

## Appendix B: Problem-Oriented Policing

Problem-oriented policing is a method of integrating daily police practice with criminal justice theory and research methods in order to develop the best possible means for reducing crime and disorder. By using a problem-solving model, officers are encouraged to follow a step-by-step process that involves gathering information, analyzing findings, developing response strategies, and assessing the success of those responses.

The problem-solving framework is recognized under various names. While the SARA model (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment) is recognized internationally, CAPRA (Client, Acquire, Partnerships, Response, Assessment) is adhered to by the RCMP.

Overall, the problem-solving model aids officers in gaining a more thorough understanding of community safety concerns that, in turn, will guide the development of more targeted response strategies.

Problem-oriented policing:

- views individual incidents as symptoms of a broader problem
- customizes response strategies through focused attention and by drawing from a diverse pool of approaches
- uses internal and external (departmental and community) resources to their fullest extent, and
- promotes sustainable results wherever possible.

### Problems

Problem-oriented policing maintains a central focus on problems by identifying those that are substantive in nature. A substantive problem is identified through the clustering or grouping of incidents according to similar or recurring characteristics. Those characteristics may involve similar behaviours, certain persons, particular location/s, or specific times of the day. Grouping incidents allows police to identify patterns that, if left unchecked, tend to re-occur. By working with incident clusters, the process of designing more strategic and targeted responses begins to shape police practice.

Using a problem-oriented approach results in three major benefits: (1) the number of calls for service declines; (2) the ability of police to respond effectively to crime and disorder increases; and (3) the negative consequences from response-driven policing are reduced.

Problem identification focuses police work. It also ensures that valuable police resources are not spent working on issues that are more effectively dealt with through other agencies. For example, where social development issues, such as the need for adequate housing, inadequate skill development, and poor management of emotions present themselves as underlying causes of persistent criminal concerns, police work may involve

the development and facilitation of partnerships with social agencies (community services, school districts, etc.) to address long-term issues within multi-pronged response strategies. As first responders, police may play the lead role in addressing community safety concerns, while at other times police may promote safety by raising awareness through the sharing of information and facilitating networking opportunities. The extent to which problem-oriented policing is effective depends largely on the quality of partnerships that exist between the police and the community. This requires co-operation from the point of initial discovery through to the final assessment of the project.

Although there has been a shift toward adopting problem-oriented policing over the past decade, to date this approach has not been fully realized within the policing culture in Canada.

## Appendix C: Key Elements of Problem-Oriented Policing

1. A problem is the basic unit of police work, rather than an individual crime, a case, a call or an incident. A problem is a group or pattern of crimes, cases, calls or incidents.
2. Addressing problems means more than providing quick fixes; it means dealing with preceding conditions that lead to crime and disorder.
3. Police officers routinely and systematically investigate problems before trying to solve them, just as they routinely and systematically investigate crimes before making an arrest. Individual officers and the department as a whole develop routines and systems for investigating problems.
4. The investigation of a problem is thorough even though it may not be complicated. This principle is as true for problem investigation as it is for criminal investigation.
5. Problems are described accurately and then broken down into specific components. Problems are often different from how they appear at first glance.
6. To provide the best response to a problem, it is important to first understand how a problem has been handled in the past and to be conscious of its limitations before improving the response.
7. Initially all possible responses to a problem should be considered to ensure that an effective solution will not be over-looked. This may necessitate the possibility of an arrest.
8. Police proactively solve problems rather than merely react to the harmful consequences of the problem.
9. The police department encourages police officers and detectives to participate in important decision-making opportunities, while holding them accountable for the results.
10. Responses are evaluated so that results can be shared with other police officers and to facilitate a process where departments can learn about what works and what does not work.

"Key Elements of Problem-Oriented Policing" was developed by Sgt. Gravel of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police adapted from Gravel, S. (1997), *Problem-Oriented Policing*, Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service.

