



OHIO CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAM LAW ENFORCEMENT POLICY GUIDE

This guide was completed by staff at the Ohio Criminal Justice Coordinating Center of Excellence in cooperation with Ohio's CIT Coordinators and community partners.

© Northeast Ohio Medical University

For more information or to make inquiries, please contact us:

Email: cjccoe@neomed.edu

Phone: 330.325.6861



**CRIMINAL JUSTICE
COORDINATING CENTER
of EXCELLENCE**
A NEOMED CCoE

Table of Contents

Overview.....	2
Revisions.....	3
The Goals of Ohio CIT Programs.....	5
The Crisis Intervention Team Model.....	6
The Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs.....	6
Crisis Response Policy.....	7
Purpose Statement.....	7
Guiding Principle.....	8
Definitions.....	10
Crisis Intervention Team.....	13
Guidelines for Recognition.....	15
Engaging People in Crisis and Assessing Risk.....	17
Resolution Options.....	19
Reporting and Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets.....	21
Continuum of Care and Follow-Up Activities.....	22
Evaluation.....	23
Training.....	25
Emergency Hospitalization Policy.....	27
Introduction.....	27
Assessment.....	29
Emergency Hospitalization Process.....	31
Transports.....	33
Criminal Offenses.....	35
Juveniles.....	36
Other Policy Considerations.....	37
Use of Force Considerations.....	37
Use of Restraints.....	39
Interview and Interrogation.....	40
Other Medical Considerations.....	42
Crisis Response Policy Example.....	43
Emergency Hospitalization Policy Example.....	50
Reference List & Suggested Publications.....	54

Overview

This guide was created to assist law enforcement executives and their personnel with the construction and publication of policies involving law enforcement's response to service calls involving persons in crisis.

“Persons in crisis” are defined in this guide as persons who have reached a state of crisis from an underlying mental illness, intellectual or developmental disability (I/DD), diagnosis of an Autism Spectrum Disorder, a traumatic brain injury (TBI), another form of brain-based disorder or cognitive disorder, a medical condition that may masquerade as mental illness, substance use, or any combination of conditions or diagnoses.

Policies created by law enforcement agencies provide the boundaries and underlying core values for their personnel's actions and tactics that can be employed in specific circumstances. They acknowledge that law enforcement officers have broader discretion because of the variation in calls for service, due to their roles, and because supervisors and managers are not always immediately available to provide guidance. Policies convey the “commander’s intent” to describe the desired end state so that personnel can critically think through a situation, problem-solve, and best resolve that situation after considering all the possible outcomes, with more than one outcome being feasible or proper. Policies also guide the creation of training as training reinforces the policies.

This guide specifically focuses on policy creation to respond to persons in crisis using the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Model and the Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs. The CIT Model, created in Memphis, TN in 1988, was designed to foster better outcomes when law enforcement officers handle calls involving a person in a mental health crisis and to divert those persons away from the criminal justice system to the system of care, whenever possible. There are other models for crisis intervention by law enforcement, but the CIT Model has been recognized as one of the most promising practices due to extensive research.

In 2004, CIT program coordinators assisted with creating a consensus document outlining the first Ohio CIT core elements. Those core elements were updated in 2022 in the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*. That document provides guidance on developing and implementing a CIT in an agency and developing a CIT program. The core elements are separated into four specific segments: Law Enforcement, Mental Health, Training, and Coordination. Law enforcement agencies will also find direction for policy creation, team member training, and collaboration with other CIT program partners.

This guide was created through the study of policies across the US and governmental and non-governmental publications to ensure a breadth of content and examples. It is structured to assist law enforcement agencies in Ohio in developing their policies for responding to service calls involving persons in crisis. Samples are provided for use or as templates to create community-specific policies. Community-specific policies should include local protocols that identify community resources, reflect organizational culture, and recognize the law enforcement agency as an integral part of the continuum of care for persons in crisis.

Revisions

In 2020, this policy guide was released to assist law enforcement executives and personnel in developing policies for responding to service calls involving individuals experiencing a crisis. The guide also provides direction for establishing a Crisis Intervention Team within a law enforcement agency as part of a broader CIT program. This guide can be a valuable tool for agencies to develop effective CIT-focused crisis response policies that achieve their objectives while complying with laws and local procedures and promoting transparency and accountability.

Three years later, this is the first revision. Revisions are essential to ensure that the guide remains relevant and effective by addressing new issues or concerns and that its terminology is current and appropriate. Significant revisions are listed below to quickly identify what changes were made and why they were made while documenting the guide's evolution over time.

Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Law Enforcement Policy Guide

The original title of this guide was *Crisis Intervention Law Enforcement Policy Guide (CIT Focused)*. This title was changed to better align with the guide's purpose, which is to develop a policy specifically addressing how to develop and implement a CIT in an Ohio law enforcement agency. It also better reflects the need for law enforcement agencies to develop crisis response policies that adhere to the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*, released in 2022.

Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs

Reference to the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs* and the inclusion of its concepts were added to this guide. While publications about CIT provided suggestions, there were no clear expectations for Ohio law enforcement agencies regarding developing and implementing an agency CIT or their operation within a CIT program. The Law Enforcement section of the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs* outlines these expectations, and this document serves as a practical guide for how agencies can meet them.

The Goals of Ohio CIT Programs

The goals of Ohio CIT programs were updated and explained further to align with those published in the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*. These goals are specific to Ohio and were created for Ohio CIT programs as they strive for better outcomes when law enforcement officers are called to interact with a person in crisis.

Crisis Response

In this guide, the term "crisis intervention" has been revised to "crisis response" to distinguish between Crisis Intervention Teams and the role of law enforcement in responding to persons in crisis. The revision addresses the confusion arising from the widespread use of "intervention" and the term's multiple definitions and uses. The update provides clarity and reduces ambiguity when discussing different facets of crisis management. By doing so, the guide aims to provide a better understanding of crisis response by law enforcement and the broader scope of using Crisis Intervention Teams for crisis management.

New Terms and definitions

The definitions section of the guide has been updated to include new terms and their corresponding definitions. Specifically, the distinction between "Crisis Intervention Team (Agency)" and "Crisis Intervention Team Programs" has been clarified. Additionally, the definition of "Emergency Psychological Services" has been expanded to improve clarity and broaden its application. "Receiving Centers" has been

introduced to reflect its increasing usage and provide a more appropriate term when referencing a location or facility where persons in crisis are transported for evaluation or care.

Training Course Names

Per the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*, Ohio Crisis Intervention Team programs have adopted various names for CIT training courses to emphasize the importance of tailoring the training to participants' specific roles within a CIT program. The "Training" section introduces the CIT Patrol Officer Training Course and the CIT Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) Training Course. These course names identify and differentiate the CIT training courses for patrol officers and public safety telecommunicators.

Transports

The section previously titled "Voluntary Evaluation" has been changed to "Transports" to provide a more accurate and focused description of the issue discussed. In addition, this section has been expanded to address a pertinent issue: collaboration between agencies when transporting a person in crisis is needed, and more than one agency is involved. With the expansion of crisis services in communities, agencies may require assistance with transport from other community partners. Leadership in these agencies must communicate, collaborate, and proactively address potential challenges, ensuring that staff in the field have clear directives to follow and that the person in crisis receives the appropriate care and treatment.

The Goals of Ohio CIT Programs

Ohio CITs and CIT programs are developed with clear goals in mind. These goals play a pivotal role in providing a roadmap and sense of direction for the implementation and effectiveness of these programs. By defining specific areas of improvement and desired outcomes, these goals help focus the efforts of CIT to ensure that all stakeholders, including law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and community members, are working together towards a shared purpose.

The goals provide a solid foundation for strategic planning and resource allocation. They help identify priorities, establish action plans, and determine the necessary steps to achieve desired outcomes. With these goals in mind, CITs and CIT programs can develop strategies and initiatives that effectively address their communities' unique needs and challenges, leading to more targeted and impactful crisis response and intervention.

They also serve as a benchmark for measuring the success and effectiveness of CITs and CIT programs. By establishing comprehensive goals, progress can be systematically monitored and evaluated. This evaluation process identifies areas of success and highlights areas that may require further attention or improvement.

The goals of Ohio CIT Programs aim to foster a more compassionate, effective, and equitable approach to crisis response and intervention within the state. By keeping these goals at the forefront, CITs and CIT programs strive to create positive and lasting change in how persons in crisis are supported and assisted, ensuring their well-being, and promoting stronger connections between law enforcement and the community.

The goals of Ohio CIT programs are:

- Improve the safety of everyone in situations when law enforcement officers interact with persons in crisis.
- Improve outcomes when law enforcement officers interact with persons in crisis.
- Increase understanding of, accessibility to, and improve responsiveness by the local crisis response system.
- Divert persons in crisis from the criminal justice system to treatment alternatives when possible.
- Transform the local crisis response system to use law enforcement officers as first responders only when there is an immediate or imminent threat to safety or a serious criminal concern.

The Crisis Intervention Team Model

To achieve the goals of Ohio CIT programs, CITs and CIT programs actively implement and develop the CIT Model. The CIT Model is an organizational model that helps coordinate the mental health crisis care system with the criminal justice system. The model has core elements that, when properly implemented at the local level, will not only improve the utilization of essential mental health services but assist with keeping people out of crisis.

The CIT Model's core elements describe a fully developed CIT program. As seen below, partnerships are the first core element of CIT because they are the foundation of everything else. As a community progresses, they can strengthen their crisis response system incrementally as a long-term goal. Law enforcement training is only a step along the way to developing a CIT program, not the end goal. Crisis Intervention Teams are robust programs containing ongoing, operational, and sustaining elements.

Ongoing Elements

1. Partnerships: Law Enforcement, Advocacy, Mental Health
2. Community Ownership: Planning, Implementation & Networking
3. Policies and Procedures

Operational Elements

4. CIT: Officer, Dispatcher, Coordinator
5. Curriculum: CIT Training
6. Mental Health Receiving Facility: Emergency Services

Sustaining Elements

7. Evaluation and Research
8. In-Service Training
9. Recognition and Honors
10. Outreach: Developing CIT in Other Communities

Further information on the CIT Model can be found at <https://www.citinternational.org/bestpracticeguide>

The Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs

In collaboration with Ohio CIT Coordinators and community partners, the Ohio Criminal Justice Coordinating Center of Excellence has developed the core elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team programs, which are utilized to effectively implement the CIT Model in CITs and CIT programs throughout the state. Updated in 2022, these newly constructed core elements provide essential guidance to law enforcement, mental health, and advocacy partners in achieving Ohio CIT programs' goals through the CIT Model.

Further information on the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs* can be found at:

<https://www.neomed.edu/wp-content/uploads/Ohio-CIT-Core-Elements-rev.-2022.pdf>

Crisis Response Policy

Purpose Statement

Commentary:

A purpose statement for the establishment of policies for interactions between agency personnel and persons in crisis is necessary to guide personnel engaged in these community caretaker functions. This statement often consists of two major parts. The first part identifies that the creation of these policies is to maximize the safety of all involved in such an interaction. The second part is to provide agency personnel with guidance, techniques, and resources so that agency personnel have confidence in their abilities to resolve the situation in a constructive, legal, and compassionate manner.

The purpose of establishing policies for creating and operating a Crisis Intervention Team within a law enforcement agency has three parts. The first is to ensure ongoing collaboration with the crisis care system. The second is to provide guidelines for the structure and operation of team members within the agency, including a stipulation that sufficient agency personnel receive specialized training to respond to persons in crisis as part of a coordinated response. The third is that persons in crisis are to be diverted from the criminal justice system to a place of safety and care when feasible.

Main Elements of a Purpose Statement for Crisis Response:

- Acknowledgment of challenges or difficulties associated with crisis response calls for law enforcement officers
- Language that safety is of substantial concern, if not the primary concern
- Language that policies are created to promote personnel confidence that they can effectively respond and create a positive outcome
- Language that addresses the need for legal and compassionate resolutions

Main Elements of a Purpose Statement for Crisis Intervention Teams:

- Acknowledgment that CIT exists in the agency
- Statement of the need for CIT officers to be trained and available
- Acknowledgment that CIT is a collaboration and coordinated program
- Acknowledgment that CIT officers should be the primary responders to service calls involving persons in crisis
- Acknowledgment that the goal is to divert persons in crisis away from the criminal justice system

Policy Example:

The <<AGENCY>> recognizes that personnel will, at times, be required to interact with persons in crisis. Those interactions can be challenging and may require difficult decisions about a person's level of crisis and lawful actions that can be taken. These policies will guide responding personnel to aid them in making effective decisions that safeguard the community and all persons involved and promote a legal and compassionate resolution.

The <<AGENCY>> has *(created/agreed to participate in)* a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT). This policy was created to provide operational guidelines for CIT, and for CIT officers to include training, response, and the primary responsibility to respond to service calls involving persons in crisis. The <<AGENCY>> acknowledges that CIT is an ongoing collaboration with mental health service providers, advocates, persons with mental illness or other behavioral health disorders, family members, and the community with the intent to divert persons away from the criminal justice system when feasible.

