

St. Louis County, Missouri Police Department

Policewomen on Patrol

(The Results of an Experiment)

Joann V. Liscombe, DSN 1316

This history report is dedicated to Police Officer Joann V. Liscombe who, at age 38, was shot during the early morning of January 11, 1991, after approaching a suspicious person near the intersection of Patricia Ridge Drive and Old Halls Ferry Road. With no further police radio communications, an assist patrol car was dispatched to the same location where she was found incapacitated having been shot several times. She was taken to Christian Hospital where she died on January 14, 1991, of her injuries. Officer Liscombe entered service with the St. Louis County Police as a dispatcher, promoted to police officer and gave her life in the line of duty. She was a 16 year police veteran and earned several commendations while serving in the divisions of Operational Support and Patrol. The suspect was identified and arrested, tried and found guilty of murder.



Prepared by:

Colonel Jon M. Belmar, Chief of Police
Gil Kleinknecht (Ret.), Historian

Contributions by:

Captain Terry (Mary) Barton, Bureau of Staff Services
Captain Jack J. Webb (Ret.)

Project of the St. Louis County Police Welfare Association

Lieutenant Karl M. Bulla, President

May 15, 2014

“... there is nothing in womanhood per se that precludes women from doing effective work in patrols, investigations, control of civil disturbances or control of traffic.”

Professor Lewis J. Sherman, 1972

Introduction

This history document records the implementation issues and details associated with the 1972 decision by the St. Louis County Police (County Police) to recruit and assign female police officers to single person or “one-man” patrol vehicles. No other large police department at this time was allowing females to work alone while patrolling in a marked cruiser, a period when the police profession was dominated by both male patrol officers and male supervisors. This new police practice was part of an “experiment” managed by Professor Lewis J. Sherman, with the results and conclusions used to decide if assigning females to uniform patrol duties would continue. The early history review is supplemented with the personal experiences and testimonials from several female police officers, including active duty, retired and those who had worked for the County Police. It is also noted that this report pertains only to the County Police, particularly the period from 1955 to 1990.

The Early History

In a June 1971 questionnaire/survey received from the International Association of Women Police, the County Police reported that the number of commissioned or sworn officers at the time consisted of 420 males and three females. Two of the policewomen were assigned to juvenile investigative duties with the third assigned to the communications center as a desk sergeant. None of the three policewomen had been previously assigned to uniform patrol duties at either of the two patrol districts. However, each was considered a sworn officer and provided a female uniform plus equipment, including a .38 caliber revolver, which required annual firearms and use of force qualification along with the males. The response to the questionnaire also stated that two of the policewomen were required to wear a uniform (skirt and blouse) each work day. In late 1971, only police departments serving Indianapolis, Miami, Peoria (Illinois), and Washington, D.C routinely assigned female officers to hazardous jobs, e.g., two-person patrol duties.

The three patrolwomen noted in the County Police response to the questionnaire are identified below and are considered as the first policewomen to be employed by the County Police:

Winona “Jean” Schrieber, DSN 203. Jean Schrieber started her law enforcement career as a policewoman with St. Louis Police Department and served from July 16, 1951 to November 5, 1955. Following graduation from the City police academy she avoided an assignment to the parking meter enforcement by a seeking a transfer to a patrol district to work as a juvenile investigator.

Desiring to improve her police career, she made application with the County Police and was appointed on August 20, 1957, as a policewoman. During the selection process the personnel office forgot to ask her if she had a driver’s license, which she did not because she always rode the public bus to work and back. Her commanding officer encouraged, or insisted, she learn how to drive and obtain the license as soon

as possible. In addition to serving as a detective assigned to the Juvenile Division and Missing Persons Unit, she spent many hours on detail conducting undercover investigations. These sensitive investigations involved a serial rapist operating along Big Bend Road and alcohol violations occurring in different sections of the County. Jean Schrieber was also known for the many police-community relations and recruitment presentations she made on the behalf of the Department. New police recruits will recall Jean's expertise in juvenile matters as she taught the Missouri Juvenile Code at the police academy. In September 1978, she was assigned to the Fourth Precinct (Lemay) as a uniform patrol officer. During her career she found time to raise a family as well as attend Meramec Jr. College for two semesters. She eventually retired as a police officer from the County Police on March 17, 1979, after 22 years of service to the community.