## Appendix D: Problem Analysis Guide

To understand a problem fully, the analyst must find and examine information on various aspects of the problem. As a rule of thumb, three basic areas of an incident should be uncovered:

1. Learn about the **ACTORS** involved in the incident. This includes offenders, victims, and others (third parties) who witnessed the incident or were directly involved in some other way.
2. Understanding the **INCIDENT** requires knowing the sequence of events, the social and physical context surrounding the events, and the immediate effect of those events.
3. The community's **RESPONSES** to the problems might affect the actors and lead to further problems. Consider the degree to which the community, including its institutions, views the issue.

The most important types of information can be organized in a list. The analyst can use this list to identify the type of information that has the most bearing on the problem. The analyst can then determine where more detailed information can be found for collection.

### 1. Actors

Most often, a problem requires at least two actors: an offender and a victim. At times, it can be difficult to distinguish between them. This can become confusing in situations involving victimless crimes, offences that are committed between friends and relatives, or situations that involve business partners and their transactions. Third parties may be involved as witnesses or through various associations with individuals. Depending on the nature of the problem, analysts may require a variety of data sources. Some sources of data are described below. (Note: these will already be familiar with officers).

#### Offenders

##### 1. Identifiers

- a. Name
- b. Address
- c. Driver license number
- d. Phone number

##### 2. Physical description

## APPENDIX C: PROBLEM ANALYSIS GUIDE

- a. Age
- b. Race
- c. Sex
- d. Height
- e. Weight
- f. Hair colour
- g. Facial hair
- h. Eye colour
- i. Distinctive marks
  - i. Tattoos
  - ii. Scars
  - iii. Right-/Left-handed
  - iv. Physical disabilities
- j. Blood type
- k. Finger/footprints
- l. Speech pattern/accents
- m. Clothing
- n. Perfume or cologne

### 3. Lifestyle

- a. Financial status
  - i. Sources of income
    - Legitimate
    - Illegitimate
  - ii. Real and other property owned
  - iii. Credit
- b. Friends and associates
  - i. Marital status
  - ii. Living situation
  - iii. Friends
  - iv. Criminal associates
  - v. Gang and criminal organizational affiliations
  - vi. Prior residences
  - vii. Location of family and friends
  - viii. Sexual preferences
- c. Leisure activities
  - i. Hobbies
  - ii. Religious preferences
  - iii. Background
- d. Ever a victim

### 4. Education and employment history

- a. Schooling/Training
  - i. Special skills

- ii. Schools attended/Location
- b. Employment
  - i. Present employer/Location
  - ii. Previous employer/Location
  - iii. Occupation
- c. Military record
  - i. Active/inactive/reserve
  - ii. Type of discharge
  - iii. Activities in service

**5. Medical history**

- a. Physical health
  - i. Physical disabilities
  - ii. Hospitalization record
- b. Substance use/Abuse
  - i. Type of substance
  - ii. Frequency of use
  - iii. Behaviour under influence
  - iv. Location (where substance bought/used)
  - v. Allergies
- c. Mental health
  - i. Present status
  - ii. Residency/patient
  - iii. History

**6. Criminal history**

- a. Type of crimes
  - i. Trend in crimes
- b. Motive for crimes
  - i. Profit
  - ii. Revenge
  - iii. Anger
- c. Method of operation
  - i. Preferred MO
  - ii. Trend in MO
  - iii. Where learned MO
  - iv. One of several MOs
- d. Recorded criminal record
  - i. Number and crime type of prior arrests
  - ii. Existing warrants
  - iii. Crimes done on bail/parole/probation
  - iv. Jail and prison time
  - v. Behaviour in prison
  - vi. Current parole/probation
  - vii. Status and name of PO
- e. Probable future conduct
  - i. Prospects for rehabilitation

- ii. Prospects for deterrence

## Victims

### 1. Personal data

- a. Identification
- b. Description
  - i. Age
  - ii. Sex
  - iii. Race
  - iv. Height
  - v. Weight
  - vi. Medical history
  - vii. Present state of health
  - viii. Education/employment history
  - ix. Source of income
  - x. Criminal record

