lead Model Outcomes for more information.

Finally, veteran/Cohort 1 SAEs, Patrick Chaney and Elaina Camacho, were trained as co-trainers using the revised model curriculum and led an online model training for the Ethan Saylor Alliance Steering Committee. To accomplish these outcomes, the PIs facilitated twenty-three (23) LEAD Model trainings, 17 for the scenario-based training participants and 6 for the co-trainers, over the course of the contract. **The nineteen (19) first responder trainings and twenty-three (23) LEAD Model trainings vastly exceeded the pre-determined deliverables** of the 2019-2021 contract which called for 15 first responder trainings and 6 LEAD Model trainings**.** Please see the Scope of Work Completed sections III.A, III.B, and III.C for more information. SAEs overwhelming reported positive experiences with the LEAD Model and first responders. See III.3 Lead Model Outcomes for more information.

Please see the corresponding synopsis of training metrics on the following page for more information.

Prince George's County Municipal Police Academy

Date	Number Trained/Rank	SAEs Participating	Format
3/3/20	17/ Comparative Compliance	5	F2F
6/30/20	20/ Academy	5	F2F
5/24/21	18/Academy	6	F2F

Baltimore City Police Academy

Date	Number Trained/Rank	SAEs Participating	Format
1/23/20	28/Academy	4	F2F
6/12/20	25/Academy	4	Online
7/6/20	25/Academy	4	Online
7/13/20	25/Academy	4	Online
8/25/20	25/Academy	4	Online
1/12/21	43/Academy	4	Online

Montgomery County Fire/EMS

Date	Number Trained	SAEs Participating	Format
10/21/19	16	1	F2F
11/7/19	18	1	F2F
5/2/20	10	1	Online
5/12/20	33	1	Online
6/18/20	17	1	Online
8/20/20	10	1	Online
9/10/20	11	1	Online
10/23/20	13	1	Online
10/28/20	25	1	Online
11/4/20	19	1	Online

Ethan Saylor Alliance Steering Committee Training Presentation

Date	Number of Participants	SAEs Participating	Format
5/4/21	13	2	Online

II. LEAD PROGRAM MODEL 2019-2021

The LEAD Program Model includes a three-pronged partnership between first responders, an academic institution, and advocacy organizations. For the 2019-2021 contract, the partners included: PGCC Municipal Police Academy, Baltimore Police Department, Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service, Loyola University Maryland, and the Best Buddies Maryland. Program staffing included: Director Percel Alston from PGCC Municipal Police, Elizabeth Wexler**,** CIT Program Coordinator from Baltimore Police Department, Major Martin Bartness from the Baltimore Police Department and Chair of the Training and Implementation Committee (TIC) subcommittee Rae Oliveira, ALS Program Coordinator from Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services, Amber Yates, Program Manager for Community Engagement, and Drs. Lisa Schoenbrodt and Leah Katherine Saal from Loyola University Maryland.

The program model and collaboration has been effective in theory and practice in face-to-face and online formats. Drs. Schoenbrodt and Saal met in person, by email, Zoom, or by phone with Director Alston, Ms. Oliveira, and Ms. Wexler approximately thirty (30) times and Ms. Yates around thirty (30) times throughout the grant period. Director Alston, Major Martin Bartness, Ms. Wexler, and Ms. Yates all reported their satisfaction with both the effectiveness and timeliness of communication.

III. SCOPE OF WORK COMPLETED

A. Selection of New Self-Advocate Educators

New self-advocate educators (SAEs) were recruited by Ms. Amber Yates through her role at Best Buddies and her knowledge of individuals who met the job description in the grant. The PIs also contacted the Arc of Maryland, Special Olympics of Maryland , and People on the Go to further recruit. Special Olympics of Maryland was the only other advocacy group to respond to the call and provide potential SAEs with information to interview for the position. As a result, fourteen (14) potential SAEs were interviewed and screened across two days in October 2019 using the screening tool as prescribed in the grant and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-4 (revised) to evaluate overall comprehension of language. Two of the individuals screened did not meet the screening threshold of being able to understand the role of the SAE in acting scenarios with role plays with first responders and had difficulty understanding directions. In total, twelve new SAEs were selected for this second cohort, and almost all SAEs had previous experience participating in public speaking, drama, or acting. People with a variety of disabilities and communication abilities were represented by the cohort. Individuals with Down syndrome, Autism, Williams syndrome, Sturge-Weber syndrome, learning disabilities, and unspecified speech and language impairments were included. SAEs included six (6) males and six (6) females who ranged in age from 18 to 42 years old. Since the beginning of the LEAD Model for first responders, twenty-two (22) SAEs

have been trained through both grant funding and an additional $25,000 in outside philanthropic support from Lynne and Don Myers in memory of their son, Eric Davis Myers.

B. LEAD Curricular Trainings

1. SAEs Participating in LEAD Model Scenario-based Training

For the SAEs participating in scenario-based training, a total of seventeen (17) training sessions were held over the course of the contract (see chart below for more specifics). Six (6) whole group, four (4) face-to-face training sessions and two (2) online sessions (post-COVID-19), were held. In initial whole group training sessions, Cohort 1 of SAEs acted as training facilitators and peer leaders for Cohort 2. In addition, following the shift to online training, we identified the need for small group maintenance training as well as the need to have an opportunity for online socialization. Therefore, we led eleven (11) additional online, small group sessions and three (3) unpaid social events. Training sessions were held with the SAEs to train each of the scenarios using improvisation first in a face-to-face delivery model and then in an online delivery model. The training included:

a. **Training on Video-conferencing Software Use for Scenario-based Training** including how to set up sessions for optimal scenario-based training, video-conferencing software tools/commands, and how to use the chat platform and text messaging on cell phones for stage directions and coaching.
b. **Warm Up Activities** using improvisation (walking through a "door" and introducing self, bowl of emotions).
c. **Introduction of Role Play Scenarios** with models first provided by instructors and then implemented by the SAE's.
d. **Self and Team Critique with N.E.D**. (narration, emotion, detail) strategy.