***First Group of St. Louis
County Policewomen
(left to right) Judy Durso, Jean
Schrieber, Sgt. Maggie Warmann***

Margot "Maggie" Jane Warmann, DSN 216. Maggie Warmann joined the County Police on July 15, 1955 as a civilian stenographer/clerk assigned to the Detective Bureau, just two weeks after the Department was established. Two years later, on September 16, 1957, she was promoted to policewoman and served in several specialized assignments during her career, e.g., Communications Center, Detective Bureau, First and Second Precincts, Intelligence and Internal Affairs. Early in her career she was promoted to the rank of sergeant, but also held the title of detective while assigned to juvenile and internal affairs investigations. Her personnel file revealed that she was a graduate of the National Traffic Management Institute located at Central Missouri State University. On July 31, 1991, Sergeant Warmann retired after serving 36 years with the County Police.

Judith "Judy" Ann Durso, DSN 379. Judy Durso was appointed to the County Police on March 18, 1965. Following graduation from the training academy she was assigned to the Booking Desk located in the Clayton headquarters building. Assignments during her 29 years of service included appointments as a detective in the intelligence and juvenile units. From January 1982 to October 1990, Judy Durso was assigned to the Third Precinct (Affton) as a uniform patrol officer. In addition to completing numerous specialized police training programs, she was successful in receiving a Criminal Justice degree from Meramec Community College. Prior to her retirement on March 30, 1994, she was assigned as a DARE officer, a specialized function performed by the School Safety Unit.

The Experiment

Robert J. di Grazia.

The idea and decision to evaluate the use of females while assigned to one-person patrol duties was made by Robert J. di Grazia who served as Superintendent (Chief) of the County Police from 1969 to 1972. An examination of the “vintage files” from the Superintendent’s Office determined the experiment to employ several uniform policewomen formally began in March 1972 when Supt. di Grazia approached the Police Foundation (Washington, D.C.) seeking approval to participate in their “women in policing” project. This project intended to place on police patrol 100 women



Robert J. di Grazia
Superintendent of
Police (1969-1972)

recruits in various U.S. cities. Supt. di Grazia was also seeking funding from the Police Foundation to augment the police budget, allowing him to employ women for assignment to uniform patrol duties. At a 1972 press conference, Supt. di Grazia announced that only five females would be selected initially as this was the number required to operate one patrol beat around the clock.

The following month a formal recruitment notice was sent to Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice, announcing plans to employ five qualified female candidates by May 15, 1972. The letter stated that the goal was to “employ female police officers in all aspects ... including patrol. Further, expansion of the traditional policewoman role to include the total police function will open legitimate avenues of promotion for women which have previously been closed.” A similar letter was sent to other universities and large metropolitan police departments. The initial employment date was actually delayed one month until June 26, 1972.

In order to inform the general public and members of the Department about the proposed policewoman experiment, Supt. di Grazia released the following statement on May 22, 1972, spelling out the goals as well as the details of the project:

“The St. Louis County Department of Police is initiating a new positive program to expand the role of women in police work. Many highly qualified, dedicated, and responsible women have been turned away from the police profession in the past due to the stereotyped image of women’s role in police operations. Five existing vacancies ... will be filled by female candidates. More women would improve the police service ... due to the following factors:

- *The pool of available candidates will be significantly increased.*
- *Police officers will be more highly qualified in terms of education, awareness, and sincere dedication because the recruitment base will be improved.*
- *In other metropolitan areas where police women have been used on patrol, there is evidence suggesting that a police woman may provoke less hostile behavior.*
- *The input and perspective of female officers will lead to improved police-community relations resulting in higher quality of law enforcement.*

The five police women will undergo 16 weeks of training at the Greater St. Louis Police Academy, will be assigned to a patrol vehicle upon graduation, and will be subject to identical occupational requirements as male candidates. The female officers will be assigned to a specific beat area in order that the Department may carefully evaluate the effectiveness and impact of female officers on crime."