### 2. How involved

- a. Connection to incident
  - i. Witness/bystander
  - ii. Friend/relative of the victim
  - iii. Friend/relative of the offender
  - iv. Discoverer of the crime
- b. Relationship to victim
  - i. Family member
  - ii. Friend
  - iii. Neighbour
  - iv. Acquaintance
  - v. Stranger
- c. Relationship to offender
  - i. Family member
  - ii. Friend
  - iii. Neighbour
  - iv. Acquaintance
  - v. Stranger
- d. Effects of victimization
  - i. Stress
  - ii. Anxiety
  - iii. Inconvenience due to involvement in justice system
- e. Reported to police
  - i. Length of reporting delay
  - ii. Reason for delay
  - iii. Reason for reporting at all

### 3. Expectations for police actions

- a. Willingness to co-operate with police
- b. Willingness to prosecute
- c. Seeking referrals or support from police

## 2. Incidents

Although police are accustomed to describing an incident in simple terms, such as is listed in the criminal code, for example, a thorough description is more involved. In particular, consideration must be given to the full sequence of events leading up to and including the event itself, the social and physical environment that provide the context for these events, and the results of the actions taken by the offenders and victims.

### Sequence of events

#### 1. Target of act

- a. Person
- b. Property
- c. Exchange

#### 2. Events preceding act

- a. Crime part of other acts or end in itself
- b. Transactions involved
  - i. Legitimate business
  - ii. Illegal activities: fencing/loan sharks/etc.
- c. Victim/witness/offender precipitation
- d. Witnesses and others involved

#### 3. Event itself

- a. Intent of offender
- b. Actions by victim to avoid attack

#### 4. Type of tools used by offenders

- a. Attack buildings and things
- b. Attack people
  - i. Gun
  - ii. Knife
  - iii. Lead pipe
  - iv. Rope
  - v. Wrench
  - vi. Other

- c. Other instruments
  - i. Vehicles
  - ii. Police scanner
  - iii. Other

**5. Events following the act**

- a. Actions taken following the event
  - i. By offenders
  - ii. By victims
  - iii. By witnesses
  - iv. By other third parties

**Physical context**

**1. Chronology**

- a. Time of day
- b. Day of week
- c. Month
- d. Season
- e. Holiday or special event
- f. Cycle: business, pay schedules, etc.

**2. Location**

- a. Inside
- b. Outside
- c. Vehicle
  - i. Private auto
  - ii. Public transportation
  - iii. Type of vehicle
- d. Character of surroundings
  - i. Neighbourhood
  - ii. Residential
    - Single family
    - Condo
    - Apartment
  - Hotel
  - i. Commercial
    - Retail
    - Warehouse
  - i. Parking lot
  - ii. Industrial
  - iii. Deserted location
  - iv. Mixed land use

### 3. Access control

- a. Target hardening
  - i. Locks
  - ii. Window bars/jams
  - iii. Peepholes
  - iv. Light timers
  - v. Watchdogs
  - vi. Burglar alarms
  - vii. Safes
  - viii. Limitation of traffic flow (people/vehicles)
  - ix. Fences
- b. Symbolic barriers
  - i. Shrubs
  - ii. Trees
  - iii. Short fences
  - iv. Defined walkways

### 4. Surveillance

- a. Street and doorway lights
- b. Physical design
  - i. Positioning of windows
  - ii. Positioning of apartment building entrance
  - iii. Positioning of lobbies
  - iv. Placement of playgrounds
  - v. Placement of high-activity areas
  - vi. Size and state of common areas
  - vii. Closed-circuit television

## Social context

### 1. Likelihood of witnesses

- a. Street traffic
  - i. Pedestrians
  - ii. Vehicles
  - iii. Variation in activity between day and night
- b. Visibility of events to nearby buildings
- c. Characteristics of likely witnesses
  - i. Criminals
  - ii. Drug addicts
  - iii. Derelicts
  - iv. Law-abiding citizens

### 2. Probable actions of witness

- a. Neighbours able to identify strangers
- b. Frequency and intensity of interaction