Following LEAD curricular training, SAEs' progress on meeting job indicator* outcomes was measured. All eighteen (18) SAEs were able to:

- Follow multi-step directional instructions.
- Answer yes/no questions accurately in the context of the LEAD curriculum.
- Understand and identify emotions such as: frustrated, angry, frightened, worried, and confused.
- Understand and define phrases such as: "being in trouble," "going to jail," and others.
- Understand vocabulary for law enforcement trainings to include police, officer, safety, crime, vehicle, siren, elopement, missing person, suspect, victim, and others.
- Understand and follow directions using on, up, under, over, beside, down.
- Understand cause/effect relationships in the context of the LEAD curriculum.
- Communicate concepts in front of a crowd with clarity and articulation.

- Participate in role-play with minimum number of prompts.
- Self-evaluate performance in role-play after viewing video recordings.

Table 1. SAEs Participating in LEAD Model Scenario-based Training

Date	SAE Participants	Type of Training	Format
10/8/19	10	Interviews/Screening	F2F
10/15/19	4	Interviews/Screening	F2F
11/19/19	Whole Group	New SAE Training	F2F
12/10/19	Whole Group	New SAE Training	F2F
1/13/20	Whole Group	New SAE Training	F2F
2/18/20	Whole Group	New SAE Training	F2F
3/31/20	Whole Group	New SAE Training	Online
4/28/20	Whole Group	Social Meet Up (No stipends paid)	Online
5/26/20	Whole Group	Maintenance Training	Online
10/27/20	Whole Group	Halloween Party (No stipends paid)	Online
11/10/20	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
11/17/20	Small Group (9 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
11/24/20	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
12/15/20	Whole Group	Holiday/Winter Party (No stipends paid)	Online
1/5/21	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
1/12/21	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
1/19/21	Small Group (5 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
1/26/21	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
4/6/21	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
4/13/21	Small Group (4 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
4/20/21	Small Group (5 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online
4/27	Small Group (5 SAEs)	Maintenance Training	Online

2. SAEs Participating in Co-Trainer Collaboration

Two veteran/Cohort 1 SAEs, Patrick Chaney and Elaina Camacho, participated in co-trainer training collaboration around the revised model curriculum. To achieve this goal, the PIs met with Patrick and Elaina six (6) times online for 1.5 hours per session. SAEs and PIs collaborated to:

- review the entire training curriculum as well as all of the "notes for presenters."

- establish context and defined terms within the training. Through this process, we also identified problems with the training videos embedded in the curriculum and notified the Saylor Alliance Steering Committee.
- add additional context and personalized scripts for each co-trainer.
- create a "Master" curriculum for SAE co-trainers and PIs

Table 2. SAEs Participating in Co-Trainer Collaboration

Date	SAE Participants	Type of Training	Format
12/8/20	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online
1/5/21	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online
2/23/21	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online
4/13/21	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online
4/20/21	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online
4/27/21	2	Co-Trainer Collaboration	Online

C. First Responder & Saylor Alliance Steering Committee Training Sessions

1. Law Enforcement Training Sessions

Nine (9) training sessions for law enforcement were held during the grant period. One (1) of these sessions, held at **Prince George's County Municipal Police Academy,** was for veteran (Comparative Compliance) training. Law Enforcement who participated in this training were identified as changing departments and needed additional training as a result. This training included an abbreviated curriculum as well as participation in the three role play scenarios (outlined above) with the SAEs. The other training sessions, two (2) for **Prince George's County Municipal Police Academy** and six (6) for **Baltimore Police Department**, were four (4) hour cadet training sessions that included a combination of a PCTC approved curriculum in addition to participating in the role-play scenarios with SAEs. We had one additional training for veteran officers scheduled with **Prince George's County Municipal Police Academy**; however, this training was cancelled by our partners due to timing constraints.

The **initial format for these trainings** included the following: SAEs sat amongst police officers as equal partners in the educational setting. The approved curriculum was presented by the trainer. SAEs provided personal introduction and answered questions along with police officers/trainees. At a scheduled break, SAEs and police officers socialized. Finally, the role-play scenarios were enacted. Following each scenario, a debrief was conducted with both the SAEs and the trainees. These debriefs included officer critique and reflection.

The **secondary/online format for these trainings** included the following: SAEs were enrolled in video-conference platform along with police officers as equal partners in the educational setting. The approved curriculum was presented by the trainer. PIs introduced the project, SAEs introduced

themselves. SAEs answered questions along with police officers/trainees and also engaged in the chat box conversation where appropriate. Finally, the role-play scenarios were enacted online. Officers either engaged through their individual computers or through computers with audio/video capability placed in the training academy classrooms. Following each scenario, a debrief was conducted with both the SAEs and the trainees. These debriefs included officer critique and reflection. Five (5) training sessions were in this secondary/online format. All online sessions were for Baltimore Police Academy.

2. Fire & Rescue (EMS) Training Sessions

Ten (10) training sessions for **Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service** were held during the grant period. This training included an abbreviated curriculum as well as participation in one role play scenario with an SAE.

The initial format for these trainings included the following: SAE sat amongst providers as equal partners in the educational setting. The curriculum was presented by the trainer. SAEs provided personal introduction and answered questions along with providers. At a scheduled break, SAEs and police officers socialized. Finally, the role-play scenario was enacted, often multiple times. Following each scenario, a debrief was conducted with both the SAE and the trainees. These debriefs included provider critique and reflection. Two (2) training sessions were in this initial format.