Guiding Principle

Commentary:

Guiding principles are established to identify broad policy direction, desired actions, and culture of the agency that guide agencies and organizations when minor or more substantial changes must be made to policies because of changes to the law, court decisions, goals, and type of work to be performed. They allow agency members to understand what is important to the agency and the people that it serves.

The guiding principle behind the response to persons in crisis is to maximize safety for all involved and to treat these calls for service, absent clear and serious criminal offenses that may have occurred, as a need for medical help within the “community caretaker” function instead of a need for entering the person into the criminal justice system within the “law enforcer” function. Persons who may have a mental illness, intellectual or developmental disability (I/DD), an injury/trauma to the brain, deterioration of the brain, or other medical conditions have a right to be left alone unless they violate the law, or they pose a substantial risk of harm to themselves or others.

The guiding principle behind Crisis Intervention Teams is that the agency has committed to the core elements of starting and maintaining a CIT, including having a coordinator, training for specified personnel in CIT tactics and techniques to include the use of de-escalation when appropriate, collaborating with stakeholders in the community along with the community crisis care network, and collecting and analyzing data to inform and improve the network and responses to persons in crisis. Also, the agency has committed to making CIT officers the first responders to service calls involving persons in crisis and permitting CIT officers to control the situation at the site of the call unless a supervisor deems otherwise.

Main Elements:

- Language that the agency will treat persons in crisis calls as “community caretaker” conditions instead of criminal justice conditions if any alleged criminal activity is minor and violence has not occurred. Persons in crisis will be diverted from the criminal justice system when possible.
- Language that persons with various illnesses or injuries are not to be taken into custody merely for their conditions, but only if a crime that requires arrest has occurred or the person poses a risk of substantial harm to self or others.
- Language that the agency is committed to CIT as a program that requires ongoing collaboration between stakeholders and goes beyond training to align with the CIT Model and *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*.
- Language that the agency is committed to CIT by identifying a coordinator, selecting and training enough personnel in their CIT role to respond to a person in crisis call at any time, continually interacting with CIT partners, and collecting data as needed and desired (aligns with *Core Elements of Ohio CIT Crisis Intervention Team Programs*).
- A statement that CIT officers shall be the first responders to calls involving persons in crisis and called to the scene to interact with persons in crisis when available.

Policy Example:

The <<AGENCY>> is committed to being a collaborative partner in the CIT program and the crisis care and response system in <<COUNTY/CITY/TOWNSHIP>>. As a partner in CIT, the <<AGENCY>> will work with the other partners to minimize the criminal justice system's involvement with people experiencing a crisis in our community. The <<AGENCY>> also recognizes that <<officers/deputies>> interact with people in crisis and that persons in crisis will benefit from an appropriate intervention and better interactions. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall use de-escalation skills instead of physical force, as circumstances dictate, to interact with persons in crisis. Since the arrest of a person in crisis is the least preferred alternative, <<officers/deputies>> should divert a person in crisis to emergency psychological services (EPS), when not compelled by code or court decision to make an arrest.

CIT officers shall be dispatched to service calls involving persons in crisis whenever available and shall be called to the scene by non-CIT officers, when available, after determining that the call involves a person in crisis.

Definitions

Commentary:

Definitions are provided for clarity. Legal definitions or definitions complying with the Ohio Revised Code are used when possible.

Policy Examples of Definitions to be Used:

Crisis (Person in Crisis) – A situation whereby a person has become unable to self-regulate thinking, mood, or behavior. A person could be experiencing intense feelings of distress and/or displaying obvious changes in functioning in their daily living activities. This disturbance with a person’s understanding and comprehension, ability to regulate emotions, and/or ability to regulate behavior may occur due to mental illness, intellectual or developmental disability (I/DD), an injury/trauma to the brain, deterioration of the brain, other medical conditions, or a medical emergency.

Crisis Intervention Team (Agency) - A business or organization that provides a specific service (law enforcement, service provider, etc.) that formally and through written policy has integrated concepts of the CIT Model and the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs* into their organizational structure. A CIT can exist within criminal justice and mental health agencies. A CIT only operates within a broader CIT program.

Crisis Intervention Team Program (CIT Program) – A program consisting of law enforcement, mental health, and advocacy collaborating to improve community responses to mental health crises. CIT programs are formally organized and have implemented the concepts of the CIT Model and the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*. A CIT program comprises agency CITs, a steering committee, relevant agencies, and stakeholders. In Ohio, CIT programs are organized by mental health and recovery board catchment areas – which can encompass one or multiple counties. In Ohio, CIT programs utilize their local crisis response system, which is typically county-specific.

Crisis Intervention Team Program Coordinator (CIT Program Coordinator) – A person assigned to coordinate the activities of agencies participating in a CIT program. Typically, this is done at a county level. Their responsibilities include coordinating CIT strategies such as sustaining a CIT steering committee, establishing relationships with law enforcement and the local crisis response system, coordinating training, and programmatic data collection and evaluation.

Crisis Intervention Team Coordinator (CIT Coordinator) – A CIT officer (*specify rank if desired*) assigned by the <<AGENCY EXECUTIVE/DESIGNEE>> to manage the administration, planning, personnel selection, training, and overall operation of the CIT within an agency. The duties include acting as the liaison between the <<AGENCY>>, Crisis Intervention Team Program Coordinators, service providers, and community partners.

Crisis Intervention Team Officer (CIT Officer) – Law enforcement officers who have received specialized training in first response crisis intervention and are identified as being the primary responders to calls for service involving a person in crisis. These law enforcement officers will perform their regular duties within the agency. They will be the primary responders to persons in crisis calls based on policy and leadership support.

De-escalation – A system employing active and aligned communication along with the use of time, distance, and barriers as tactics to reduce or manage behaviors displayed by a person in crisis to reduce or avoid physical conflict. De-escalation is employed, when possible, to avoid or reduce the amount of force needed to control a situation involving a person in crisis.

Elopement – This term is applied when a person in crisis has been transported to a receiving center after being taken into involuntary custody and that person leaves the EPS facility before being released by the chief clinical officer of the facility or the chief clinical officer's designee. Custody may have been taken for emergency hospitalization per ORC § 5122.10 or taken in response to the issuance of a temporary order of detention by a judge/referee/or magistrate of the probate court of the county with jurisdiction per ORC § 5122.11.

Emergency Psychological Services (EPS) – A location or method of providing crisis intervention, evaluation, and stabilization. This could be a mental health facility, a receiving center, or a mobile team or responder who can assess the current situation and direct officers to the appropriate location.

Mental disorder (mental illness) – A substantial disorder of thought, mood, perception, orientation, or memory that grossly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or the ability to meet the ordinary demands of life (ORC § 5122.01(A)).

Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) – These personnel work within agency-specific or combined emergency communications centers (ECCs). They are commonly referred to as dispatchers and/or call takers. PSTs handle emergency calls via 911 and non-emergency calls over other telephone lines or platforms. They dispatch the appropriate resources for the situation or refer callers to other services if public safety intervention is not needed at the time.

Receiving Center – A location, sometimes known as a crisis receiving and stabilization facility, which can provide care to a person in crisis. This place may be a stand-alone facility, a hospital licensed by the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, a portion of a general hospital, or an emergency department of a general hospital.

Substantial Risk of Physical Harm – A person has the means to cause harm (either to themselves or others), there is a significant risk that such harm will occur (to themselves or others), a person has made a credible threat which expresses an intention to cause harm (to themselves or others), the method of causing harm is accessible by the person, and/or the person has the means to act on the threat. Substantial risk of physical harm can be from any of these listed indicators or a combination of these indicators. It is determined by threat, method, and/or opportunity test. As per the Ohio Revised Code, "Physical harm to persons means any injury, illness, or other physiological impairment, regardless of its gravity or duration" (Section 2901.01(A)(3)).

Written Statement – A written statement is required if a law enforcement officer takes a person into custody according to Ohio's mental health laws as found in ORC § 5122.01(B). This written statement shall specify the circumstances under which the person was taken into custody and the reasons that a law enforcement officer believes that the person is a mentally ill person subject to a court order and represents a substantial risk of physical harm to self or others if allowed to remain at liberty pending examination (ORC § 5122.10(A)(1)). This written statement shall contain facts and not opinions, diagnoses, or jargon to ensure that "a minimal level of probable cause" exists (*In re Miller* (1992), 63 Ohio St. 3d 99, 585 N.E. 2d 396).

Written Statement Form and Format – The written statement is most often provided in Ohio on the DMHAS-0025 Application for Emergency Admission form, commonly referred to as a “pink slip.” This form, created under the authority of the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, is an administrative instrument used and recognized by locations where EPS are obtained or provided. The authority does not reside with the form but instead with the law, as found in ORC § 5122.10. Alternative versions of the authorized form used to supply a written statement may be used in various counties in Ohio per local convention and process. Due to this variance in formats, the form itself has no authority other than to provide a written statement in an established and known format. The DMHAS-0025 form or an alternative version may be submitted via a paper copy or in an electronic format.

Crisis Intervention Team

Commentary:

Crisis Intervention Teams are more than training law enforcement officers to handle calls for service involving persons in crisis. A CIT program is not a law enforcement-run program. Instead, it is a collaborative community program that brings mental health service providers, emergency medical service providers, advocates, persons with lived experience of mental illness (consumers), elected officials, and law enforcement together to solve problems involving persons in crisis and the local crisis response system to avoid having law enforcement be the default responders to persons in crisis calls and jails be the default location where persons in crisis are taken.

The goals of CIT focus on safety for all when law enforcement officers interact with persons in crisis, to effectively and efficiently connect people in crisis to needed services, to only use law enforcement for crisis response when there is a substantial risk of harm to persons or when a serious criminal offense has occurred, and to aid persons in crises in short-term and long-term recovery.

CIT was created for interactions with a person in a mental health crisis. Since the beginning of CIT in Memphis, Tennessee in 1988, CIT programs and CIT officers have expanded their scope of interactions to include persons in a temporary emotional crisis, persons in a crisis as a result of I/DD issues and situations, persons in crisis due to other brain-based or behavioral diagnoses such as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) or Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBIs), persons in crisis due to loss of memory, and persons in crisis due to temporary illness that affects thinking and reasoning. This is not an exhaustive list. Individuals may be in crisis due to dual or multiple diagnoses including substance use disorder. Determining the underlying cause for the crisis may be difficult and some factors may remain unknown.

Operationalizing CIT within a law enforcement agency involves multiple outcomes:

1. The CEO of the organization must commit to involvement in CIT and then support and sustain the CIT.
2. A person within an agency must be identified and empowered as the CIT Coordinator.
3. Personnel must be selected and then trained to become CIT officers.
4. CIT officers must be organized and assigned within the agency so that they are available to be sent to persons in crisis calls at any time.
- 5.. PSTs must be trained to recognize calls involving persons in crisis and to dispatch CIT officers when appropriate.
6. CIT officers should be dispatched to calls involving persons in crisis whenever they are available. If PSTs get new information and/or non-CIT responding officers later identify that the call involves persons in crisis, a CIT officer should be dispatched to the call or called by responding officers for assistance.
7. CIT officers are empowered to control the at-scene response involving a person in crisis unless control/command is taken by an officer of greater rank.
8. Program duties must be assigned to the CIT coordinator or others to ensure that information is collected to identify locations or persons involved in high numbers of crisis calls. This information must then be shared with local mental health professionals so that, if needed, essential mental health services are engaged. The information is also compiled and analyzed to monitor the program to improve responses to persons in crisis and to create or advocate for improvements to the system and the available services for persons in crisis.

Main Elements:

- Direction that CIT officers are dispatched as primary responders to service calls involving a person in crisis.
- Direction that CIT officers are assigned to all shifts to facilitate their use during service calls involving a person in crisis.
- Language that CIT officers are requested to respond to the scene of service calls involving a person in crisis when identified as such by non-CIT officers.
- Language that CIT officers will control the scene of a service call involving a person in crisis unless a supervisor of greater rank takes control/command.

Policy Example:

NOTE: The sample policy language below focuses on sending CIT officers and defines their authority.

<<AGENCY/RESPONSIBLE PERSON>> shall assign adequate CIT officers to all shifts to meet the identified service call demand involving persons in crisis. CIT officers shall be dispatched, whenever available, to calls for service involving a person in crisis and shall be called to the scene by non-CIT officers if those officers identify a person in crisis. CIT officers shall remain in control at the scene of a person in crisis call unless relieved by a supervisor of greater rank. That supervisor shall seek the input of an on-scene CIT officer to resolve the crisis when reasonable and practical.

Guidelines for Recognition

Commentary:

It is important for law enforcement officers to recognize observable and reported behaviors and conduct that may reveal that a person is in crisis. The law enforcement officer who can quickly and appropriately interpret the behaviors and conduct they observe and then combine those observations with reports from others will be better at assessing the situation, meeting the needs of a person in crisis, and implementing the best possible resolution. This recognition and interpretation of observable and reported behaviors, often called signs and symptoms, along with knowledge of alternatives to arrest, will increase the potential methods of resolution. These methods of resolution may consist of intervention or referral at the scene, or additional referrals and interventions as the person interacts with other components of the criminal justice system if an arrest must be made.