- i. Amongst neighbours
- ii. Amongst friends
- iii. Amongst casual acquaintances
- iv. Amongst enemies
- c. Neighbourhood Watch active in area

### 3. Apparent attitude of residents toward neighbourhood

- a. Condition of residences
  - i. Yards and lawns
  - ii. Exterior maintenance
    - window
    - paint
  - iii. Common interior areas in apartments
- b. Condition of neighbourhood
  - i. Abandoned cars
  - ii. Trash
  - iii. Common exterior areas in apartments

## Immediate results of events

### 1. Harm done to victim

- a. Threat or intimidation
  - i. Weapon used or threatened
  - ii. Threats to break into home or business
  - iii. Injury threatened
  - iv. Short-/long-term stress and anxiety
- b. Injury
  - i. Extent of injury
  - ii. Medical care or hospitalization required
  - iii. Long-term debilitating effects of injury
- c. Property loss
  - i. Value of property stolen
  - ii. Value of damage
- d. Prospects for recovery
  - i. Covered by insurance
  - ii. Effects of insurance premiums
  - iii. Replacement of lost property possible
- e. Operation ID or other identifying marks

### 2. Legal issues

- a. Statutory category/legal definition
- b. Elements of proof required
  - i. Arrest
  - ii. Indictment

- iii. Conviction
- c. Potential penalties
  - i. Violation
  - ii. Misdemeanor
  - iii. Felony
- d. Previous court cases
  - i. New law
  - ii. Known track record

### 3. Gain to offender

- a. Property
- b. Revenge
- c. Gratification
- d. Status/recognition

## 3. Responses

All problems result in some form of community response; implicitly or explicitly. This occurs across a variety of levels, including government agencies, the media, and among individual citizens. Responses provide significant clues for understanding the problem. First, community responses prescribe the goals and objectives of the police, in a large part. Thus, community responses may help to determine the seriousness of a particular issue. Second, those responses have a direct affect on the problem itself.

### Community response

#### 1. Neighbourhood affected by the problem

- a. Perceptions of problem
  - i. Perceived amount of crime in neighbourhood
  - ii. Perceived handling of problem by police
  - iii. Perceptions of courts/other agencies
- b. Attitudes about problem
  - i. Fear level
  - ii. Acceptance of problem
  - iii. Perceived seriousness of problem
  - iv. Expectations of action by police
  - v. Expectations of action by courts
- c. Actions
  - i. Willingness to prevent further incidents
  - ii. Self-protection/avoidance
  - iii. Participation in Neighbourhood Watch
- d. Political clout

**2. City as a whole**

- a. Perceptions of problem
  - i. Know problem exists
  - ii. Perceived relevance of problem to their neighbourhood
- b. Attitudes about problem
  - i. Special vested interest
  - ii. Fear levels
  - iii. Expectations about actions by police
  - iv. Expectations about actions by courts
  - v. Responses to victim/suspect
  - vi. Attitudes toward press/media
  - vii. Feels responsible for incidents
  - viii. Outside immediate area
- c. Actions
  - i. Avoid areas perceived to be risky
  - ii. Willing to help solve problem

**3. Opinions of people outside city**

- a. Investors
- b. Commuters
- c. Shoppers
- d. Tourists
- e. Job seekers

**4. Community groups**

- a. Churches
- b. Civic associations
- c. Clubs
- d. Neighbourhood Watch

**Institutional response**

**1. Police**

- a. Prevailing attitudes
  - i. Seriousness of incidents
  - ii. Victims
  - iii. Perpetrators
  - iv. Departmental philosophy
  - v. Individual philosophy
- b. Workload
  - i. Perceived workload
  - ii. Actual workload
  - iii. Staffing levels

- iv. Contribution of this problem to overall workload
- c. Approach to problem
  - i. Procedures
  - ii. Previous work with victims and witnesses
  - iii. Past experience/previous approach to this problem
- d. Belief in effectiveness of approach
  - i. Approach
- e. Resources
  - i. Information systems
  - ii. Equipment
  - iii. Expertise
  - iv. Funding