The secondary/online format for these trainings included the following: SAE was enrolled in video-conference platform along with providers as equal partners in the educational setting. The approved curriculum was presented by the trainer. PIs introduced the project, SAEs introduced themselves. SAE answered questions along with providers and also engaged in the chat box conversation where appropriate. Finally, the role-play scenario was enacted online. Providers engaged through their individual computers. Following each scenario, a debrief was conducted with both the SAE and the trainees. These debriefs included provider critique and reflection. Eight (8) training sessions were in this secondary/online format

3. Saylor Alliance Steering Committee Co-Trainer Model

Following collaborative co-training sessions, Elaina Camacho and Patrick Chaney co-presented five (5) of seven (7) modules of the newly approved training curriculum segments to the Saylor Alliance Steering Committee on May 4, 2021. The PIs each also presented a module appropriate to their expertise. As the collaborative co-training sessions were all online, the PIs felt that an online video-conference format for the presentation of the co-trainer model was appropriate and necessary. Elaina and Patrick did an outstanding job and the comments from the committee were overwhelmingly positive.

D. LEAD Model Promotion & Outreach

Throughout the course of the contract, Drs. Schoenbrodt and Saal promoted the LEAD model through local, regional, and national/international media outlets in addition to replying to individual and organizational inquiries. The LEAD project was promoted by Loyola University Maryland's public relations and marketing teams through using web announcements and social media platforms. Further, the PIs have presented, along with Self Advocate Educators and training partners, Rae Oliveira, Jennifer Eastman, and Patti Saylor, at regional, national, and international conferences. They have also been invited to host two national webinars. Dr. Schoenbrodt and Patrick Chaney were also invited to participate in a consortium two-day roundtable led by the Department of Justice, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the University of Cincinnati. Finally, the PIs have one published academic article reporting on the initial results of the LEAD Model pilot associated with the grant.

1. Conference Presentations & Webinars

**Saylor, P., Schoenbrodt, L, Saal, L. K., Brooks, A., (2019, May). Safe, understood, and included: The work of the Maryland Department of Disabilities and the Ethan Saylor Alliance Steering Committee. The Arc of Maryland Convention, Ellicott City, MD.

Schoenbrodt, L, & Saal, L. K. (2020, February). Leading forward: Training self-advocate Educators for first responders. Loyola University Maryland Forensic Studies Seminar Series, Baltimore, MD.

Schoenbrodt, L., & Saal, L. K., *Chaney, P., & **Eastman, J. (2020, September). Including self-advocates in trainings for law enforcement and other emergency personnel. Mid Atlantic ADA Conference: Corrections and Law Enforcement, Alexandria, VA.

Schoenbrodt, L., Saal, L. K., & **Oliveira, R. (2021, March). Using Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs) with Disabilities as Patient Actors in EMS and Law Enforcement Training During Challenging Times. Poster presentation at the 2021 National Academies of Practice Annual Meeting and Forum, Washington, D. C./Online

Schoenbrodt, L., Saal, L. K., *Chaney, P., *Camacho, E. & **Oliveira, R. (2021, April). Using Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs) with Disabilities as Patient Actors in EMS. Webinar for the National Association of EMS Educators (NAEMSE).

Schoenbrodt, L., Saal, L. K., & **Hayes, A., (2021, May). Using Self-Advocate Educators with disabilities as patient actors in training. Presentation for ICISF World Congress 16. Online.

Schoenbrodt, L., & Saal, L. K. (2021, June) Using Self-advocate Educators (SAEs) With Disabilities As Patient Actors in EMS And Law Enforcement Training During Challenging Times. Poster presentation for 2021 Annual Meeting of American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

Schoenbrodt, L., Saal, L.K., & *Chaney, P. (2021, June). Mid Atlantic ADA Webinar Small Workshop Series. Online

Schoenbrodt, L., Saal, L. K., & *SAE TBD (2021, July). Learning to LEAD: Training law enforcement to interact with individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Poster Session at 2020 AJCU Justice in Jesuit Higher Education Conference, Georgetown University, Washington D.C./Online

*Self-Advocate Educator Presenter
**Training Partner Presenter

2. Journal Articles

Schoenbrodt, L., & Saal L. K. (2021). LEADing the Way: Perceptions of Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs) for law enforcement. *Global Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities*, *7*(4), 1-4. https://juniperpublishers.com/gjidd/pdf/GJIDD.MS.ID.555718.pdf

Schoenbrodt, L. (2020). Improv to Empower People With Disabilities—and Train First Responders. The ASHA LEADER. https://doi.org/10.1044/leader.LML.25042020.28

E. LEAD Model Outcomes

In order to assess the effectiveness of the LEAD Program Model in improving outcomes, five measures were used to attempt to conduct a pre-post implementation evaluation.

First, to assess outcomes for first responder trainees, initial data was collected from two rounds of PGCC Municipal Law Enforcement Officer Training and Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service using two quantitative instruments: *The Interactions with Disabled Persons Scale* and the *Interpersonal Reactivity Index*. A third data source, a questionnaire, was also distributed to all first responder participants in order to gather qualitative feedback on the training and solicit additional training needs. Unfortunately, because of Baltimore City's implementation of new training curriculum as a result of the consent decree, pre-data could not be gathered. Following the implementation of the LEAD Program Model, the participating trainees across all three partnerships were assessed utilizing the same three tools.

Second, to assess outcomes for self-advocate educators two measures were initially given – the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* and the *Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Functioning*. Each

were administered to eighteen (18) SAE participants in the pre-LEAD condition. After further analysis, only the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* was deemed appropriate for post assessment. However, SAEs were also provided an exit survey and questionnaire in the post-Lead condition. Where necessary, follow up interviews were used to complete the exit survey and questionnaire as well as gauge the SAEs perceptions of their role in and effectiveness of the LEAD program.