Main Elements:

- Language that acknowledges the importance of early recognition and interpretation of behaviors and conduct (signs and symptoms) that can be displayed by a person in crisis or another who has witnessed such a crisis
- Language that includes examples of behaviors and conduct (signs and symptoms) that may be observed by a law enforcement officer responding to a call about a person in crisis, and that may be reported by others.

Policy Example:

<<AGENCY>> <<officers/deputies>> responding to a call involving a person in crisis must assess what they observe and what is reported to them by others. This initial assessment can be difficult. Based on observable and reported behaviors and conduct, <<officers/deputies>> should recognize that they may be dealing with a person in crisis due to potentially underlying mental illness or medical condition (see definition of crisis). These behaviors and conduct are often referred to as signs and symptoms and may include:

- Has a history of mental illness, I/DD, or other crisis-related calls for service for the person or location.
- Made a current or past mention or threat of suicide (including gestures/attempts).
- Made a current or past threat or has taken action to harm another individual.
- Displays violent behavior towards persons or objects (e.g., threats, destruction of property).
- Displays reckless behavior (e.g., walking through busy traffic).
- Displays self-injurious behavior (e.g., cutting or cigarette burns to skin).
- Shows a loss of memory/disorientation and/or quick frustration that may include inappropriate or aggressive behavior when dealing with a new situation or unforeseen circumstance—this may include temper tantrums.
- Displays confusion about or unawareness of surroundings and may have difficulty in understanding or answering questions.
- Presents a lack of emotional response, an extreme emotional reaction, or an exaggerated emotional reaction to include a strong fear of persons, places, or things.
- Displays wide eyes, avoids eye contact, or stares at someone or a fixed point.
- Articulates rambling or incoherent thoughts, disconnected ideas, or nonsensical ideas.
- Displays speech that has an unusual speed, is halting, is overly flat, is overly excited, shows limited vocabulary, or shows signs of impairment.
- Speaks in a child-like manner or repeats what others say.
- Refuses to speak or cannot speak.
- Appears to process information slowly.

- Shows an unusual physical/general appearance (for example, inappropriate clothing for the weather, lack of personal hygiene).
- Displays unusual body movements to include pacing, clutching oneself or other objects to maintain control, repetitive movements such as rocking, or sluggishness.
- Reveals extreme agitation to include an irrational lack of cooperation and/or tendency to argue—may include hostility towards and/or distrust of some persons or everyone.
- Displays signs of hyperactivity—to include an inability to sit still, a short attention span, and evidence of lack of sleep.
- Offers assurances that everything is all right or begs to be left alone when observations or statements contradict—assurances may be frantic and may also suggest that the person is close to losing control.
- Mentions fixed, false beliefs (delusions) with a common focus on persecution or grandeur—may state that personal actions were directed by a higher power, or that the person suffers from extraordinary physical maladies that are not possible.
- Mentions hallucinations or shows signs of attending to them—hears voices, or sees, smells, tastes, or feels things that others do not and may carry on conversations with someone others cannot see or hear.
- Displays strange decorations (for example, aluminum foil wrapped around objects).
- Hoards items one might consider garbage (e.g., newspapers, string).
- Reveals the presence of feces or urine on floors or walls where the person stays/resides.

This list is not exhaustive but is comprehensive. A history of signs and symptoms should not be treated as proof of the presence or absence of a crisis. <<Officers/Deputies>> should investigate and determine if what they see and hear and what they are told constitutes a state of crisis.

Engaging People in Crisis and Assessing Risk

Commentary:

Law enforcement officers must engage with persons in crisis and others who can provide information about persons in crisis so that an assessment can be made. A probable cause standard has been applied by the Ohio Supreme Court to take a person into custody according to ORC § 5122.10. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has affirmed that a probable cause standard, and not a reasonable suspicion standard, is necessary before taking a person into custody for any mental health seizure laws within the circuit. The task of law enforcement officers is to assess the safety risk to themselves, the community, and the person in crisis and use trained tactics and techniques to reduce that risk. Those tactics and techniques should include methods of not escalating a person in crisis and creating an environment for crisis de-escalation. Active communication is a key element for de-escalating a crisis, and personnel must understand that communication can be difficult. Overall, law enforcement officers must assess the signs and symptoms being displayed by a person in crisis, determine if any serious criminal offenses have occurred, determine if the signs and symptoms are so acute that they constitute probable cause for taking a person into custody absent a criminal offense, and then take appropriate action.

Main Elements:

- Language that responding personnel must continually assess the call to a person in crisis for safety risks to all involved.
- Language about how personnel must interact with the person in crisis and others to obtain information to determine the need for custody-taking.
- Language that responding personnel must not knowingly/unknowingly escalate the situation (introduce officer-created jeopardy or increase situational risk).
- Language that responding personnel are to use trained tactics and techniques to de-escalate the situation or attempt to do so before resorting to force.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> shall respond to a call involving a person in crisis and assess the safety concerns and risks to all involved before taking any other action. This safety assessment shall continue throughout the interaction. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall gather information from all available sources (family members and friends, service providers, bystanders, the person in crisis) to determine if the person in crisis is to be taken into custody for emergency hospitalization or arrested for a serious criminal offense.

<<Officers/Deputies>> shall attempt to de-escalate the situation unless circumstances require other actions due to the safety of anyone involved in the interaction.

Signs and symptoms displayed by or articulated by a person in crisis or credible witnesses can make interaction difficult. Interaction with a person in crisis can be enhanced using the following tactics and techniques. Most of the tactics and techniques are listed as actions to take instead of actions to avoid. This list is comprehensive but not exhaustive.

- Slow down and take time to assess the situation if there is no immediate danger to others or the person—assess safety issues.
- Maintain a reasonable and safe distance from the person in crisis.
- Prepare for a lengthy interaction—do not rush the interaction unless there is an emergency.
- Gather information on the subject from acquaintances or family members where possible—contact a caregiver if appropriate.
- Introduce yourself and attempt to obtain the person’s name—look for or attempt to obtain personal identification if needed.
- Indicate a genuine willingness to understand and assist.

- Speak simply, slowly, and with direct phrases using a low tone; repeat as needed.
- Move slowly and use non-threatening body language and gestures.
- Remove distractions, upsetting influences, or disruptive people from the area.
- Recognize that the person may be overwhelmed by external and internal stimuli and be sensitive to sensory impairments. Both may cause the person difficulty with information processing. Eliminate commotion to the extent possible (loud sounds, bright lights, sirens, crowds) and move the person to a calm environment if necessary.
- Demonstrate “active listening skills.”
- Relate your concern for their feelings and allow them to vent their feelings.
- Respond to rage with quiet and calm reassurances.
- Listen carefully and do not interrupt except to redirect or refocus the person.
- Be aware of different forms of communication (signals or gestures) due to limited speaking capabilities.
- Use “I” and “We” statements (for example, I understand, we need to work together).
- Ask them if they are taking any medications and, if so, the types prescribed and when they were last taken.
- Be truthful as often as possible—unless there is immediate danger.
- Touch the person only when necessary and state your intentions when doing so.
- Understand that a rational discussion may not take place.
- Be friendly, patient, and accepting, but firm and professional.
- Recognize a person’s delusions or hallucinations are very real for them—avoid challenging them or validating them.
- Remain calm and avoid overreacting.
- Request a backup officer, and always do so in cases where the person will be taken into custody.
- Avoid automatically interpreting odd behavior or lack of quick response as resistance
- Avoid getting angry or frustrated—be aware of non-verbal signals you may send.
- Avoid allowing others to interact simultaneously with the person while you are attempting to talk to the person and stabilize the situation.
- Avoid cornering a person or being cornered—give the person expanded space and ensure that officers have expanded their space and identified a safe exit if it should become necessary.

Resolution Options

Commentary:

The resolution to a call for a person in crisis often falls into one of the following categories:

- Referral to community mental health services or other service providers
- Transport to a receiving center - Emergency hospitalization

Law enforcement officers must have a basic knowledge of what services exist in their communities and what services are provided by the various service providers. The county or multi-county boards that oversee or provide services to persons with mental illness, persons who have an I/DD diagnosis, and other organizations that provide behavioral services or advocacy will have directories or indexes about what services exist and where they can be found or obtained. As previously noted in this guide, persons in crisis who have not committed a criminal offense or who have committed minor criminal offenses should be taken into custody and transported to a receiving center, or a place where medical care or crisis evaluation can be delivered or conducted if those persons meet any of the criteria found within ORC § 5122.01(B). Persons who do not meet one or more of those criteria should be referred to another source so that receiving centers are not unduly overwhelmed.

If a crime is involved, an arrest should be reserved for situations when a person in crisis has engaged in a violent misdemeanor or felony, the Ohio Revised Code requires arrest, and probable cause exists to effect an arrest. In some cases, the issuance of a summons may be appropriate. In some locations, service linkage for a person in crisis begins at the county jail because that is the only option. If a person is to be taken into custody according to ORC § 5122.10, the custody-taking officer will follow the procedures identified in the section about Emergency hospitalization.

There may be circumstances when a responding officer does not have probable cause to believe the person in crisis is subject to Emergency hospitalization and the person is not willing to obtain services. In those cases, the responding law enforcement officer may have to provide the person with information and leave the scene with no further action taken. Persons in crisis who continually have contact with law enforcement but are not taken into custody must be reported to the agency's CIT coordinator so that other paths of resolution can be collaboratively explored with service boards, service providers, and the probate court of the county if needed.

Main Elements:

- Language that identifies the most common resolutions for a person in crisis call and inclusion of language that leaving the scene with no further law enforcement action taken is a possible resolution.
- Language to again identify that arrest is not the preferred option for calls when either non-violent misdemeanor activity or no criminal activity has occurred.
- Language that personnel should be knowledgeable about available services in their communities, the locations of those services, and where information and directories for services can be accessed.
- Language that persons in crisis who are continually in contact with law enforcement without resolution in the scene must be reported to the CIT coordinator for additional assessment and review.
- Language that personnel who arrest persons in crisis and transport them to detention centers (jails) shall notify those working in those centers of the crisis and shall notify the appropriate court systems so that specialty dockets can be considered when criteria for those dockets are met.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> who have identified and de-escalated a person in crisis shall appropriately resolve the situation based on all available information. Resolution options include, but are not limited to, taking no additional action, making a referral to community mental health services or other service providers, or taking a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization.

If the <<officers/deputies>> do not have probable cause to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization, no further police action may be necessary. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall refer the person to local community mental health services or other appropriate services based on the situation.

<<Officers/Deputies>> shall be familiar with services in their area and provide others with information about how to access those services. <<Officers/Deputies>> who have had more than one call with a person in crisis that has been resolved by referral shall forward information about the person in crisis and the resolution to the CIT coordinator for additional review.

<<Officers/Deputies>> taking a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization shall follow the procedures outlined in the section on Emergency hospitalization. CIT officers shall be used, when available, to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization and transport that person to a receiving center.

If a person in crisis has committed a non-violent misdemeanor and a victim requests that charges be filed, <<officers/deputies>> who have established probable cause that the offense has occurred shall issue a summons for the charge. If probable cause also exists for taking the person into custody for Emergency hospitalization, then follow the procedures outlined in the section on Emergency hospitalization. If a person in crisis has committed a violent misdemeanor other than for Domestic Violence (ORC § 2919.25) or Violating Protection Order (ORC § 2919.27), the <<officer/deputy>> shall contact a supervisor for approval to issue a summons in addition to taking the person into custody for Emergency hospitalization. If an arrest is made, <<officers/deputies>> shall follow standard arrest and booking procedures. If taken to jail, officers shall inform intake staff about their condition so that they may receive appropriate screening and care. Officers shall not only document the reason for arrest and facts surrounding the criminal offense but also document their recognition of mental health issues or other cognitive issues on the <<ARREST REPORT (By name or designation as needed)>>. The arresting <<officer/deputy>> shall notify the CIT coordinator and <<the court system where arraignment will occur>> so that the person can be considered for the <<mental health court/docket or other dockets as named or available>>

NOTE: If there is no specialty docket in your county, then the arresting officer shall only notify the CIT coordinator by completing and forwarding the Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet.

Reporting and Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets

Commentary:

The purpose of documenting law enforcement responses to persons in crisis is much more than a method of generating statistics. The completion of a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet or an agency-modified equivalent is important for the following reasons.

- Name and last known location (LKA) of the person in crisis.
- Identification of frequent users of law enforcement services that can lead to the creation of strategies to reduce repeat contacts with law enforcement officers.
- Information about the person in crisis that can be used to safely interact with that person in the future to include safety alerts, methods that have worked to de-escalate the person, and methods that have not worked.
- Identification of persons who are not connected to services.
- Identification of persons who are not receiving effective services.
- Information that allows all stakeholders to prioritize their resources for those in crisis.
- Data in the form of statistics and narrative information is created, and that data supports a CIT program with its request for additional funding and/or to expand crisis system services and responses. Those expanded responses to persons in crisis could be the creation of co-responder teams or the creation of non-law enforcement methods of response, such as mobile crisis teams staffed by clinicians.