## **2. Prosecution**

- a. Priorities
  - i. Special sections
  - ii. Case screening
- b. Procedures

## **3. Courts**

- a. How actors are treated
  - i. Victims
  - ii. Offenders
  - iii. Repeat victims/repeat offenders
- b. Readiness to incarcerate
- c. Procedures

## **4. Corrections**

- a. Space available
- b. Jail and prison conditions
- c. Parole procedures

## **5. Legislature**

- a. Knowledge of problem
- b. Willingness to deal with problem
  - i. Receptivity to change
- c. How voters affected

## **6. Preventive programs**

## **7. Mass media**

- a. Effects of news coverage on actors tendency to sensationalize violence
  - i. Public
  - ii. Victim

- iii. Offender
- b. Copycat crimes result
- c. Willingness to co-operate with justice agencies

**8. Business sector**

- a. Insurance
  - i. Contribution to problem
  - ii. Knowledge about problem
- b. Housing industry
- c. Business organizations

**9. Schools**

- a. Crime prevention programs
- b. Truancy
- c. Vandalism

**10. Medical**

- a. How victim/offender treated
- b. Willingness to co-operate with other interested parties

**11. Other social services**

- a. Public housing
- b. Mental health
- c. Welfare
- d. Planning
- e. Codes compliance and enforcement
- f. Fire
- g. Revenue
- h. Community development
- i. Other government agencies

**Seriousness of the problem**

**1. Public perceptions**

- a. How seriously regarded by public
- b. Why seriously regarded by public
- c. Publicity about the problem
- d. Community support and acceptance of present police actions

**2. Perceptions of problem by other agents**

- a. Crown Attorney's view and support

- b. Court cases on this problem
- c. Other enforcement agencies outside this jurisdiction
- d. Perception of city manager and other city agencies

**3. How came to police attention**

The Problem Analysis Checklist was developed for the Calgary Police Service and adapted from Brown, D., Jackson, T., King, D., Moe, R. & Rudd, R. (1991), *Calgary Police Service Operational Process: Emphasizing Problem-Solving as a Focus for Policing the Community*.

# Appendix E: Sample Problem-Oriented Policing Project Form

Officer(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Problem site  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Problem type (see attached list): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Problem location (see attached list): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Problem description: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Basis for problem awareness – Reviewed by Supervisor:**

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Observation/Knowledge |  |
| Radio calls           |  |
| Citizen request/calls |  |
| Routed letter(s)      |  |
| Supervisor            |  |
| Survey                |  |
| POP Coordinator       |  |
| Other agency referral |  |
| Agency:               |  |
| Other:                |  |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Signed:   |  |
| Date:     |  |
| Comments: |  |

**PLEASE DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE**

POP Coordinator approval: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Crime analysis files checked: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other related POP projects: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other related projects/files: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Project/Problem Types

1. Abandoned vehicles
2. Alarms
3. Animals
4. Arsons
5. Assaults
6. Auto thefts
7. Break and enter
8. By-law infraction(s)
9. Child abandonment
10. Child abuse
11. Condoms
12. Damage to auto
13. Dilapidated building(s)
14. Domestic dispute
15. Drugs
16. Drunk in public
17. Fighting
18. Fire code violations(s)
19. Fraud
20. Gambling
21. Gangs
22. Graffiti
23. Guns
24. Highway Traffic Act
25. Insecure building
26. Litter
27. Loitering
28. People with mental illness
29. Noise
30. Off-road vehicles
31. Panhandling
32. Parking violation
33. Phone calls
34. Property damage
35. Property theft
36. Property dispute
37. Prostitution
38. Robbery
39. Runaway
40. Shoplifting
41. Syringes/needles
42. Theft from auto
43. Theft
44. Threats
45. Traffic hazard

## APPENDIX D: SAMPLE PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING PROJECT FORM

46. Trespassing
47. Vagrancy
48. Vandalism
49. Weapons
50. Young offenders

### Location

1. Alley
2. Apartments
3. Bar
4. Business
5. College
6. Condo
7. Duplex
8. Field
9. Hotel
10. House
11. Intersection
12. Motel
13. Park
14. Parking lot
15. Recreation centre
16. Restaurant
17. School
18. Shopping centre
19. Street
20. University
21. Vacant lot
22. Vacant building
23. Vehicle

The Problem-Orienting Policing Project Form was adapted from Sgt. Gravel of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police (1997), *Problem-Oriented Policing*, Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service.