For Law Enforcement participants, data was collected from a total of fifty-nine (59) trainees in the Pre-LEAD Condition and one hundred thirteen (113) trainees in the Post-LEAD Condition. Because some trainees did not complete all components of the quantitative instruments, incomplete data was removed from the quantitative dataset. **Because BPD data could not be collected in the pre-condition, the post-data does not come from an equivalent sample to the pre-condition**. For Fire and Rescue Service, data was collected from forty (40) participants in the pre-LEAD condition and twenty-seven (27) participants in the post-LEAD condition. Response rate for both law enforcement and fire and rescue service participants fell significantly from the previous grant year. Unfortunately, the response rate for law enforcement was only 50% and Fire and Rescue Service was 16%. This low response rate was due, in large part, to the shift to online evaluation during the COVID-19 pandemic transition to online training.

Therefore, quantitative assessments were not inferentially statistically compared (across the pre-post conditions) as planned. Instead, given the challenges with data collection and subsequent concerns with power and validity, the quantitative assessments were descriptively statistically analyzed. The qualitative data for both groups (pre/post LEAD condition) was analyzed using the inductive data coding process of the *constant comparative method* (Glaser & Strauss, 1965). Further analysis and results from each of the measures are described independently below.

1. Results from the Interactions with Disabled Persons Scale

The Interactions with Disabled Persons Scale (Gething & Wheeler, 1992) is an instrument designed to measure attitudes towards people with disabilities. Respondents indicate their level of agreement with prompts such as "I feel ignorant about people with disabilities," and "I am aware of the problems that people with disabilities face." Each response is scored and summed. For the Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale, the higher the score, the higher the respondent's self-reported level of discomfort in social interactions with people with disabilities.

Table 3. Law Enforcement Training Descriptive Statistics

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**58**	Total Number	**113**
Minimum	**33**	Minimum	**39**
Maximum	**83**	Maximum	**116**
Range	**50**	Range	**77**
Mean	**58.44**	Mean	**63.53**

Median	**58**	Median	**63**
Mode	**67**	Mode	**59, 63**
Sum of Squares	**5698.34**	Sum of Squares	**14606.14**
Variance	**99.97**	Variance	**130.41**
Standard Deviation	**9.99**	Standard Deviation	**11.41**
Quartiles	**Q_1 --> 50** **Q_2 --> 58** **Q_3 --> 66**	Quartiles	**Q_1 -->57** **Q_2 -->63** **Q_3 --> 70**

Table 4. Fire and Rescue Service Training Descriptive Statistics

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**39**	Total Number	**26**
Minimum	**54**	Minimum	**23**
Maximum	**93**	Maximum	**84**
Range	**39**	Range	**61**
Mean	**67.08**	Mean	**63.80**
Median	**66**	Median	**64.5**
Mode	**66, 64**	Mode	**57, 73, 65, 60, 64**
Sum of Squares	**2300.76**	Sum of Squares	**3836.03**
Variance	**60.54**	Variance	**153.44**
Standard Deviation	**7.78**	Standard Deviation	**12.39**
Quartiles	**Q_1 -->62** **Q_2 -->66** **Q_3 --> 71**	Quartiles	**Q_1 -->58** **Q_2 -->64.5** **Q_3 -->73**

Analysis

The two samples from law enforcement's Interactions with Disabled Persons Scale have very little in common. The pre-LEAD condition for law enforcement consists only of PGCC Municipal Law Enforcement Officer Training which were conducted face-to-face. The post-LEAD condition consists of both PGCC Municipal Law Enforcement Officer Training and Baltimore Police Department academy training in both face-to-face and online formats.

As a result of significant sample difference for law enforcement, we cannot provide comparison data in the pre/post condition. However, we recommend that this data collection continue in the future iterations of the LEAD model so that a longitudinal analysis of the program's effectiveness

(across both formats) can be identified. In order to further test the model using the data collected, we recommend collecting and analyzing a control set of data from other departments in Maryland who have not completed the LEAD Model training.

Further, we were not able to collect an adequate sample (power) to complete an inferential analysis of Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services responses. However, given the sample equivalence, the 1.5-point mean difference across the pre-post condition holds promise for the efficacy of the model. Participants reported *higher levels of comfort in social interactions with people with disabilities post training* when compared to the training group who did not yet receive the LEAD training.

2. Results from the Interpersonal Reactivity Index

The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983) is a measure of dispositional empathy that takes as its starting point the notion that empathy consists of a set of separate but related constructs. The instrument contains four seven-item subscales, each tapping a separate facet of empathy. For the purposes of this research, we used two of the subscales: the perspective taking subscale and the empathic concern subscale. The perspective taking (PT) scale measures the reported tendency to spontaneously adopt the psychological point of view of others in everyday life and includes prompts such as "I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective." The empathic concern (EC) scale assesses the tendency to experience feelings of sympathy and compassion for unfortunate others and includes prompts such as "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me." For the Interpersonal Reactivity Index, the higher the score on a subscale, the higher the respondent's reactivity to that component of empathy.

Table 5. Law Enforcement Training Descriptive Statistics - Perspective Taking Scale

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**86**	Total Number	**112**
Minimum	**3**	Minimum	**8**
Maximum	**37**	Maximum	**23**
Range	**34**	Range	**15**
Mean	**21.84**	Mean	**15.42**
Median	**23**	Median	**15**
Mode	**24, 26**	Mode	**16**
Sum of Squares	**2281.72**	Sum of Squares	**907.27**
Variance	**26.84**	Variance	**8.17**
Standard Deviation	**5.18**	Standard Deviation	**2.86**

Quartiles	**Q_1 -->18** **Q_2 -->23** **Q_3 --> 26**	Quartiles	**Q_1 -->13** **Q_2 -->15** **Q_3 --> 17**

Table 6. Law Enforcement Training Descriptive Statistics - Empathic Concern Scale

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**86**	Total Number	**112**
Minimum	**7**	Minimum	**6**
Maximum	**36**	Maximum	**21**
Range	**29**	Range	**15**
Mean	**21.77**	Mean	**14.92**
Median	**22**	Median	**15**
Mode	**28, 25**	Mode	**17**
Sum of Squares	**2073.35**	Sum of Squares	**830.27**
Variance	**24.29**	Variance	**7.48**
Standard Deviation	**4.94**	Standard Deviation	**2.73**
Quartiles	**Q_1 -->19** **Q_2 -->22** **Q_3 --> 25**	Quartiles	**Q_1 -->13** **Q_2 -->15** **Q_3 --> 17**