Gathered data are shared by all stakeholders to the extent allowed by law. The creation of most of the data will be the responsibility of first responders, which often consists of or includes law enforcement officers. Comprehensive data will be created through the completion of an incident report created for use by the law enforcement agency and titled to reflect an interaction with a person in crisis. This may be done through the agency's records management system (RMS) or by using other reporting programs. In addition to the incident report, CIT officers and/or other officers who respond to persons in crisis calls must complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet or an agency-modified equivalent so that pertinent information can be shared with stakeholders.

Main Elements:

- Requirement that an incident report be completed to document interactions with persons in crisis--used by the law enforcement agency for documentation.
- Requirement that a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet or agency-modified equivalent be completed for all CIT officer-involved responses to a person in crisis call—this sheet contains information that is shareable with stakeholders.
- Requirement to forward the Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet or agency-modified equivalent to the agency's CIT Coordinator.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> who have been dispatched to a call involving a person in crisis or who interact with a person in crisis due to self-initiated activity shall document that incident on the <<NAME/DESIGNATOR OF AGENCY REPORT>>. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall thoroughly document in the report the circumstances for the call for service, actions taken, and any information that could assist with follow-up services.

All officers shall complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet <<AGENCY FORM NUMBER OR NAME AS NEEDED>> in addition to the <<NAME/DESIGNATOR OF AGENCY INCIDENT REPORT>>. The Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet shall be forwarded to the CIT Coordinator.

Continuum of Care and Follow-Up Activities

Commentary:

As previously addressed, data must be created and collected so that decisions can be made to focus on persons in crisis who have continued and substantial contact with law enforcement agencies and service providers. The law enforcement agency and its CEO must recognize that it is a partner in the continuum of care and the data it creates assists the other stakeholders with prioritizing their services and actions. The law enforcement agency's CIT coordinator is the liaison with their CIT program and stakeholders to include CIT coordinators who work within service boards, service agencies, and advocacy groups. The agency CIT coordinator is also responsible for working with CIT officers to engage in follow-up contacts and welfare checks, as needed, with persons in crisis who are frequent users of law enforcement services. These contacts and checks may build a rapport between the person in crisis and the law enforcement agency and provide additional data that can be shared with service providers to evaluate and/or change the provision of services so that the frequency of crises for the person is reduced.

Main Elements:

- Statement that identifies the law enforcement agency as a partner in the continuum of care for persons in crisis.
- Statement that the law enforcement agency passes information about persons in crisis to applicable service providers.
- Statement that the agency may conduct additional non-crisis follow-up to include welfare checks as directed by the CIT coordinator or as identified by CIT officers based on their interactions with persons who have been in crisis.

Policy Example:

The <<AGENCY>> recognizes that it serves a critical role in the continuum of care for persons in crisis. The CIT coordinator shall serve as the liaison to other community stakeholders that make up the continuum of care and provide data from the <<AGENCY>>, in compliance with applicable laws, to other community stakeholders to reduce the need for the <<AGENCY>> to respond to persons in crisis calls for service.

CIT officers should contact persons they have interacted with, as time and circumstances permit, to further their rapport and provide a current evaluation of the person to others in the <<AGENCY>>. The CIT coordinator may also request that CIT officers perform welfare checks on individuals if a current crisis assessment of the person is needed.

Evaluation

Commentary:

Evaluating a CIT is much more than evaluating a CIT training course or courses. It involves being able to use data to determine if actual outcomes match the desired outcomes, and if the systems that have been put into place to support CIT and to respond to persons in crisis demonstrate efficacy. Although some publications suggest that someone should merely monitor an agency's CIT, it should instead be evaluated on a timely basis so that continuous improvements can be made.

Evaluations have formative, summative, and confirmative elements. These elements should be checked periodically or continuously. The elements apply to CIT in the following manner:

- Formative – Check the effectiveness of team design; check to see that policies and procedures can be created and implemented; check to see if training can be established, if it has the right goals and objectives, and if suitable trainers have been identified.
- Summative—Check if CIT officers and other stakeholders are reacting positively to how the team works; check if the training was/is sufficient; check if the training is being applied.
- Confirmative—Check to see if the team is effective and efficient or if a change is needed; check for improvement in officers' and PST's knowledge, skills, and abilities when responding to persons in crisis calls; check to see if the team is having a positive effect on persons in crisis calls; and check to see if funding for the CIT is providing value.

In an annual evaluation bringing together all the data and evaluation outcomes, the CIT coordinator and others should consider success stories and lessons learned in addition to what has been learned from evaluation efforts. Evaluations should result in a report that will be delivered to the law enforcement agency CEO and CIT program coordinator and should include feedback from CIT officers and other stakeholders in the community. It should also include a discussion of changes that have been made and/or should be made based on all the data received from incident reports to persons in crisis calls, Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets, training evaluation forms, and input from community stakeholders.

Main Elements:

- Stipulations that the CIT coordinator must continually evaluate the CIT and make changes in response to collected data to improve team efficiency and effectiveness and mitigate safety risks to agency personnel and the public.
- Stipulations that the CIT coordinator will prepare an annual report, in the form and format identified by the agency, and disseminate it to pertinent agency personnel and the CIT program coordinator. Sensitive data or data that is contrary to any federal, state, or local laws is to be withheld or redacted when shared.

Policy Example:

The CIT coordinator shall be responsible for the ongoing evaluation of the <<AGENCY NAME>>'s CIT. Data for this evaluation will be obtained from the <<AGENCY NAME>>'s incident reporting system, submitted Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets, and other databases or sources as needed. The CIT coordinator shall make changes to the team as needed. The CIT coordinator shall submit a letter to the <<CHIEF/SHERIFF/DESIGNEE>> if immediate changes to policies are needed or if an immediate need for unbudgeted funding is required to operate and maintain the CIT. The CIT coordinator shall forward a letter with such information and reasoning as soon as practical.

The CIT coordinator shall also prepare and submit an annual report about the CIT. An annual report will

be prepared and submitted to the <<CHIEF/SHERIFF/DESIGNEE>> and CIT program coordinator. This report will include statistics about CIT staffing and calls to persons in crisis, call outcomes, commentary about CIT effectiveness and efficiency to include training feedback, and how funds have been spent to include the added value from those funds.

Training

Commentary:

Training is critical in CIT programs, but law enforcement agency executives should remember that CIT is not just training. The CIT Patrol Officer Training Course is the most intensive and designed for personnel assigned to general patrol functions. This course is primarily designed to identify and interact with persons in crisis due to mental illness but has grown to include persons in crisis for other reasons. The CIT Patrol Officer Training Course must be created and delivered by the CIT program.

In addition to training the desired number of CIT officers, the agency must provide some level of training about interacting with persons in crisis to all sworn personnel. Additional training programs exist for this purpose. All sworn personnel should have received training in crisis intervention during the required Peace Officer Basic Training (POBT) school they attended. The knowledge and information from that crisis intervention training should have been applied and turned into basic skills during the agency's field training program. Sworn personnel who will not become CIT officers must receive appropriate training to interact with persons in crisis safely. That training should also include instruction to request a CIT officer response to the scene when available.

Other agency personnel must be trained based on their member role and/or accreditation standards the agency has chosen to follow. Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) must be trained to recognize service calls that identify a person or persons in crisis and to send the appropriate personnel, usually a CIT officer or officers. PSTs are encouraged to attend a CIT PST Training Course delivered by their local CIT program.

Civilian agency personnel who interact with the public in some manner should be trained to recognize a person in crisis, attempt to safely interact with that person, and call for the appropriate resources as needed. Training programs, such as Mental Health First Aid (MHFA), can be used for these personnel. Agencies that are accredited will find these requirements to train civilian personnel in their accreditation standards.

Agency executives must decide how often continuing professional training (CPT) is needed for sworn personnel and civilian personnel and how long the training session should last. Accreditation standards may assist agency executives with decisions about the length and frequency of training. Annual requirements for CPT or Continuing Education Training (CET) for PSTs may be created by the Ohio Peace Officer Training Commission (OPOTC) and the Ohio 911 Program Office. These requirements may include a combination of specific topics to be provided and the number of hours required.

Main Elements:

- Identification of training for sworn personnel in the basic training academy and application during field training.
- Identification of the CIT Patrol Officer Training Course and the personnel to whom it should be delivered.
- Identification of training for non-CIT officers (sworn personnel).
- Identification of training for the CIT PST Training Course (unless the agency contracts with another agency for call-taking and dispatching services).
- Identification of the length and frequency of continuing professional training for CIT officers.
- Identification of the length and frequency of continuing professional training or continued education and training for all other sworn personnel and PSTs.
- Identification of the length and frequency of training for other civilian personnel who come into frequent contact with the public.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> who have been selected to become CIT officers shall complete the CIT Patrol Officer Training Course before responding to service calls that require a CIT officer. CIT officers shall receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of continuing professional training (CPT) in crisis intervention topics every <<TIME FRAME>>. CIT officers shall complete all required training to maintain CIT status.

All other <<officers/deputies>> shall receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of training in response to persons in crisis in place of CIT training. All training for <<officers/deputies>> will build upon the training provided in the basic academy and applied during field training. All <<officers/deputies>> shall also receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of CPT in crisis response every <<TIME FRAME>>.

Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) shall receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of training in taking 911 or non-emergency calls involving persons in crisis during introductory training. All PSTs shall attend a CIT PST Training Course conducted by the local CIT Program. PSTs shall receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of continuing education and training (CET) to handle calls involving persons in crisis every <<TIME FRAME>>.

NOTE: The Ohio Peace Officer Training Commission (OPOTC) and/or the Ohio 911 Program Office may choose to require specific hours of training in responding to persons in crisis or handling calls about persons in crisis in any given calendar year. If so, the higher number of training hours will prevail.

Civilian personnel who regularly interact with the public shall receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of training to interact with persons in crisis within <<TIME FRAME>> of the date of hire. Civilian personnel in these positions will also receive <<NUMBER OF HOURS>> of continuing education/training to interact with persons in crisis every <<TIME FRAME>>.

Emergency Hospitalization Policy

Introduction

Commentary:

Police officers and Sheriffs (and by delegated authority deputy sheriffs) in Ohio, along with other non-law enforcement professionals identified by the Ohio Revised Code, may take a person into custody if they have reason to believe that the person is a mentally ill person subject to a court order and if that person represents a substantial risk of physical harm to self or others if allowed to remain at liberty pending examination according to ORC § 5122.10, titled “Emergency hospitalization.” A set of criteria for a “mentally ill person subject to court order” is further defined in ORC § 5122.01B. The additional language found in both ORC § 5122.01B and ORC § 5122.10 provides specific steps that must be taken when taking persons into custody to be examined. Many of these steps also apply if a person is taken into custody on a temporary order of detention issued by a judge or magistrate of the probate court of the county according to ORC § 5122.11 titled “Court ordered treatment of mentally ill person.”

If a person is taken into custody for “Emergency hospitalization” (ORC § 5122.10), a probable cause standard (referred to in mental health codes as “reasonable cause” or “reason to believe”) is required. There is no “reasonable suspicion” test for a mental health seizure (see *Fisher v. Harden*, 398 F.3d 837 (6th Cir. 2005)).

Main Elements:

- Language about “mentally ill person subject to court order.”
- Language referencing ORC § 5122.10, titled “Emergency hospitalization.”
- Language referencing ORC § 5122.01, titled “Hospitalization of mentally ill definitions.”
- Language referencing ORC § 5122.11, titled “Court ordered treatment of mentally ill person.”
- Language identifying that the standard for mental health seizure is probable cause and not merely reasonable suspicion.

Policy Example:

The <<AGENCY>> shall protect people through the legal and appropriate use of the Emergency hospitalization process. <<Officers/Deputies>> responding to a call of a person in a crisis shall only take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause exists. <<Officers/Deputies>> having probable cause to believe that a person is a “mentally ill person subject to court order” should take the person, or cause the person to be taken, into custody and immediately transported to a receiving center for a mental health evaluation.

A “mentally ill person subject to court order” is defined in ORC § 5122.01B as a person who, because of the person’s illness:

1. Represents a substantial risk of physical harm to self as manifested by evidence of threats of, or attempts at, suicide or serious self-inflicted bodily harm;
2. Represents a substantial risk of physical harm to others as manifested by evidence of recent homicidal or other violent behavior, evidence of recent threats that place another in reasonable fear of violent behavior and serious physical harm, or other evidence of present dangerousness;
3. Represents a substantial and immediate risk of serious physical impairment or injury to self as manifested by evidence that the person is unable to provide for and is not providing for the person's basic physical needs because of the person's mental illness and that appropriate provision for those needs cannot be made immediately available in the community; or

4. Would benefit from treatment for the person's mental illness and is in need of such treatment as manifested by evidence of behavior that creates a grave and imminent risk to substantial rights of others or the person.

CIT officers should be dispatched to these types of calls. Non-CIT officers should contact a CIT officer for assistance when necessary.