In order to demonstrate to the community and the Department that he was confident females were capable of handling the duties of a patrol officer, Supt. di Grazia selected a First District patrol beat that covered the neighborhood where he and his family lived (Clayton Road and Woods Mill Road/Route 141). The deployment plan assigned the five policewomen to the same patrol beat, which would provide coverage 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The editorial page of The St. Louis Post-Dispatch reported that the chief of the St. Louis, Missouri Police Department (City), Chief Gene Camp, did not endorse the experiment to assign females to uniform patrol duties as proposed by Supt. di Grazia. Chief Camp said publicly that using women on patrol duty was *"gimmickry, a play for the grandstands because of women's lib."* He also said that there was a place for women in the police department, but he rejected certain assignments as too dangerous.

The Sherman Research Project

Upon learning that the County Police planned to recruit a large number of females as patrol officers, Professor Lewis J. Sherman (PhD), who was the Chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL), sent an April 1972 letter to Supt. di Grazia expressing support of the patrolwoman project. At the time, Professor Sherman was a nationally known consultant on the role of females in police work. He also informed Supt. di Grazia that the Washington, D.C. newspapers gave favorable publicity to Chief of Police Jerry Wilson when he introduced a similar policewoman program for the District of Columbia. Likewise, the suggestion that females could handle traditional uniform police patrol duties the same as a male generated favorable press for Supt. di Grazia and the Department. There were internal comments by members of the County Police that Supt. di Grazia introduced the project because he was seeking recognition. Professor Sherman concluded his correspondence to Supt. di Grazia by stating *"this is the year of the women-clearly, an idea whose time has come."*



Professor Lewis J. Sherman (PhD)

Prior to the decision to employ policewomen for assignment to patrol duties, the County Police had the benefit of evaluating the research and publications released by Professor Sherman and others. In his April 1972 rough draft of *"Women in Police Work,"* Professor Sherman reported that there were approximately 6,000 female police officers in the United States assigned to jobs *"in which women are presumed to excel; they do clerical work, or work with juveniles or female prisoners. Some departments, in fact, hire only women with social work or nursing experience because such experience presumably equips them to do what they are supposed to do - work with young people."* As the number of female police officers (at the time of his report) doing police work traditionally assigned to males was small, Professor Sherman incorporated in his research papers the experiences of policewomen in West Germany, Israel and England. There is a noteworthy quote offered in one of his research reports that illustrates his eventual research conclusions: *"there is nothing in womanhood per se that precludes women from doing effective work in patrols, investigations, control of civil disturbances or control of traffic."*

In a May 1972, interview with a Globe-Democrat reporter about the County Police project to assign females to police patrol duties, Professor Sherman stated that *"women might even be more effective*

than men in some police situations.” In the newspaper article he cited the family quarrel as an example where a woman might have *“a more quieting effect than a man.”* Professor Sherman believed that police departments across the country would be greatly improved by the wholesale hiring of tactful, nonviolent policewomen. He also reported that the employment of policewomen could produce these four important benefits for local police departments:

1. Precipitate less violence than the men do.
2. Polish up the badly tarnished public image of the police service as women use less physical force than male officers.
3. Effectively settle problems reported by women, especially those coming from low income communities.
4. Serve as an effective program to bring a high number of African-American and Hispanic applicants into law enforcement jobs.

In the same year the County Police decided to recruit females for uniform patrol duties (1972), the U.S. Congress modified the federal Civil Rights Act. Title VII of the Act was extended to cover public as well as private employers. Under the requirements of the Act and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines, police departments which did not employ and assign women on the same basis as males were required to prove that sex was a *bona fide* occupational qualification. Also in 1972, just a month or so before the first patrolwomen were employed, the County Police adopted the phrase - “The Proud Ones” – as part of the logo or seal representing the pride the men and women of the Department enjoyed while serving as law enforcement officers.