Table 7. Fire and Rescue Service Training Statistics - Perspective Taking Scale

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**40**	Total Number	**23**
Minimum	**7**	Minimum	**3**
Maximum	**22**	Maximum	**36**
Range	**15**	Range	**33**
Mean	**16.58**	Mean	**15.82**
Median	**17**	Median	**16**
Mode	**16**	Mode	**17**
Sum of Squares	**431.77**	Sum of Squares	**777.30**
Variance	**11.07**	Variance	**35.33**
Standard Deviation	**3.33**	Standard Deviation	**5.44**
Quartiles		Quartiles	

	Q_1 -->15.5 **Q_2 -->17** **Q_3 --> 18.5**		**Q_1 -->14** **Q_2 -->16** **Q_3 --> 18**

Table 8. Fire and Rescue Service Training Statistics - Empathic Concern Scale

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**40**	Total Number	**24**
Minimum	**8**	Minimum	**7**
Maximum	**20**	Maximum	**24**
Range	**12**	Range	**17**
Mean	**14.18**	Mean	**14.83**
Median	**14**	Median	**15**
Mode	**14**	Mode	**15**
Sum of Squares	**193.78**	Sum of Squares	**273.33**
Variance	**4.97**	Variance	**11.88**
Standard Deviation	**2.23**	Standard Deviation	**3.45**
Quartiles **Q_1 -->13** **Q_2 -->14** **Q_3 --> 16**		Quartiles **Q_1 --> 14** **Q_2 --> 15** **Q_3 --> 16**	

Analysis

The two samples from law enforcement's perspective taking and empathic concern scales have very little in common. The pre-LEAD condition for law enforcement consists only of PGCC Municipal Law Enforcement Officer Training which were conducted face-to-face. The post-LEAD condition consists of both PGCC Municipal Law Enforcement Officer Training and Baltimore Policy Department academy training in both face-to-face and online formats.

As a result of significant sample difference for law enforcement, we cannot provide comparison data in the pre/post condition. However, we recommend that this data collection continue in the future iterations of the LEAD model so that a longitudinal analysis of the program's effectiveness (across both formats) can be identified. In order to further test the model using the data collected, we recommend collecting and analyzing a control set of data from other departments in Maryland who have not completed the LEAD Model training.

Further, we were not able to collect an adequate sample (power) to complete an inferential analysis of Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services responses. However, given the sample

equivalence, we did note a less than one point mean difference across the pre-post conditions of the scale. Participants reported *slightly lower levels of perspective taking and slightly higher levels of empathic concern* when compared to the training group who did not yet receive the LEAD training.

3. Results from the Qualitative Questionnaire for Trainees

The qualitative questionnaire contained three open-ended response questions and sought to gain insights from the trainees on their learning as well as their perceptions of opportunities to further develop the LEAD curriculum. Each participant across the pre/post LEAD conditions responded to three questions, "What did you learn from the ID/DD training?," "What questions do you still have after the ID/DD training?," and "What are areas from the training that you would like to have an opportunity to practice/simulate? Or other Comments?" Finally, this year, as a result of the shift in training format to online, we also asked "How was your experience role-playing/ scenario-based training online?" in our newly created online questionnaire in order to identify strengths and areas for growth in the new online delivery method.

For this dataset, we only analyzed the post-condition using the inductive data coding process of the *constant comparative method* (Glaser & Strauss, 1965) and themes and corresponding exemplars are described below.

a) Law Enforcement Themes & Exemplars

On Learning – Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, trainees noted that they expanded their understanding on: (1) the various ID/DDs and presentations of people with disabilities, (2) how to better communicate with people with disabilities in calls for service, including crisis, and the (3) rights of people with disabilities.

Exemplars of Learning Theme 1:

- *"I learned that there are many types of disabilities way more than I thought."*
- *"I learned to recognize the characteristics of ID/DD."*
- *"I learned that not everyone who has disabilities shows they have them."*
- *"You can't always judge a book by its cover."*

Exemplars of Learning Theme 2:

- *"It can be hard to communicate with someone with a disability, take your time and be patient."*
- *"I learned to just slow down and take as much time as you need to get the best results."*
- *"Always be respectful and remember the safe and understood methods."*
- *"Communication is key, no matter how you do it."*

- *"The twenty second rule, you need to take time to communicate with people and be a better listener."*
- *"Getting at comfortable level when conducting an interview."*
- *"There are different styles of resolving the same situation. Understand who you are speaking with and make them feel heard."*

Exemplars of Learning Theme 3:

- *"A disability doesn't hinder someone; you have to learn to adapt."*
- *"I learned more about ADA."*
- *"They are no different than other people, but I learned what an officer can do to improve."*
- *"People with disabilities have the same issues as the rest of us, but people with IDD may* need *more attention than others."*
- *"They are people first. They have a strong sense of self and work well within themselves."*

On Outstanding Questions **–** Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, trainees noted that they would like more information on: (1) how to work with individuals who are nonverbal, local resources and supports, and (2) how to differentiate between working with a child and adult with disabilities.

On Requests for Practice Opportunities **-** Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, trainees noted that they would like more practice opportunities on: (1) working with individuals with comorbidities like addiction and other mental health disorders who may be violent or resistant towards an officer, and (2) more opportunities to work with people who are non-verbal or non-responsive.

On Online Scenario-based Training Shift - Post online LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, we asked an additional question about their experiences with the online training. Trainees responded that while they hoped to have more face-to-face interactions in the future, that the online role play and feedback from the self-advocate educators aided in their understanding and development.