Assessment

Commentary:

Law enforcement personnel responding to a call about a person in crisis must assess the situation upon arrival and during the interaction so that a decision can be made about how to resolve the situation. Personnel should use their senses and should gather information from the person in crisis, family members, bystanders, and any available records, including previous contact records. That information must be scrutinized to determine its reliability and pertinence to the situation. This assessment will make the situation safer for all involved and guide the responding personnel towards the best possible resolution.

A portion of the assessment of the person in crisis is the risk of self-harm or harm to others. Past actions should be considered in addition to the display of signs or utterances of symptoms in the presence of the responding law enforcement officer. Law enforcement officers are not expected to diagnose persons in crisis or be clinicians. They are expected to determine how severe the crisis is, and then reach an appropriate resolution to mitigate and resolve the crisis.

Threats of self-harm and threats of harm to others are the primary reasons for a response to calls involving persons in crisis. Threats of harm to others are often voiced by the person in crisis or relayed by others. Past service call histories may also provide insight. Threats of self-harm may be rapidly voiced by the person in crisis or others, or the responding officer may have to elicit such information from the person in crisis through questioning. Guidance about the types of responses from a person expressing a desire for self-harm, called suicidal ideations, should be provided.

Main Elements:

- Language that the responding law enforcement officer, preferably a CIT officer, must obtain information from all reliable sources and from the officer's senses to determine if a person is in crisis and to determine the severity level of the crisis.
- Language that the responding law enforcement officer, preferably a CIT officer, must assess self-harm risk and risk of violence/harm to others.
- Language that the responding law enforcement officer, preferably a CIT officer, must know what responses from a person in crisis constitute a high acuity level of threat of self-harm.
- Language that the responding law enforcement officer, preferably a CIT officer, must be knowledgeable of the criteria to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization and how to articulate probable cause to support taking custody.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> responding to a person in crisis call will assess the level of crisis by obtaining information from all reliable sources at the scene, any history of previous calls for service to the person or location, information from the person in crisis, and information from the <<officer's/deputy's>> own senses. CIT officers are the preferred responders to these service calls.

<<Officers/Deputies>> will analyze all information and determine if the person in crisis is a substantial risk of harm to self or others. <<Officers/Deputies>> are not expected to diagnose disorders but to recognize behavior that has a substantial risk of being harmful, dangerous, or creating a grave and imminent risk to substantial rights of others or the person exhibiting those behaviors.

<<Officers/Deputies>> shall call for emergency medical services (EMS) for those persons who have already physically harmed themselves or others as needed and take appropriate action to contain the scene.

When thoughts of self-harm (suicidal ideations) are articulated or suspected, <<officers/deputies>> should determine if there is a substantial risk for physical harm to self (suicide) by asking questions or obtaining information about the following:

- The frequency of suicidal thoughts and types of thoughts.
- Any suicide plan.
- The means to complete suicide, including the immediate availability of items related to the plan.
- Any past behavior related to suicide (e.g., suicide attempts by the person, suicide attempts or completions by family members or friends).
- Current support system(s) or lack thereof.

When a person's perception of reality may be impaired, <<officers/deputies>> should attempt to determine the person's awareness relative to the following:

- Time (awareness of existing in the present, knowledge of the date and time).
- Person (awareness of who they are, and who are the people with them or around them).
- Place (awareness of where they are and why they are there).

<<Officers/Deputies>> <<should or shall>> take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause is developed to support the custody, and the taking of custody conforms with one or more of the first four criteria found in ORC § 5122.01(B) (1-4). <<Officers/Deputies>> shall transport the person in crisis to a receiving center.

Emergency Hospitalization Process

Commentary:

Once law enforcement officers have decided to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization as outlined in ORC § 5122.10(A), some actions are required at the time custody is taken. Some additional actions and steps are required or suggested when the person in custody is transported to a receiving center. The actions at the time of taking custody are listed in ORC § 5122.10(B) and (C).

Main Elements:

- Listing of requirements after taking custody of a person for Emergency hospitalization.
- Listing of required/suggested steps when a person is transported to a receiving center.
- Listing of additional suggested steps after taking custody of a person for Emergency hospitalization.

Policy Example:

When a person is taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization, the custodial <<officer/deputy>> shall:

- Make every reasonable and appropriate effort to take the person into custody in the least conspicuous manner possible (ORC § 5122.10C).
- Inform the person of the <<officer's/deputy's>> name, title, and agency (ORC § 5122.10C).
- Inform the person that this custody is not a criminal arrest (ORC § 5122.10C).
- Inform the person that they are being taken for examination by mental health professionals at a facility to be identified by name (ORC § 5122.10C).
- Create a written statement to be provided to the receiving center where the person is to be transported using the <<NAME OF FORM/FORMAT USED>> (ORC § 5122.10B).
- Make reasonable accommodations, if applicable, for the person taken into custody, such as the care of the person's pet, securing of a house or vehicle, and/or notification to relatives or other involved persons.

Once the person is in custody, the custodial <<officer/deputy>> shall:

- Search the person for weapons or contraband as an inventory of the person's belongings and document what was removed.
- Contact the receiving center to inform them of the transport.
- Transport the person to a receiving center by patrol vehicle or arrange for EMS to transport the person to an available emergency department if the person requires medical treatment or is under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
- Obtain approval from a supervisor if the person is transported by EMS and the officer's presence is requested.
- Escort the person into the treatment area upon arrival at the receiving center, provide staff members with a written statement, and remain present to provide clarification of the grounds for detention, upon request.

Before the service call is completed, the <<officer/deputy>> shall:

- Complete the appropriate incident report <<ENTER REPORT NAME AND SYSTEM IN PLACE OF "APPROPRIATE">>. Attach a copy of the written statement or document containing the written statement that was provided to the receiving center.
- Complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet (or equivalent) <<IDENTIFY EQUIVALENT BY NAME AND SYSTEM IF NEEDED>>.

Transports

Commentary:

When responding to crisis calls, law enforcement officers may interact with a person in crisis who does not fit the criteria for Emergency hospitalization. The person in crisis is compliant and willing to be transported to a receiving center. Some law enforcement officers find that they can quickly conclude a crisis call by transporting a person for evaluation rather than conducting a thorough crisis assessment. These decisions can overtax receiving centers that evaluate for Emergency hospitalization. Also, persons in crisis who have agreed to be transported may change their minds during or after arrival. If the transporting officers do not have probable cause to take the person into custody for Emergency hospitalization, the person being transported willingly must be immediately released and potentially returned to their original location.

Persons in crisis who do not meet the criteria for Emergency hospitalization should not be transported to a receiving center but should instead be referred to other community resources and/or service providers that provide non-emergency, outpatient care. Family members, as applicable, should be referred to community advocacy groups or service boards for additional support and education and/or to the probate court of the county to determine if the court could issue a temporary order of detention or begin a process for assisted outpatient treatment.

When a person is in crisis, several services, such as law enforcement, mental health agencies, mobile crisis teams, and EMS, may be involved. These agencies must work together when the need to transport someone to a receiving center occurs. Through formal agreements, such as Memoranda of Understanding or Agreement (MOUs/MOAs), agency policies, and program procedures, agencies should agree on how they will work together when transporting a person in a crisis in their community. With these agreements and policies in place, the person in crisis is better served, and conflict between agencies is avoided.

Main Elements:

- Direction to law enforcement officers to only transport persons subject to Emergency hospitalization.
- Direction to law enforcement officers to refer persons in crisis along with family members and concerned parties to non-emergency service providers or advocacy groups when probable cause for Emergency hospitalization does not exist or to the probate court of the county for other options.
- Direction to follow agreements or procedures when working with other crisis services.
- Direction to complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies >> should not transport a person in crisis to a receiving center unless they meet Emergency hospitalization criteria. If probable cause exists for Emergency hospitalization, the person in crisis should be taken into custody. <<Officers/Deputies> should instead refer persons from crisis calls that will not result in Emergency hospitalization to service providers that can provide outpatient services <<REPLACE WITH NAMES AS APPLICABLE>> and other concerned parties to advocacy groups <<REPLACE WITH NAMES AS APPLICABLE>> or the applicable services board <<REPLACE WITH NAMES AS APPLICABLE>> for support and information. Concerned parties should also be referred to the <<NAME>> probate court of the county for additional options if desired.

When other agencies (EMS, mental health services, mobile crisis teams, etc.) are involved with responding to a person experiencing a crisis, <<Officers/Deputies >> shall collaborate with those agencies to determine

which agency is best suited to transport the person to a receiving center for evaluation.

<<Officers/Deputies >> shall follow any agreements or procedures in place to guide them on which service is best to use.

<<Officers/Deputies>> who have referred persons in crisis instead of taking custody for Emergency hospitalization shall document their actions. <<ENTER NAME OF REPORT TO BE TAKEN OR REFERENCE DOCUMENTATION TO BE ENTERED INTO CAD SYSTEM>>. <<Officers/Deputies >> shall also complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet and submit it to the CIT Coordinator.

Criminal Offenses

Commentary:

Law enforcement officers responding to persons in crisis calls may find that criminal activity has occurred. As noted elsewhere in this manual, an assessment should be made to determine if the person must be arrested as a preferred course of action. If an offense has been committed, a summons can be issued to the person in crisis, and then that person should be transported to a receiving center subject to Emergency hospitalization. The appropriate offense report should be completed.

If an arrest is made and the person is transported to jail or a detention facility, the transporting officers must inform intake staff at the jail or detention facility that the person is in crisis. This notification will allow jail or facility staff to have the person evaluated according to their protocols. The arresting officer should also forward information to the court system, through the CIT coordinator or other established channels, so that the person can be considered for any specialty dockets that may exist in the county where the offense occurred.

Main Elements:

- Direction to law enforcement officers to issue a summons if applicable/appropriate, and/or document the criminal offense on the appropriate offense report.
- Direction to law enforcement officers who have effected an arrest based on probable cause and are transporting a person in crisis to the applicable jail or detention facility to notify jail/facility staff of the crisis and provide information that can be used for an assessment by the jail/detention facility staff.
- Direction to forward information about the person to the CIT coordinator or another authorized channel to the court system having jurisdiction over the offense so that the person can be considered for any appropriate specialty docket in that court system.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> who have responded to a person in crisis call that involves a criminal offense by the person or who have responded to a criminal offense call that is found to involve a person in crisis shall take one of the following actions:

- Effect an arrest, if probable cause exists, if the offense is a felony or violent misdemeanor that lists arrest as a preferred course of action.
- Issue a summons, if probable cause exists, if the offense is a non-violent misdemeanor. The person in crisis will also be taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause exists.

If the person in crisis is arrested and booked at the <<NAME OF JAIL OR FACILITY>>, the transporting <<officer/deputy>> will notify the <<NAME OF JAIL OR FACILITY>> intake staff that the person is in crisis and needs a psychological evaluation. The transporting <<officer/deputy>> shall also inform the CIT coordinator of the arrest <<OR IDENTIFY THE NOTIFICATION PATH AND METHOD>> so that the court can consider the person for a specialty docket <<ENTER NAME OF DOCKET INSTEAD-IF ANY>>.

Any responding <<officer/deputy>> seeking to issue a summons instead of effecting an arrest for a violent misdemeanor other than those that prefer arrest shall contact a supervisor for permission and guidance. The arresting or summoning <<officer/deputy>> shall complete the appropriate offense report and arrest report if applicable. A Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet (or equivalent) shall also be completed and submitted to the CIT Coordinator.

Juveniles

Commentary:

ORC § 5122.10 is not specific as to the age of the person in crisis. Therefore, it appears to be equally applicable to those legally defined as adults or juveniles. Law enforcement officers interacting with a juvenile (a person who is 17 years or younger) have various options available.

As with adults, if the juvenile is delinquent by reason of the commission of a criminal offense that should result in arrest, then the juvenile should be arrested and handled through the system that exists in the county where the juvenile resides. If a summons is desired, that should also be handled in the manner prescribed in the county where the juvenile resides.

If a juvenile is in crisis and the parent or guardian is involved and agrees, the juvenile can generally be transported to the designated receiving center for evaluation. The parent or guardian should accompany the juvenile. If the juvenile is in crisis and the parent or guardian is not involved or agreeable, a law enforcement officer, having probable cause to believe that the juvenile should be taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization, can take the juvenile into custody in the same manner prescribed for an adult in crisis. The appropriate county children's services department or child and family services department should be notified. Concurrent custody could be taken under ORC § 2151.31(A)(3)(a) (Taking child into custody) when "there are reasonable grounds to believe that the child is suffering from illness or injury and is not receiving proper care."

Law enforcement executives should be aware that taking juveniles into custody for Emergency hospitalization is not uniformly applied across Ohio and that courts have differing opinions and methods about how this should be done. Local conventions should be followed to avoid conflict with county courts and judges holding jurisdiction over the juvenile.

Main Elements:

- Language that juveniles can be transported to a receiving center if parents/guardians agree and participate.
- Language that juveniles may be taken into custody per ORC § 5122.10 if the parents/guardians do not participate and disagree with obtaining an evaluation and services for the juvenile.
- Language that law enforcement officers may also have to take concurrent custody under ORC § 2151.31(A)(3)(a) and notify the county children's services or job and family services office for involvement by that office.