On January 4, 1973, Professor Sherman advised the County Police that his proposed one year research project to evaluate policewomen performing uniform patrol duties had been approved by the University. The research methods used by Professor Sherman were specific to the task and included, for example, student observers trained to observe incidents and calls-for-service handled by a control group made up of policewomen and policemen. From the two patrol districts at the time, seven male officers, who had work experience similar to the policewomen, were selected as members of the control group. The observers would exit the patrol vehicle and actually go along with the officer in order to observe the interaction between officer and citizen. Within five days following an incident, the research included interviews (conducted by trained citizens) of those complainants or victims receiving police service from the patrolwomen and patrolmen in the control group. The purpose of the observations and interviews was to evaluate how women performed in comparison to a group of males who had essentially the same police street experience.

The research also included an analysis of performance data collected from questionnaires and surveys, performance ratings and police administrative records. For example, in April 1973 an extensive questionnaire consisting of 56 multi-choice questions was distributed to both male and female patrol officers. The questionnaire was intended to *“evaluate the Policewomen Program and to assist in developing new programs to improve the department.”* Because there were questions of a personal nature, the name of the employee completing the questionnaire was not required. Below are several questions taken from the questionnaire that illustrates the personal nature and scope of the research:

- *“Do you think there will be a difference in the way supervisors watch and criticize patrolmen and patrolwomen if they have the same level of ability?”*
- *If a patrolwoman were flirtatious with a male sergeant or supervisor, what effect do you think this would have?”*

- *You have a female probationary officer in your car and you respond to a disorderly call. When you arrive you find people fighting. You tell them to break it up. Do you think the people would react differently because your partner is a female probationary officer rather than a male probationary officer?*
- *How do you think the community will react to the assignment of women to patrol duty?*
- *If half of the patrol officers in your district were women how would it affect your job?*
- *If you worked often with a person of the opposite sex what do you think your spouse's reaction would be?*
- *What are your beliefs about equal rights for women?"*

During the two years covered by Professor Sherman's research, the County Police had 544 sworn officers serving over 320,000 residents. This number included 23 policewomen or about four percent of the total number. In June 1974, Professor Sherman completed his research of 16 patrolwomen assigned to one-person patrols units and submitted his findings and conclusions in a 13 page report. As noted, the project was expanded from the original five policewomen. His research report included a notation that the International Association of Chiefs of Police had recently conducted a survey of all policing organizations in the U.S. and found that the County Police ranked third behind New York City and Washington, D.C. in the number of women assigned to uniform patrol duties. The key difference was that in New York City and Washington, D.C., the police departments had females assigned to two-person patrols. The County Police used one-person patrols exclusively. Therefore, the available evidence suggests that the St. Louis County Police was the first police department to assign policewomen to one-person patrols. There are several other noteworthy findings in Professor Sherman's research report involving the County Police and police services:

- *"The average policewoman ... is slightly less than 23 years old, 5'5", 128 pounds, and has three years of college training, and shows above average intellectual ability and stable personality characteristics on various objective tests.*
- *Women were able to perform the duties of one-person motor patrols in a suburban police department equally as well as men.*
- *It is clear from most data that women perform in a less aggressive fashion than male officers. Our results reveal they (females) make fewer arrests and engage in less so-called preventive activity, such as car and pedestrian stops. On the other hand women awarded more traffic citations ... than did men There is a clear suggestion that when women respond to potentially violent episodes they don't escalate into actual physical confrontations as often as when men respond to similar incidents.*
- *There were significant differences between the public's perception of policemen and policewomen on the dimensions of sympathy, empathy and compassion.*
- *Citizens feel that policewomen can handle their service calls and domestic quarrels better than men. It certainly seems likely that the absence of aggressive policing*

by women may result in a much more positive image of the police in the public's eye. The very fact that women are less likely to use any force at all should result in improved police-community relations.