Exemplars Included:

- *"It was great and informative."*
- *"It was a great experience to get to work with individuals with disabilities and use strategies learned to aid in their call for service."*
- *"The Role-playing/ scenarios were great! while I only observed I did feel as if I was about to learn a lot about how all of the knowledge can be applied and how it really*

plays out. I believe the greatest input was the actors and their honest responses to the officers."

- *"I feel that it went very well and made us understand these circumstances much more."*
- *"I wish it was more hands on, in person, but was a great experience to have."*
- *"Although limited, this was an excellent way to view the interaction."*
- *"I feel it got the point across of how we are supposed to handle things, the role players did an amazing job."*
- *"Amazing. Made me better understand how to handle myself and how their disability doesn't make them different than everyone else."*
- *"I enjoyed it very much. The role playing and discussion helped me get a better understanding. Having Elena's input also helped in what she saw or thought we need to do better."*

b) Fire and Rescue Themes & Exemplars

On Learning – Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, trainees noted that they expanded their understanding on: (1) the various ID/DDs and presentations of people with disabilities, (2) how to better communicate with people with disabilities in calls for service, including crisis, and the (3) comorbidities of people with disabilities and how these can impact calls for service.

- *"I learned about the multiple forms of disabilities."*
- *"Everyone's disabilities and coping abilities are different & unique to the individual."*
- *"I learned the more specific nature of specific disabilities."*
- *"It is important on how to approach. Also, make sure [the provider] the acknowledges the person."*
- *"Compassion and patience is key."*
- *"We are all the same. We just need to learn to adjust to different levels of needs."*
- *"Twenty second rule, comorbid factors, and overstimulation."*
- *"Be a good listener and go at a slow pace."*
- *"Give a person with IDD at least 20 seconds to respond to a question."*
- *"Always go to the person first, even if you know they are not able to speak to you."*
- *"I learned that people with IDD should be spoken to directly and they may have trouble giving information right away."*
- *"Person first."*
- *"I learned that people with IDD often keep a book of record to include diagnoses and medications."*
- *"I learned that people with IDD may also have vision problems."*
- *"Don't assume a low or high level of function. Take time to observe and read the patient from there."*
- *"Wide spectrum of pathologies."*
- *"That there are different levels. You have to assess each person to determine your level of evaluation and interaction."*

On Outstanding Questions – Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, included wanting more information on: (1) special considerations around consent and transport of people with ID/DD, (2) how to support family members or care givers who may also be with the patient, (3) very upset, violent, or fleeing patients and/or trauma assessment considerations for people with ID/DD, and (4) additional local resources for working with people with ID/DD.

On Requests for Practice Opportunities - Post LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, providers wanted more practice on (1) treating and conducting assessments with patients who may be violent or non-verbal, and (2) a situation involving conflict between what patient with ID/DD wants and what the caregiver wants.

On online scenario-based training shift **-** Post online LEAD training, following the mandated ID/DD training including the SAEs, we asked an additional question about their experiences with the online training. Trainees responded that the online role play and feedback from the self-advocate educators aided in their understanding and development. Fire and rescue providers didn't report limitations of the online environment. However, it should be noted that they were each on their own device at their own home – unlike law enforcement trainees.

Exemplars Included:

- *"I think it went very well."*
- *"Excellent… thank you so much for participating… Having out patient (Chris) actually role playing for us made a huge difference in the scenario and putting myself in the reality of attending to an IDD person that has called 911… please thank Chris… he's a really good actor, it's not easy to do!!"*
- *"Very realistic for an online environment."*
- *"It was awesome I liked that the PT was in a setting he's used to rather than the awkwardness of a classroom."*
- *"Thoroughly enjoyed watching the scenario."*
- *"Great visual. Even for someone who is higher functioning, we need to alter our approach."*
- *"I thoroughly enjoyed my time with the team. Please come back for ALL members of the MCFRS-ALS and BLS!!"*

4. Results from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs)

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) is the instrument most commonly used to measure self-esteem. The instrument has been used across several disciplines including psychology, sociology, education, and others and has verified equivalent stability in many cultures. The 10-item scale that measures global self-worth by measuring both positive and negative feelings about the self and includes items such as, "I feel that I have a number of good qualities." All items are answered using a 4-point Likert scale format ranging from strongly

agree (4) to strongly disagree (1). Based on the recent research of Park and Park (2019), the validity and reliability of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for use with individuals with ID/DD was verified. This scale can be regarded as a useful tool for evaluating the level of self-esteem of individuals with ID. Scores between 25 and 35 are within normal range; scores below 25 suggest low self-esteem.

Table 9. Self-Advocate Educators' Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale Statistics

Pre-LEAD Condition		**Post-LEAD Condition**	
Total Number	**16**	Total Number	**14**
Minimum	**20**	Minimum	**26**
Maximum	**40**	Maximum	**40**
Range	**20**	Range	**14**
Mean	**29.44**	Mean	**33.93**
Median	**29**	Median	**34**
Mode	**25**	Mode	**40, 34, 32, 38**
Sum of Squares	**415.94**	Sum of Squares	**274.93**
Variance	**27.72**	Variance	**21.15**
Standard Deviation	**5.27**	Standard Deviation	**4.60**
Quartiles	**Q_1 -->25** **Q_2 -->29** **Q_3 -->32.5**	Quartiles	**Q_1 --> 32** **Q_2 --> 34** **Q_3 --> 38**

Analysis

In the pre-LEAD condition, we were able to survey sixteen (16) SAEs and in the post-LEAD condition we have surveyed fourteen (14) so far using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. PIs are still making every attempt to secure the last two post-report to complete the dataset. Due to low sample size, we were not able to collect an adequate sample (power) to complete an inferential analysis of SAE responses for this iteration of the contract. Therefore, we completed a descriptive analysis of the pre-post condition. SAE participants reported *higher levels of self-esteem* in the post-LEAD condition by **4.49 points** with quartile 1 (Q_1) increasing from twenty-five (25) to thirty-two (32) points. While we cannot yet speak to statistical significance, this initial result is very positive. When triangulated with the frequent references to confidence and self-esteem in the questionnaire below, these initial findings are supported. However, we recommend that this data collection continue in the future iterations of the LEAD model so that an inferential analysis of SAE self-esteem pre/post program participation can be analyzed.