Policy Example:

If Emergency hospitalization criteria are met, an officer has the authority to take a person 17 years or younger (juvenile) into custody and transport the juvenile to a receiving center for evaluation. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall involve the parent/guardian in this process. If the parent/guardian is not available, the <<officers/deputies>> must notify them of the actions taken. When the parent/guardian is not agreeable to the seizure, <<officers/deputies>> should still take the juvenile into custody for evaluation if they believe this is the best course of action. <<Officers/Deputies>> should also consider utilizing ORC § 2151.31(A)(3)(a) "Taking child into custody" and notifying <<CHILDRENS' SERVICES/JOB AND FAMILY SERVICES>>.

Other Policy Considerations

Use of Force Considerations

Commentary:

The taking of persons into custody according to Ohio Revised Code § 5122.10 (Emergency hospitalization), or according to a temporary order of detention issued by a judge or magistrate as defined in Ohio Revised Code § 5122.11 (Court ordered treatment of mentally ill person) may require adjustments to the application of force if force must be used to effect taking a person into custody. A general recommendation, derived mainly from federal court decisions that are binding on all agencies in Ohio, is that law enforcement officers who are encountering unarmed and minimally threatening persons who are exhibiting conspicuous signs that they are unstable due to a mental health crisis or some similar event must attempt to de-escalate the situation when feasible and adjust any use of force downward on use of force continuums or matrices. A growing list of federal court decisions has also provided the following items for consideration when law enforcement executives create or amend their policies on the use of force involving taking someone into custody based solely on ORC Chapter 5122 (Hospitalization of Mentally Ill).

- A person's mental capacity and mental instability must be considered before the application of force. This condition is being called "diminished capacity" within the courts. Cases involving mental illness, intellectual/developmental disabilities (I/DD), and those who have an Autism Spectrum diagnosis have been identified as part of this evolving legal doctrine. It could be expected that those suffering from other brain-based disorders or serious trauma such as a Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) are included in the thinking behind these decisions. Those displaying severe behavioral signs and symptoms due to substance use have also been mentioned in court cases as having a "diminished capacity."
- Law enforcement officers should not quickly resort to the use of force to get a person to comply when that person does not respond immediately to commands. Those with "diminished capacity" may take longer to process requests and demands, and law enforcement personnel must consider those factors before using force or escalating the amount of force used based on a belief that the person is purposely being non-compliant or is being belligerent.
- If taking persons into custody based on ORC Chapter 5122 is to prevent those persons from harming themselves, then any force by law enforcement that causes harm is contrary to the idea of protecting those persons.
- Law enforcement officers who are trying to prevent a person from fleeing or complying cannot use much force if that person is only refusing to move or comply.
- If persons who are being taken into custody based on ORC Chapter 5122 are not creating a risk of immediate danger to law enforcement officers or others, then the use of an electronic control device (ECD)/electronic control weapon (ECW) is unreasonable.
- Physical resistance to being placed into custody is not the same as a risk of immediate danger to law enforcement officers or others.
- The use of force against those who are experiencing medical emergencies is possible, but only after passing a three-pronged test that was created by the federal courts.

Main Elements:

- A statement that de-escalation tactics and techniques must be used when feasible and before an application of force when possible.
- A statement that personnel must take a person's mental state (mental instability or capacity) into account when deciding on a level of force that is to be used to take that person into custody for Emergency hospitalization.
- Language that guides personnel to allow for additional time if a person in crisis does not immediately respond to commands or directions when feasible.
- Language that identifies that any use of force that is used to prevent persons from harming themselves will not be used if the force causes harm to those persons.
- Language that personnel will not use higher levels of force to prevent fleeing or to resist being taken into custody by a person in crisis who is only refusing to move or comply with commands.
- A statement that an ECD/ECW (most common is the TASER®) is not to be used on persons in crisis if those persons are not creating a risk of immediate danger to personnel or the public. Passively resisting the law enforcement personnel who are attempting to take custody is not a risk of immediate danger.
- Language discussing that any force may only be used against those experiencing medical emergencies if it meets the three-pronged test identified in the decision by the United States Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, titled *Estate of Corey Hill v. Christopher Miracle*. Force can only be used if all three of the following factors apply:
 - The person is experiencing a medical emergency that makes the person incapable of making a rational decision while posing a threat of serious harm to the person or others.
 - Some degree of force is reasonably necessary to ameliorate (make something bad or unsatisfactory better) the immediate threat.
 - The level of force used is reasonable based on the circumstances (not excessive).

Use of Restraints

Commentary:

The use of handcuffs or other forms of restraint is often required by law enforcement agencies when a person is taken into custody. There may be some allowances to handcuff a person in front of their bodies instead of behind due to size or medical concerns, but those medical concerns do not often include mental illness, an I/DD diagnosis, a diagnosis of an Autism Spectrum Disorder, or any other brain-based or behavioral disorder or condition. The required use of handcuffs for transport may cause members of the public to avoid calling law enforcement agencies for assistance with a person in crisis until the crisis has reached a point where family or others must get immediate assistance.

Law enforcement officers should be permitted to use their discretion to decide if a person in crisis who is being transported to a receiving center should be handcuffed or otherwise restrained. Law enforcement officers should assess the immediate risk of harm to self or others and then decide if restraints must be applied. If handcuffs or other restraints must be applied, the law enforcement officer applying them should explain why they are being applied (policy) and that they will be removed as soon as possible. Law enforcement officers should also explain the reason for not using restraints on persons being transported, along with explaining that restraints may have to be applied if circumstances change. Finally, transport personnel should inform the person in crisis of why transportation in a police vehicle is necessary. All these tactics help to reduce stigma and additional trauma for the person in crisis and increase the possibility that the person in crisis or family/friends of the person in crisis will call for help in future crises and may even call earlier as a crisis develops.

Main Elements:

- Language to be inserted into CIT and/or persons in crisis response policies along with arrest, search, and seizure policies that law enforcement personnel will have discretion in the use of handcuffs or other forms of restraints when taking a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization or an issued temporary order of detention.
- Language to be inserted into all applicable policies that law enforcement personnel will explain to persons in crisis why restraints are or are not being used and explain that restraints could be used later if safety needs dictate.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> should use discretion when deciding to handcuff or use other restraints when taking persons into custody for Emergency hospitalization. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall use restraints if the safety of the person or others is a concern or to prevent escape or injury to the person. <<Officers/Deputies>> shall explain why handcuffs or other restraint devices were used or not used and document their use/non-use in the <<NAME OF REPORT>>.

Interview and Interrogation

Commentary:

Most law enforcement agencies place guidance for interviewing victims or witnesses of criminal activity and for interviewing/interrogating those who are suspected of committing criminal acts into their policies. Agencies provide additional guidance for interviewing or interrogating specific populations. Interviewing and interrogating juveniles, persons with limited English proficiency (LEP), and persons who are hard of hearing or deaf get specific mention due to laws, court decisions, and review by federal funding authorities and the U.S. Department of Justice. What is often missing is guidance for interviewing or interrogating persons who have mental illnesses, I/DD diagnoses, an Autism Spectrum Disorder diagnosis, or who have other brain-based disorders. For law enforcement agencies that have become accredited or are seeking accreditation, policy and procedure language about how personnel will interview and/or interrogate persons with various brain-based disorders is usually required.

This guidance is crucial to assist law enforcement officers with getting accurate information about criminal activity and to ensure that persons who waive their US Constitutional rights do so knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently. Confessions made by persons with mental disorders have been upheld by the Supreme Court when those persons possessed sufficient cognitive abilities to understand their rights when waived. The courts have ruled that any “Miranda” warnings must be comprehended and not merely administered.

Persons with these diagnoses, persons in crisis, and others may have difficulty recalling and/or articulating facts or observations as either witnesses or suspects. People with these diagnoses may respond with a “yes” when asked if they waive their rights or if asked if they have committed a criminal act even if they do not understand the question. People with these diagnoses may admit guilt or be highly suggestible to leading questions. Finally, they may provide incorrect information that could lead law enforcement personnel to incorrect decisions.

Main Elements:

- Language in policies to guide personnel when interviewing a person with a brain-based or cognitive disorder when the person is a victim or witness.
- Language in policies to guide personnel when interviewing/interrogating a person with a brain-based or cognitive disorder when the person is suspected of being involved in criminal activity.

Policy Example:

<<Officers/Deputies>> shall use caution when interviewing or interrogating a person in crisis or a person known or suspected to have a brain-based or cognitive disorder. <<Officers/Deputies>> should use the following guidelines to ensure that Constitutional rights are protected, and that accurate information is obtained. These guidelines are comprehensive, but not all-inclusive.

Interviews

- Conduct interviews in a setting free of people or distractions.
- Interview with one officer if possible. The officer should be patient and offer encouragement during the interview.
- Be aware that persons experiencing delusions, paranoia, or hallucinations may still be able to accurately provide information outside their false system of thoughts, including details related to observations they made or statements they heard.

Interviews or Interrogations

- Use simple words when reading the Miranda warning and modify the warning to help the person understand—avoid receiving a yes answer if the person does not appear to understand the warning.
- Do not employ common interrogation techniques, suggest answers, or attempt to complete the
 - thoughts of persons slow to respond or pose hypothetical questions.
- Ask open-ended questions and avoid leading questions.
- Use simple and straightforward language—speak slowly and clearly—be specific and direct.
- Keep sentences short and break complicated questions into smaller parts.
- Repeat questions more than once or ask a question in a different way when necessary—allow time for the person to give information and to ask for more information.
- Ask for concrete descriptions, colors, clothing, etc.
- Use pictures, symbols, and actions to help convey meaning when possible.
- Avoid the use of slang/jargon.
- Avoid inferring that persons who act as if they do not hear the questions or exactly repeat what
 - was said to them are being belligerent—the person may lack control over what is communicated or be unable to verbally communicate and may not fully understand the question.
- Avoid interpreting a lack of eye contact or strange actions as indications of deceit.
- Investigate any admission of guilt carefully, as it may not be true.
- Use firm and calm persistence if the person does not comply or acts aggressively.

Other Medical Considerations

Law enforcement agency executives should create policies to guide their personnel in interacting with persons who may be in medical distress that has resulted in a crisis. Medical issues such as epilepsy, diabetes, and delirium could cause a person to exhibit signs and symptoms of being in crisis, but those issues are not part of this guide. Executives can seek out other sources of information and other advocacy and educational groups to provide this guidance.

Law enforcement executives should also consider the creation of policies to guide their personnel in interactions with persons who appear to be experiencing an agitated chaotic event (formerly known by the term “excited delirium”). Interactions between law enforcement officers and those who appear to be experiencing an agitated chaotic event have often been violent and, at times, deadly. Many resources are available to provide this guidance.

Crisis Response Policy Example

Woody Valley Police Department



Effective: 11.16.23

Revised:

Pages: 7

Number: 306-1

Crisis Response

1. Purpose Statement

The Woody Valley Police Department (WVPD) recognizes that personnel will, at times, be required to interact with persons in crisis and that those interactions can be challenging and may require difficult decisions about a person's level of crisis and lawful actions that can be taken. This policy is intended to guide responding personnel to aid them in making effective decisions that safeguard the community and all persons involved, and that promote a resolution that is both legal and compassionate.

WVPD agreed to participate in a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) program. This policy was created to provide operational guidelines for our agency's CIT, and for CIT officers to include training, response, and the primary responsibility to respond to service calls involving persons in crisis. WVPD acknowledges that CIT is an ongoing collaboration with the crisis care system. This system includes mental health service providers, advocates, persons with mental illness or other behavioral health disorders, family members, and the community with the intent to divert persons away from the criminal justice system when feasible.

2. Guiding Principle

WVPD is committed to being a collaborative partner in the CIT program and the crisis care and response system in Munetz County. As a partner in CIT, WVPD will work with the other partners to minimize the criminal justice system's involvement with people experiencing a crisis in our community. WVPD also recognizes that its officers interact with people in crisis and that persons in crisis will benefit from an appropriate intervention and better interactions. Officers shall use de-escalation skills instead of physical force, as circumstances dictate, to interact with persons in crisis. If a criminal offense is involved, the arrest of a person in crisis is the least preferred alternative. Officers should divert a person in crisis, voluntarily or involuntarily, to a receiving center, when not compelled by policy, law, or court decision to make an arrest. CIT officers shall be dispatched to service calls involving persons in crisis whenever available and shall be called to the scene by non-CIT officers, when available, after determining that the call involves a person in crisis.

3. Definitions

Crisis (Person in Crisis) – A situation whereby a person has become unable to self-regulate thinking, mood, or behavior. A person could be experiencing intense feelings of distress and/or displaying obvious changes in functioning in their daily living activities. This disturbance with a person’s understanding and comprehension, ability to regulate emotions, and/or ability to regulate behavior may occur due to mental illness, intellectual or developmental disability (I/DD), an injury/trauma to the brain, deterioration of the brain, other medical conditions, or a medical emergency.