- *It is significant that the citizens expressed unanimous satisfaction with the service received from women in both service and non-service calls and feel no less safe when their needs are responded to by women than by men.*
- *Throughout the year women typically received higher ratings than men in the areas concerned with public contacts and community relations. Men usually exceeded women in the areas of accepting responsibility and initiative. In general ... all performance evaluations reveal no essential difference between policewomen and policemen.*
- *... new policewomen had a significantly higher automobile accident rate than the comparison men.*
- *The married women in particular expressed the view that they can leave policing at any time that it conflicts with their home and family life. To a man with a family and mortgage the possibility of loss of job was sufficient to command obedience, if not his loyalty and dedication. Women may be more independent and be less susceptible to threats or punishment.*
- *It will take a long time but genuine acceptance by men will follow effective performance by women.*
- *Several of the women ... have commented that they have been forced to sacrifice some of their femininity in order to gain acceptance from their male colleagues. They resent this and don't like it."*

Professor Sherman submitted a second request to the Department in June 1978 seeking approval to continue his research on the role of women in law enforcement. His follow-up research addressed *"the personality characteristics of women who apply for jobs as police officers. How do they differ from men and women in general, if indeed they do?"* This research did not include any interviews with police officers, but did involve collecting data from the County Police applicant and personnel files. Unfortunately, the results of this research project were not shared with the County Police.

The Issues Involved

The Bureau of Personnel and Training in early 1972 initiated a special recruiting effort seeking females using traditional advertising efforts as well as sending recruitment letters to several universities that offered criminal justice or law enforcement degrees. Before the experiment and research could begin, as well as the steps in the selection process, several issues or questions had to be resolved. One initial question concerned the minimal physical requirements for female applicants. Would the height and weight standards remain the same for both males and females – or would they be different? Upon the recommendation of Supt. di Grazia, the Board of Police Commissioners approved separate physical standards for female applicants applying for the position of policewomen. Although the minimum height of 5'7" remained for male applicants, the minimum height for females was reduced to 5'2". It had been determined that lowering the height

requirement to 5'2" for policewomen would increase significantly the pool of qualified applicants. Supt. di Grazia's first reaction was to remove the height requirement all together for both male and female applicants. Some 26 years later (1998) the minimum height requirement for female applicants was reduced from 5'2" to 4'10".



County Police Recruiting Poster- 1974

As to weight, the revised standards only required that it be commensurate with the applicant's height. The other physical fitness requirements for appointment remained generally the same for males and females. The reports found that the patrol supervisors were pursuing all avenues to encourage both male and female officers to manage their weight when it influenced performance or appearance. Today, the weight requirement for female applicants has changed somewhat as there is a minimum weight of 102 pounds for an applicant who is 4'10" and a maximum of 201 pounds for a 6'3" applicant.

The selection process also included oral interview boards that were held on May 31, 1972, at the Clayton Community Center. The initial interview board members consisted of Catherine Milton, Assistant Director of the Police Foundation (Washington, DC); Sergeant Sandra Johnston, a Peoria, Illinois policewoman; Professor Lewis J. Sherman; Professor Samuel G. Chapman, University of Oklahoma (police science program); and Robert Scott, Director of

Personnel and Training for the County Police. Catherine Milton was well known as the author of a book on women in police work. Sergeant Johnston had been a policewoman for more than five years with the Peoria Police Department and assigned to a high crime area within the city. Eleven applicants, who ranged in age from 21 to 30 years, were selected to go before the first interview board. None of those interviewed had any law enforcement experience, although several had worked for police agencies as civilian employees. It is also noted that none of the applicants were married at the time. Five of the 11 applicants were college graduates and the remaining had some college credits. During one interview published in the Post-Dispatch, Sergeant Johnson told the reporter that "women (policewomen) had to work harder and should be aggressive without being overbearing." One of the candidates shared with a newspaper reporter her concern that a male suspect might object to being frisked by a policewoman - "Then again, she said with a sly grin, "maybe they won't." In addition to the oral interview board, the selection process included a written test followed by a psychological and physical examination, and a background investigation.

Just one month following the interviews, on June 26, 1972, the County Police announced the selection of six women to be employed as probationary patrolwomen. Six days after the swearing-in ceremony the new policewomen started their police academy training. The policewomen were:

Bridget P. Barnett (Porter), DSN 1046. At the time of appointment she was 21 years old with a degree in Criminal Justice from Central Missouri State College and residing in Florissant, Missouri. Following graduation from the academy on October 12, 1972, she was assigned to the First District (North County) and served as a patrol officer for nearly seven years before resigning on May 6, 1979.