## Appendix F: Recommended Readings

### Books and articles

Brantingham, P.L., & Brantingham, P.J., Eds. (1991). *Environmental criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Bullock, K., & Tilley, N. (Eds.). (2003). *Crime Reduction and problem-oriented policing*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.

Crowe, T. (1994). *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Stoneham, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Garland, D., von Hirsch, A., & Wakefield, A. (2000). *Ethical and social perspectives on situational crime prevention*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Grant, D., & Toch, H. (2005). *Police as problem solvers* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kelling, G., & Coles, C. (1998). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*. Carmichael, CA: Touchstone Press.

Knutsson (Ed). *Problem-oriented policing: From innovation to mainstream*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Lab, S.P. (1997). *Crime prevention: Approaches, practice and evaluations* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Scott, M. (2000). *Problem-oriented policing: Reflections on the First 20 Years*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Waller, Irvin (2006). *Less law, more order: The truth about reducing crime*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group

### Websites

BC Centre for Safe Schools and Communities  
[www.bccssc.ca](http://www.bccssc.ca)

BC Crime Prevention Association

## APPENDIX E: RECOMMENDED READINGS

<http://www.bccpa.org/>

Brockville Police

<http://www.brockvillepolice.com/programs/AssetDevelopmentforYouth.htm>

Canadian Council on Social Development,

<http://www.ccsd.ca>

Center for Problem Oriented Policing

<http://www.popcenter.org/>

Crime Prevention through Social Development

<http://www.ccsd.ca/cpsd/ccsd/index.htm>

Design Centre for CPTED Vancouver: CPTED Crime Analysis

<http://www.designcentreforcpted.org/#CrimeAnalysis>

International CPTED Association

<http://www.cpted.net/>

National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS),

<http://www.psepc.gc.ca/prg/cp/index-en.asp>

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/>

Problem-Oriented Policing Network (POPNet)

<http://www.policeforum.org/perf/popNet.asp> .

U.K.'s Home Office of Crime Reduction

<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/cpindex.htm> .

U.S. Department of Justice, Problem-Oriented Policing

<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=15>

## Appendix G: Participant Questionnaire

1. In general, were these lessons useful for you?  
 Not useful at all     Somewhat useful     Very useful
  
2. If somewhat or very useful, which lesson/s were the **most** beneficial for you?  
*(Check all that apply)*  
 Lesson 1: Crime Reduction  
 Lesson 2: Introduction to Problem-Oriented Policing  
 Lesson 3A: SARA Problem Solving Model  
 Lesson 3B: CAPRA Problem Solving Model  
 Lesson 4: Crime Prevention Through Social Development  
 Lesson 5: Situational Crime Prevention I (Crime Triangle, Broken Windows)  
 Lesson 6: Situational Crime Prevention II (C.P.T.E.D.)  
 Supervisor Lesson: Characteristics of an Effective Problem Solving Supervisor
  
3. What aspect(s) of the training did you like? *(Check all that apply)*  
 Lesson format (12–15 minute vignettes)  
 Time-frame for delivery (briefings)  
 Content  
 Other (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. How did you find the length of the lessons?  
 Too Short     Adequate     Too Long
  
5. Do you think you will integrate information obtained from these training sessions in your daily practice?  
 No     Maybe     Yes
  
6. Have you received training on problem-solving before?  
 No     Yes
  
7. Was the instructor effective in presenting the lesson material?  
 Not very     Somewhat     Very
  
8. What could be done to improve the lesson series?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*(use reverse if necessary)*
  
9. Can you think of another topic area for including in this lesson plan series?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*(use reverse if necessary)*