Crisis Intervention Team (Agency) – A business or organization that provides a specific service (law enforcement, service provider, etc.) that formally and through written policy has integrated concepts of the CIT Model and the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs* into their organizational structure. A CIT can exist within criminal justice and mental health agencies. A CIT only operates within a broader CIT program.

Crisis Intervention Team Program (CIT Program) – A program consisting of law enforcement, mental health, and advocacy collaborating to improve community responses to mental health crises. CIT programs are formally organized and have implemented the concepts of the CIT Model and the *Core Elements of Ohio Crisis Intervention Team Programs*. A CIT program comprises agency CITs, a steering committee, relevant agencies, and stakeholders. In Ohio, CIT programs are organized by mental health and recovery board catchment areas – which can encompass one or multiple counties. In Ohio, CIT programs utilize their local crisis response system, which is typically county-specific.

Crisis Intervention Team Program Coordinator (CIT Program Coordinator) – A person assigned to coordinate the activities of agencies participating in a CIT program. Typically, this is done at a county level. Their responsibilities include coordinating CIT strategies such as sustaining a CIT steering committee, establishing relationships with law enforcement and the local crisis response system, coordinating training, and programmatic data collection and evaluation.

Crisis Intervention Team Coordinator (CIT Coordinator) – A CIT officer (specify rank if desired) assigned by the Chief of Police or designee to manage the administration, planning, personnel selection, training, and overall operation of the CIT within an agency. The duties include acting as the liaison between the WVPD, service providers, and community partners.

Crisis Intervention Team Officer (CIT Officer) – Law enforcement officers who have received specialized training in first response crisis intervention and are identified as being the primary responders to calls for service involving a person in a mental health crisis. These law enforcement officers will perform their regular duties within the agency but will respond to persons in crisis calls.

De-escalation – A system employing active and aligned communication along with the use of time, distance, and barriers as tactics to reduce or manage behaviors displayed by a person in crisis to reduce or avoid physical conflict. De-escalation is employed, when possible, to avoid or reduce the amount of force needed to control a situation involving a person in crisis.

Emergency Psychological Services (EPS) – A location or method of providing crisis intervention, evaluation, and stabilization. This could be a mental health facility, a receiving center, or a mobile team or responder who can assess the current situation and direct officers to the appropriate location.

Mental disorder (mental illness) – A substantial disorder of thought, mood, perception, orientation, or memory that grossly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or the ability to meet the

ordinary demands of life (ORC § 5122.01(A)).

Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) – These personnel work within agency-specific or combined emergency communications centers (ECCs). They are commonly referred to as dispatchers and/or call takers. PSTs handle emergency calls via 911 and non-emergency calls over other telephone lines or platforms. They dispatch the appropriate resources for the situation or refer callers to other services if public safety intervention is not needed at the time.

Receiving Center – A location, sometimes known as a crisis receiving and stabilization facility, which can provide care to a person in crisis. This place may be a stand-alone facility, a hospital licensed by the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, a portion of a general hospital, or an emergency department of a general hospital.

Substantial Risk of Physical Harm – A person has the means to cause harm (either to themselves or others), there is a significant risk that such harm will occur (to themselves or others), a person has made a credible threat which expresses an intention to cause harm (to themselves or others), the method of causing harm is accessible by the person, and/or the person has the means to act on the threat. Substantial risk of physical harm can be from any of these listed indicators or a combination of these indicators. It is determined by threat, method, and/or opportunity test. As per the Ohio Revised Code “Physical harm to persons means any injury, illness, or other physiological impairment, regardless of its gravity or duration” (Section 2901.01(A)(3)).

Written Statement -- A written statement is required if a law enforcement officer takes a person into custody according to Ohio’s mental health laws as found in ORC § 5122.01(B). This written statement shall specify the circumstances under which the person was taken into custody and the reasons that a law enforcement officer believes that the person is a mentally ill person subject to a court order and represents a substantial risk of physical harm to self or others if allowed to remain at liberty pending examination (ORC § 5122.10(A)(1)).

4. Crisis Intervention Team

WVDP shall assign adequate CIT officers to all shifts to meet the identified service call demand involving persons in crisis. CIT officers shall be dispatched, whenever available, to calls for service involving a person in crisis and shall be called to the scene by non-CIT officers if those officers identify a person in crisis. CIT officers shall remain in control at the scene of a person in crisis call unless relieved by a supervisor of greater rank. That supervisor shall seek the input of an on-scene CIT officer to resolve the crisis when reasonable and practical.

5. Guidelines for Recognition

WVDP officers responding to a call involving a person in crisis must assess what they observe and what is reported to them by others. This initial assessment can be difficult. Based on observable and reported behaviors and conduct, officers should recognize that they are dealing with a person in crisis due to a potentially underlying mental illness or medical condition (see definition of crisis). These behaviors and conduct are often referred to as signs and symptoms and may include:

- Has a history of mental illness, I/DD, or other crisis-related calls for service for the person or location.
- Made a current or past mention or threat of suicide (including gestures/attempts).
- Made a current or past threat or has taken action to harm another individual.
- Displays violent behavior towards persons or objects (e.g. threats, destruction of property).

- Displays reckless behavior (e.g. walking through busy traffic).
- Displays self-injurious behavior (e.g., cutting or cigarette burns to skin).
- Shows a loss of memory/disorientation and/or quick frustration that may include inappropriate or aggressive behavior when dealing with a new situation or unforeseen circumstance--this may include temper tantrums.
- Displays confusion about or unawareness of surroundings and may have difficulty in understanding or answering questions.
- Presents a lack of emotional response, an extreme emotional reaction, or an exaggerated emotional reaction to include a strong fear of persons, places, or things.
- Displays wide eyes, avoids eye contact, or stares at someone or a fixed point.
- Articulates rambling or incoherent thoughts, disconnected ideas, or nonsensical ideas.
- Displays speech that has an unusual speed, is halting, is overly flat, is overly excited, shows limited vocabulary, or shows signs of impairment.
- Speaks in a child-like manner or repeats what others say.
- Refuses to speak or cannot speak.
- Appears to process information slowly.
- Shows an unusual physical/general appearance (e.g., inappropriate clothing for the weather, personal hygiene).
- Displays unusual body movements to include pacing, clutching oneself or other objects to maintain control, repetitive movements such as rocking, or sluggishness.
- Reveals extreme agitation to include an irrational lack of cooperation and/or tendency to argue—may include hostility towards and/or distrust of some persons or everyone.
- Displays signs of hyperactivity—to include an inability to sit still, a short attention span, and evidence of lack of sleep.
- Offers assurances that everything is all right or begs to be left alone when observations or statements contradict—assurances may be frantic and may also suggest that the person is close to losing control.
- Mentions fixed, false beliefs (delusions) with a common focus on persecution or grandeur—may state that personal actions were directed by a higher power, or that the person suffers from extraordinary physical maladies that are not possible.
- Mentions hallucinations or shows signs of attending to them—hears voices, or sees, smells, tastes, or feels things that others do not and may carry on conversations with someone others cannot see or hear.
- Displays strange decorations (e.g., aluminum foil wrapped around objects).
- Hoards items one might consider garbage, newspapers, string, etc.
- Reveals the presence of feces or urine on floors or walls where the person stays/resides.

This list is not exhaustive but is comprehensive. History of signs and symptoms should not be treated as proof of the presence or absence of a crisis. Officers should investigate and determine if what they see and hear and what they are told constitutes a state of crisis.

6. Engaging People in Crisis and Assessing Risk

WVPD officers shall respond to a call involving a person in crisis and assess the safety concerns and risks to all involved before taking any other action. This safety assessment shall continue throughout the interaction. Officers shall gather information from all available sources (family members and friends, service providers, bystanders, the person in crisis) to determine if the person in crisis is to be taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization. Officers shall attempt to de-escalate the situation unless circumstances require other actions due to the safety of anyone involved in the interaction.

Signs and symptoms displayed by or articulated by a person in crisis or credible witnesses can make interaction difficult. Interaction with a person in crisis can be enhanced using the following tactics and techniques. Most of the tactics and techniques are listed as actions to take instead of actions to avoid. This list is comprehensive but not exhaustive.

- Slow down and take time to assess the situation if there is no immediate danger to others or the person—assess safety issues.
- Maintain a reasonable and safe distance from the person in crisis.
- Prepare for a lengthy interaction. Do not rush interaction unless there is an emergency.
- Gather information on the subject from acquaintances or family members where possible—contact a caregiver if appropriate.
- Introduce yourself and attempt to obtain the person’s name—look for or attempt to obtain personal identification if needed.
- Indicate a genuine willingness to understand and assist.
- Speak simply, slowly, and with direct phrases using a low tone; repeat as needed.
- Move slowly and use non-threatening body language and gestures.
- Remove distractions, upsetting influences, or disruptive people from the area.
- Eliminate commotion to the extent possible (loud sounds, bright lights, sirens, crowds, and move the person to a calm environment if necessary).
- Demonstrate “active listening skills.”
- Relate your concern for their feelings and allow them to vent their feelings.
- Respond to rage with quiet and calm reassurances.
- Listen carefully and do not interrupt except to redirect or refocus the person.
- Be aware of different forms of communication (signals or gestures) due to limited speaking capabilities.
- Use “I” and “We” statements (for example, I understand, we need to work together).
- Ask them if they are taking any medications and, if so, the types prescribed and when they were last taken.
- Be truthful as often as possible—unless there is immediate danger.
- Touch the person only when necessary and state your intentions when doing so.
- Understand that a rational discussion may not take place.
- Recognize the person may be overwhelmed by external and internal stimuli—be attentive to sensory impairments—may cause difficulty with information processing.
- Be friendly, patient, accepting, but firm and professional.
- Recognize a person’s delusions or hallucinations are very real for them—avoid challenging them or validating them.
- Remain calm and avoid overreacting.
- Request a backup officer, and always do so in cases where the individual will be taken into custody.
- Avoid automatically interpreting odd behavior or lack of quick response as resistance.
- Avoid getting angry or frustrated—be aware of non-verbal signals you may send.
- Avoid allowing others to interact simultaneously while you are attempting to talk to the person and to stabilize the situation.
- Avoid cornering a person or being cornered—give the person expanded space and ensure that officers have expanded their space and identified a safe exit if it should become necessary.

7. Resolution Options

WVPD officers who have identified and mitigated a person in crisis shall appropriately resolve the situation

based on all available information. Resolution options include but are not limited to taking no additional action, making a referral to community mental health services or other service providers in Munetz County, Emergency hospitalization, or arrest if a serious criminal offense occurred.

If officers do not have probable cause to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization, no further police action may be necessary. Officers shall refer the person to community mental health services or other appropriate services in Munetz County based on the situation. Officers shall be familiar with county services and provide others with information on how to access those services. Officers who have had more than one call with a person in crisis that has been resolved in this manner shall forward information about the person in crisis and the resolution to the CIT Coordinator for additional review. WVPD officers taking a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization shall follow the procedures outlined in the section on Emergency hospitalization. CIT officers shall be used, when available, to take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization and transport that person to a receiving center.

If a person in crisis has committed a non-violent misdemeanor, officers who have established probable cause that the offense has occurred shall issue a summons for the charge. If probable cause also exists for taking the person into custody for Emergency hospitalization, then follow the procedures outlined in the section on Emergency hospitalization. If a person in crisis has committed a violent misdemeanor other than Domestic Violence (ORC § 2919.25) or Violating Protection Order (ORC § 2919.27), the officer shall contact a supervisor for approval to issue a summons in addition to taking the person into custody for Emergency hospitalization. If an arrest is made, officers shall follow standard arrest procedures. Officers shall not only document the reason for arrest and facts surrounding the criminal offense but also document their recognition of mental health issues on their arrest report. The arresting officer shall notify the CIT Coordinator so that the person can be considered for the Munetz County Mental Health Diversion Court.

8. Reporting and Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets

WVPD officers who have been dispatched to a call involving a person in crisis or who interact with a person in crisis due to self-initiated activity shall document that incident in a Crisis Call report. Officers shall thoroughly document in the report the circumstances for the call for service, actions taken, and any information that could assist with follow-up services.

All officers shall complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet in addition to the Crisis Call report. The Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet shall be forwarded to the CIT Coordinator.

9. Continuum of Care and Follow-Up Activities

WVPD recognizes that it serves a critical role in the continuum of care for persons in crisis. The WVPD CIT Coordinator shall serve as the liaison to other community stakeholders that make up the continuum of care and provide data from WVPD, in compliance with applicable laws, to other community stakeholders to reduce the need for WVPD to respond to persons in crisis calls for service.

CIT officers should contact persons they have interacted with, as time and circumstances permit, to further their rapport and provide a current evaluation of the person to others at WVPD. The CIT Coordinator may also request that CIT officers perform welfare checks on individuals if a current crisis assessment of the person is needed.