5. Results from the Survey and Qualitative Questionnaire for Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs)

Following participation in the LEAD program, we asked all participating self-advocate educators, 18 in total, to fill out a survey and qualitative questionnaire adapted from the Impact Survey of Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council. We submitted these surveys to all SAEs via email. After submission, the PIs learned that several SAEs did not have a functioning computer but were navigating the web through phone and tablets which did not include editing capabilities and/or adaptive word processing functions. Where notified of technical or technological difficulties, the PIs called the Self-Advocate Educators (SAEs) to conduct the survey and questionnaire by phone. We have complete responses from fourteen (14) SAEs. We are still awaiting responses from four SAEs. PIs are still making every attempt to secure the last four post-report to complete the dataset. The results of the questionnaire and surveys are the tables that follow.

Table 10. Demographic and Personal Data

Prompt	**Answer**
I am a person with a disability.	Yes (14) No (0)
I am a family member of a person with a disability.	Yes (3) No (11)
I am a professional or other	Yes (1) No (13)
I live in one of these counties or areas.	Howard (4) Anne Arundel (6) Baltimore City (1) Baltimore County (2) Prince George (1) SAEs <u>not yet responding</u> live in: Howard (1) Montgomery (1) Prince George (1) Anne Arundel (1)
I am…(check all that apply)	White (10) Asian (1) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (1) Hispanic (3) Black or African American (2) Two or more races (1)
I am… (male, female, other)	Male (7) Female (7) Other (0)

Table 11. SAE Responses to LEAD Model Training

Prompt	Answer
As a result of this training, I have increased my advocacy skills and abilities.	Yes (13) No (1)
As a result of this training, I am better able to say what I want/say what is important to me.	Yes (13) No (1)
As a result of this training, I am now participating in advocacy activities.	Yes (14) No (0)
As a result of this training, I am serving on a cross-disability coalition, policy board, advisory board, or other leadership position that makes decisions for others.	Yes (8) No (6)
I am satisfied with this training.	Yes (14) No (0)
This training has had a positive impact on the lives of people with developmental disabilities or family members.	Yes (14) No (0)

Table 12. SAE Qualitative Responses to LEAD Model Training

Q1. What did you like best about this training?

- I like being with all the people who help me practice and get better.
- I made new friends.
- I liked how polite and professional everyone was and how well-composed the learning criteria was for both the police AND the SAE's.
- Training officers how to work with people with disabilities and learning how to communicate with them.
- Teaching police officers on how to understand a person with a disability and being able to see what we were teaching was really going to make a difference.
- I liked the role play.
- Although the teachings that I observe [at police academies] are very repetitive, it's still very beneficial to see how officers observe the teaching that Ms. Lisa and Ms. Leah have been showing to help the police officers.
- I get to participate in role playing scenarios and communicate with police officers.
- Meeting new people and working with police recruits.
- I loved the role playing!
- Learning how to better deal with people with developmental disabilities.
- I made new friends and got involved more with Best Buddies of Maryland.
- It helps me to make friends with police officers and trust them.

Q2. As a result of your role as a Self-Advocate Educator, describe how you plan to or are using what you have learned.

- I tell people how I feel more now.
- It helped me talk to my group home staff.
- I tell people how I feel so they learn to know me and can help me do what I want.
- I'm going to be the one to approach to officers on discussing the person committing the crimes disability records and the situation and why it happens the first place.
- I plan to remember the things I learned about being able to express my emotions and communicate with others. That way, I can apply what I learned to a real encounter with law enforcement officials, if need [hopefully not] be.
- How to take action by your responsibilities immediately and call before the unexpected situation happens.
- Using the knowledge that I've gained from the program, I can teach future officers to treat a person who has a disability fairly and justly. I continue to use my voice to advocate for individuals with disabilities.
- I plan to teach other people with autism how to utilize public transportation.
- Not sure.
- I'm just in the beginning of learning more about my role as a self-advocate educator.
- Encourage other states to adopt such trainings and that they be mandatory for current and rookie police and EMS.
- I had to learn that when someone has a disability that they need to take time to listen and learn from one another.
- I have learned how important it is to stay calm when there is an emergency.

Q3. In your role as a Self-Advocate Educator, what skills/abilities did you improve as a result of this training?

- I feel better about speaking up for myself.
- To talk to people better.
- Gaining self-esteem and having the courage to speak up for myself and others like me who are unable to advocate for themselves.
- I have new friends who are policemen and EMS helpers. I learned I can talk to them if I have a problem and need help.
- I improved my ability to convey emotions, speak more articulately and maintain a smoother more authentic conversation with the police in an emergency situation. Given the role-playing experience, I would also like to think these skills can be applied to other conversations in my life.
- To communicate better with officers and calling for help in action.

- I've improved on enthusiasm as I believe I have to keep increasing to get better and challenging officers as well. I also improved on knowing when to shut the door and using the same techniques that I've been using since the first time I did my role play.
- I have improved my eloquence, creative, and acting skills.
- Speaking up for myself.
- Remaining calm when dealing with people with disabilities.
- Improved my role-playing skills and how to not so quickly or easily have it made known that I have an ID.
- I think I improved my skills to be myself and accept me for my disabilities.
- Improved my confidence.

Q4. In your role as a Self-Advocate Educator, what knowledge or skills did you teach to first responders?