10. Evaluation

The CIT Coordinator shall be responsible for the ongoing evaluation of the WVPD's CIT. Data for this

evaluation will be obtained from the WVPD's OHCOP records management system (OHCOP-RMS), submitted Crisis Intervention Contact Sheets, and other databases or sources as needed. The CIT Coordinator shall make changes to the team as needed. The CIT coordinator shall submit a letter to the Operations Captain if immediate changes to policies are needed or if an immediate need for unbudgeted funding is required to operate and maintain the CIT. The CIT coordinator shall forward a letter with such information and reasoning as soon as practical.

The CIT Coordinator shall also prepare and submit an annual report about CIT. An annual report will be prepared and submitted to the Operations Captain and the CIT program coordinator. This report will include statistics about CIT staffing and calls to persons in crisis, call outcomes, commentary about CIT effectiveness and efficiency to include training feedback, and how funds have been spent to include the added value from those funds.

11. Training

WVPD officers who have been selected to become CIT officers shall complete the Munetz County CIT Program's CIT Patrol Officer Training Course before responding to service calls that require a CIT officer. CIT officers shall receive four hours of advanced or refresher training in crisis intervention topics every year. CIT officers shall complete all required training to maintain CIT status.

All other officers shall receive eight hours of training in response to persons in crisis in place of the CIT Patrol Officer Training Course. All training for officers will build upon the training provided in the basic academy and applied during field training. All officers shall also receive two hours of training in crisis response every year.

Public Safety Telecommunicators (PSTs) shall receive four hours of training in taking 911 or non-emergency calls involving persons in crisis during introductory training. PSTs shall receive two hours of training to handle calls involving persons in crisis every year.

NOTE: The Ohio Peace Officer Training Commission (OPOTC) and/or the Ohio 911 Program Office may choose to require specific hours of training in responding to persons in crisis or handling calls about persons in crisis in any given calendar year. If so, the higher number of training hours will prevail.

Civilian personnel who regularly interact with the public shall receive two hours of training to interact with persons in crisis within three months of the date of hire. Civilian personnel in these positions will also receive one hour of training to interact with persons in crisis every year.

Emergency Hospitalization Policy Example

Woody Valley Police Department



Effective: 11.16.23

Revised:

Pages: 4

Number: 306-1a

Emergency Hospitalization

1. Introduction

The Woody Valley Police Department shall protect people through the legal and appropriate use of the Emergency hospitalization process. Officers responding to a call of a person in a mental health crisis shall only take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause exists. Officers having probable cause to believe that a person is a “mentally ill person subject to court order” should take the person, or cause the person to be taken, into custody and immediately transported to a receiving center where emergency psychological services can be obtained for a mental health evaluation.

A “mentally ill person subject to court order” is defined in ORC § 5122.01B as a person who, because of the person’s illness:

1. Represents a substantial risk of physical harm to self as manifested by evidence of threats of, or attempts at, suicide or serious self-inflicted bodily harm;
2. Represents a substantial risk of physical harm to others as manifested by evidence of recent homicidal or other violent behavior, evidence of recent threats that place another in reasonable fear of violent behavior and serious physical harm, or other evidence of present dangerousness;
3. Represents a substantial and immediate risk of serious physical impairment or injury to self as manifested by evidence that the person is unable to provide for and is not providing for the person's basic physical needs because of the person's mental illness and that appropriate provision for those needs cannot be made immediately available in the community;
4. Would benefit from treatment for the person's mental illness and is in need of such treatment as manifested by evidence of behavior that creates a grave and imminent risk to substantial rights of others or the person.

CIT officers should be dispatched to these types of calls. Non-CIT officers should contact a CIT officer for assistance when necessary.

2. ASSESSMENT

Officers responding to a person in crisis call will assess the level of crisis by obtaining information from all reliable sources at the scene, any history of previous calls for service to the person or location, information from the person in crisis, and information from the officer's own senses. CIT officers are the preferred responders to these service calls.

WVPD officers will analyze all information and determine if the person in crisis is a substantial risk of harm to self or others. Officers are not expected to diagnose disorders but to recognize behavior that has a substantial risk of being harmful, or dangerous, or creates a grave and imminent risk to the substantial rights of others or the person exhibiting those behaviors. Officers shall call for Woody Valley Emergency Medical Services (EMS) for those persons who have already physically harmed themselves or others as needed and take appropriate action to contain the scene.

When thoughts of self-harm (suicidal ideations) are articulated or suspected, officers should determine if there is a substantial risk for physical harm to self (suicide) by asking questions or obtaining information about the following:

- The frequency of suicidal or self-harm thoughts and types of thoughts.
- Any plan for self-harm (suicide).
- The means to complete suicide, including the immediate availability of items related to the plan.
- Any past behavior related to suicide (e.g., suicide attempts by the person, suicide attempts or completions by family members or friends).
- Current support system(s) or lack thereof.

For thought disorders where a person's perception of reality may be impaired, officers should attempt to determine the person's awareness relative to the following:

- Time (awareness of existing in the present, knowledge of the date and time).
- Person (awareness of who they are, and who are the people with them or around them).
- Place (awareness of where they are and why they are there).

WVPD Officers shall take a person into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause is developed to support the custody and the taking of custody conforms with one or more of the first four criteria found in ORC § 5122.01 (B) (1-4). Officers shall transport the person in crisis to a receiving center for a mental health evaluation.

3. EMERGENCY HOSPITALIZATION PROCESS

When a person is taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization, the custodial officer shall:

- Make every reasonable and appropriate effort to take the person into custody in the least conspicuous manner possible (ORC § 5122.10(C)).
- Inform the person of the officer's name, title, and that the officer is a member of the WVPD (ORC § 5122.10(C)).
- Inform the person that this custody is not a criminal arrest (ORC § 5122.10(C)).

- Inform the person that the person is being taken for examination by mental health professionals at a facility and identify the name of the facility (ORC § 5122.10(C)).
- Create a written statement to be provided to the receiving center where the person is to be transported using the Application for Emergency Admission (form DMHAS-0025) (ORC § 5122.10(B)).
- Make reasonable accommodation, if applicable for the person taken into custody, such as the care of the person's pet, securing of a house or vehicle, and/or notification to relatives or other involved persons.

Once the person is in custody, the custodial officer shall:

- Search the person for weapons or contraband as an inventory of the person's belongings and document what was removed.
- Contact the receiving facility to inform that facility of the transport.
- Transport the person to a receiving center by patrol vehicle or arrange for EMS to transport the person to an available emergency department if the person requires medical treatment or is under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
- Obtain approval from a supervisor if the person is transported by EMS and the officer's presence is requested.
- Escort the person into the treatment area upon arrival at the receiving center, provide staff members with a written statement, and remain present to provide clarification of the grounds for detention, upon request.

Before the service call is completed, the officer shall:

- Complete a Crisis Call report and attach a copy of the Application for Emergency Admission.
- Complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet.

4. TRANSPORTS

If probable cause exists for Emergency hospitalization, the person in crisis shall be taken into custody before being transported. WVPD officers shall not transport a person in crisis to a receiving center if they are not in custody. Officers should instead refer persons from crisis calls to service providers in Munetz County who can provide outpatient services and other concerned parties to advocacy groups or the Munetz County Mental Health and Recovery Board (MC-MHRB) for support and information. Concerned parties should also be referred to the Munetz County Probate Court for additional options if desired.

Officers who have referred persons in crisis instead of taking custody for Emergency hospitalization shall document their actions in a Crisis Call report. Officers shall also complete a Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet and submit it to the CIT Coordinator.

5. CRIMINAL OFFENSES

WVPD officers who have responded to a person in crisis call that involves a criminal offense by the person or who have responded to a criminal offense call that is found to involve a person in crisis shall take one of the following actions:

- Effect an arrest, if probable cause exists, if the offense is a felony or is a violent misdemeanor that lists arrest as a preferred course of action.

- Issue a summons, if probable cause exists, if the offense is a non-violent misdemeanor. The person in crisis will also be taken into custody for Emergency hospitalization if probable cause exists.

If the person in crisis is arrested and booked at the Munetz County Jail, the transporting officer will notify the intake staff that the person is in crisis and needs a psychological evaluation. The transporting officer shall also inform the CIT Coordinator of the arrest so that the court can consider the person for a Munetz County Mental Health Diversion Court.

Any responding officer seeking to issue a summons instead of effecting an arrest for a violent misdemeanor other than those that require arrest shall contact a WVPD supervisor for permission and guidance. The arresting or summoning officer shall complete the appropriate offense report and arrest report if applicable. A Crisis Intervention Contact Sheet shall also be completed and submitted to the CIT Coordinator.

6. JUVENILES

If Emergency hospitalization criteria are met, a WVPD officer has the authority to take a person under the age of 18 into custody and transport them to a receiving center for evaluation. Officers shall involve the parent/guardian in this process. If the parent/guardian is not available, the officer must notify them of the actions taken. When the parent/guardian is not agreeable to the seizure, officers should still take the juvenile into custody for evaluation if they believe this is the best course of action. Officers should also consider utilizing ORC § 2151.31(A)(3)(a) "Taking child into custody" and immediately notify Munetz County Job & Family Services.

Reference List & Suggested Publications

- Association for Talent Development. (2015). *ATD Human Performance Improvement Model*. Retrieved from <https://www.td.org>.
- California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. (2020), *De-escalation: Strategies and techniques for California law enforcement*. Retrieved from https://post.ca.gov/Portals/0/post_docs/publications/DeEscalation.pdf.
- Compton, M.T., Broussard, B., Munetz, M., Oliva, J.R., & Watson, A. C. (2011). *The Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) model of collaboration between law enforcement and mental health*. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Dupont, R., Cochran, S., & Pillsbury, S. (2007, September). *Crisis intervention team core elements*. School of Public Affairs and Public Policy, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, CIT Center, University of Memphis. Retrieved from <http://cit.memphis.edu/pdf/CoreElements.pdf>.
- Engel, R. S., Mcmanus, H. D., & Herold, T. D. (2020). Does de-escalation training work? A systematic review and call for evidence in police use-of-force reform. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 19(3), 721-759. doi:10.1111/1745-9133.12467
- International Association of Chiefs of Police (2020, July). *National consensus policy and discussion paper on use of force*. Retrieved from https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/National_Consensus_Policy_On_Use_Of_Force%2007102020%20v3.pdf.
- Todak, N., & March, M. (2021). De-escalation in policing: Preliminary answers to key questions. In R. G. Dunham, G. P. Alpert, & K. D. McLean (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings* (8th ed., pp. 398-415). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Usher, L., Watson A.C., Bruno, R., Andriukaitis, S., Kamin, D., Speed, C. & Taylor, S. (2019). *Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Programs: A best practice guide for transforming community responses to mental health crises*. Memphis, TN: CIT International.
- Van Tiem, D., Moseley, J. L., & Dessinger, J. C. (2012). *Fundamentals of performance improvement: Optimizing results through people, process, and organizations*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Current and past policy language for CIT operations and for response to persons in crisis that were found online were reviewed from the agencies listed below. These policies provided language samples and/or ideas for the creation of this guide.

- Akron Police Department, Akron, Ohio
- Albuquerque Police Department, Albuquerque, New Mexico
- Anne Arundel County Police Department, Millersville, Maryland
- Austin Police Department, Austin, Texas
- Baltimore Police Department, Baltimore, Maryland
- Beaverton Police Department, Beaverton, Oregon
- Bedford Police Department, Bedford, Massachusetts
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department, Charlotte, North Carolina
- Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Illinois
- Cincinnati Police Department, Cincinnati, Ohio
- Cleveland Division of Police, Cleveland, Ohio
- Collier County Sheriff's Office, Naples, Florida
- Colorado State University Police Department, Fort Collins, Colorado
- Columbus Division of Police, Columbus, Ohio
- Dallas Police Department, Dallas, Texas
- Dayton Police Department, Dayton, Ohio
- Denver Police Department, Denver, Colorado
- Fort Worth Police Department, Fort Worth, Texas
- Hartford Police Department, Hartford, Connecticut
- Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office, Tampa, Florida
- Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department, Indianapolis, Indiana
- Kansas City Police Department, Kansas City, Kansas
- Louisville Metro Police Department, Louisville, Kentucky
- Memphis Police Department, Memphis, Tennessee
- Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- New Orleans Police Department, New Orleans, Louisiana
- New York City Police Department, New York, New York
- Philadelphia Police Department, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Phoenix Police Department, Phoenix, Arizona
- Pleasanton Police Department, Pleasanton, California
- Salt Lake City Police Department, Salt Lake City, Utah
- San Diego Police Department, San Diego, California
- San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, California
- San Jose Police Department, San Jose, California
- Santa Clara Police Department, Santa Clara, California
- Seattle Police Department, Seattle, Washington
- Toledo Police Department, Toledo, Ohio
- Tulsa Police Department, Tulsa, Oklahoma

This guide was completed by staff at the Ohio Criminal Justice Coordinating Center of Excellence in cooperation with Ohio's CIT Coordinators and community partners.

For more information or to make inquiries, please contact us:

Email: cjccoe@neomed.edu

Phone: 330.325.6861



**CRIMINAL JUSTICE
COORDINATING CENTER
of EXCELLENCE**
A NEOMED CCoE