- I would like to believe that the role of an SAE is to provide more genuine insight and feedback on how people with disabilities like to be spoken to and how they can interpret certain aspects of a law enforcement official's behavior. Ideally, it never hurts to learn about patience as well, but for the sake of promptly responding to an emergency situation, the ability to interpret and communicate with people who have IDD's would greatly help serve ALL members of their community.
- Even if a person who has a disability may look different and act different, they are still human beings and should be treated like everyone else. Sometimes you just need to communicate in different ways so we can understand each other.
- I taught first responders that it's not going to be always the person exposing their disabilities because eventually they will know the cues of the person with disabilities not asking them.
- How to listen to me. How to think outside the box.
- How to feel comfortable talking to someone with Downs.
- They listen to me to know what I'm saying and what my problem is.
- They don't yell or get rough with me – they get down and make me feel like a friend.
- They learned that I can have a bad hurt like other people.
- Using props, sign language, and assistive augmentative communication.
- I taught the first responders that I am a person with autism which means that I have a developmental disorder characterized by difficulties with social interaction and communication and by restricted behavior.
- Helped show them practice.
- Patience, self-control, and considerence.
- People with ID/DDs and first responders should always feel safe, valued, and understood in their communities.
- They learned more about my skills that I have and what I do.
- I taught them to be confident.

Table 13. Brief Quotes Which May Be Shared Publicly

Name/Contact Info	Quote
Dan Tucholski	"Think outside the box. We think and feel the same as everyone else but we are "wired differently.""
Kayla Grange (410) 805-2785	"Always learn from past mistakes to correct them in the future."
Chris Schoenbrodt schoenbrodts3@gmail.com	**"**Be my friend."
Patrick Chaney 410-688-8576 pchaney6294@gmail.com	"Tough times last, Tough people outlast."
Alicia Gogue	"Communication works for those who work at it."
Jorge Tirigall	"We must promote the inclusion of people with autism no matter what kind of race and ethnicity they identify themselves with."
Sean Taneyhill	"Thank you for all your valuable time."
Elaina Camacho 443-618-8239	"Nothing is IMPOSSIBLE. The word itself says I'm Possible!"
Raven	"Thank you for choosing me to do this police training! This is important because some police don't take the time to listen to people with disabilities. This training helps both police and people with disabilities to be safe."

Analysis

For this dataset, we analyzed the responses using thematic analysis (Daly, Kellenhear, & Gliksman, 1997) identifying themes using careful reading and deductive a priori codes (Crabtreee & Miller, 1999). We utilized the (yes/no) prompts outlined in **Table 11. SAE Responses to LEAD Model Training** as initial codes and then collapsed these codes into themes and findings. Two themes emerged: 1) ***Positive impact of training*** - SAEs largely felt that the training had a positive impact on both first responders and the lives of people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities; and 2) ***Increased self-efficacy*** - SAEs largely felt that they improved their self-esteem communication, advocacy skills, and participation in advocacy activities. The one limitation of the findings, as mentioned prior, was that the PIs experienced challenges with online data collection – both technologically as well as with the clarity of the questions. Without opportunities to follow up, in person or by phone, SAEs were left to interpret questions which may have been vague or uncertain for them. For example, the use of "training" in the questions was interpreted by some to mean law-enforcement trainings versus LEAD model trainings. These questionnaires will need to be clarified in the future for online use.

IV. BUDGET

Monies were used per the submitted budget. One deviation from the original submission included changes in transportation. Due to COVID-19, monies in the transportation line were no longer needed**.** As a result, Dr. Schoenbrodt contacted MDOD to inquire if this money could be used for a continuation of services to Montgomery County EMS - particularly paying additional SAE stipends. No additional funds beyond the contract were paid to either PI. **As the PIs believe in the mission of the Ethan Saylor Alliance and LEAD Model, beyond the contract deliverables, they created an entirely new structure for training (online) as well as conducted the additional four (4) first responder and seventeen (17) LEAD model SAE training sessions pro bono.**

Further, as outlined in the proposal, the generous donation from the Myers Family in memory of their son, Eric Davis Myers, allowed for additional support of the grant in the areas of matching funds for SAE stipends for training and any additional materials needed. Invoice dates and amounts are noted in the table below.

Table 14. Invoice Dates and Amounts

Date	Invoice Number	Amount
10/01/2019 – 05/31/2020	152001012 - 01	$ 28,400.29
06/01/2020 – 11/30/2020	152001012 – 02	$27, 867.67
12/1/2020 – 02/21/2021	152001012 - 03	$19,255.44
03/01/2020 – 06/30/2021	152001012 - 04	$21,450.78

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the LEAD Program Evaluation and revised model, there are several recommendations for continuous program improvement.

A. Expand/revise the LEAD Program to New Audiences of First Responders Across Delivery Formats (Online and Face-to-Face).

- Revise training description and documents to correspond to online training options.
- Revise job description for video-conferencing skills.
- Build in purchasing equipment for SAEs (headsets, small laptops/tablets with keyboards, hot spots, or internet reimbursement**)** for online participation and communication.

- Change/adapt practice model to mimic format of requested first responder training.
- Develop more first responder scenarios which represent frequent calls by region starting with a non-verbal scenario.

Based on this year's contract, we believe a revision in the model logistics is necessary for intentional flexibility built into the model (online or face-to-face) as the model expands to new regions in Maryland.

B. Plan for Consistency

- Create plan for continuous programming for agencies who have undergone training in online or face-to-face formats for both model and SAE job maintenance.
- Plan for monthly small group training online for effective and maintenance of skills.
- Plan for quarterly whole group face-to-face training for effective job performance and maintenance of skills.

Based on this year's contract, we believe more consistency and expectations for SAEs' participation in training sessions (online or face-to-face) can improve performance and could improve SAE retention over time.

C. Data Collection Revision

- Continue collect data across format and across instruments.
- To mitigate the effects of pre/post testing problems in an online environment, use treatment/control design to investigate inferential significance.

Based on this year's contract, we believe the data we were able to collect is valid and reliable. However, for long-term program evaluation, given data collection constraints, we believe it is necessary to find/solicit a control group, who has not received LEAD model training, and assess.