Cathy L. Carter, DSN 1047. At the time of her appointment she was 21 years old and a resident of Overland, Missouri with a Criminal Justice Management degree from Tarkio College. Following academy graduation, her initial assignment was the First District as a patrol officer followed by assignments to the Airport Detail, Bureau of Tactical Operations and Sexual Assault Unit as a detective. Also known as C. L. Carter, she resigned in 1979, completing nearly seven years of service.

Kathleen A. Gaunt, DSN 1048. At the time of appointment she was a licensed practical nurse, 23 years of age and a resident of the city of St. Louis. In February 1973, before she was able to complete the 12-month probationary period and field training while assigned to the First District, she resigned due a medical condition.

Beverly A. Imsande (Girard), DSN 1049. At the time of her appointment she was 21 years of age, a resident of St. Louis County with a Public Administration degree from the University of Missouri. Following academy graduation, she had assignments as a patrol officer in the First District and the Second District (South County) as well as a brief detachment with the Bureau of Drug Abuse. After two years of service she resigned on June 30, 1974.

Shelly P. Sample (Burriss), DSN 1051. At the time of her appointment she was 21 years old and a resident of Bonne Terre, Missouri. Before receiving a Criminal Justice degree from Michigan State University (MSU) she worked as a dispatcher for a campus police agency. While at MSU she developed an interest in joining the County Police based on the recruiting letter sent to university describing the di Grazia/Sherman policewoman experiment. Following the academy training, she was assigned to the Second District for three years followed by assignments in the Third Precinct (Affton), Fourth Precinct (Lemay) and Fifth Precinct (West County) as well as Communications. After nearly seven years of service, she resigned on December 17, 1978.

Judith C. Thiel, DSN 1052. At the time of her appointment she was 23 years old and a resident of St. Louis County with 18 credits from the University of Missouri-Columbia. She submitted her application because the County Police was the "*first agency she heard of that was encouraging women to apply.*" After graduating from the academy, she served in the First and Second Districts, the Second Precinct (Page-West), as well a short assignment to the Airport Detail. She submitted her resignation in April 1976.



Policewomen on Patrol – 1972 Graduation Class
(left to right) Shelly Sample, Beverly Imsande, Bridget Barnett, (Ronald R. Rauch),
Judith Thiel, C.L. Carter, Kathleen Gaunt

Note: Ronald Rauch was in the same basic training class as the six policewomen

Police Training.

Basic training for the new policewomen was held at the Greater St. Louis Police Academy, a joint training facility operated by the City and County police departments. This 16-week training course began June 26, 1972, with graduation scheduled for October 12. On the day of graduation, Supt. di Grazia recalled that the six policewomen presented him with a caricature drawing of a “*female PIG*” (Pride, Integrity, and Guts) in the County Police uniform and signed by each of them. Supt. di Grazia was known to wear a small gold representation of a pig in his lapel each day. During the late 1960s and 1970s the term “Pig” was a derogatory word used by the anti-establishment groups to describe state and local police officers. Supt. di Grazia turned the word into a positive expression. Following basic training, the new policewomen were assigned to a patrol district to complete on-the-job training under the supervision of a Field Training Officer (FTO) and field supervisors.

During the first year of their training, Supt. di Grazia emphasized that the policewomen would have to fulfill the same job requirements, including physical demands, as required of the male officers. The policewomen would also be required to attend in-service and specialized training each year.

The need for specialized training for the policewomen was illustrated in a February 1974 memorandum from Policewoman C. L. Carter reporting that officers “*continue to receive inadequate training in non-lethal physical apprehension and restraint techniques.*” In response to this request, the Bureau of Training and Personnel developed an eight-hour training program for all female police officers on the subject of self-defense and non-lethal apprehensions and restraints.

Field Training Officer Program.

The structured program to effectively train and equip policewomen to handle all the duties of a patrol officer included partnering for several weeks with a male field training officer (FTO). As the Department had utilized male FTOs effectively since its establishment in July 1955, the decision was made in 1972 to continue using male FTOs to train the new policewomen. Initially, this use of male FTOs was acceptable as it equipped the first group of policewomen to demonstrate success in handling a one-officer patrol car assignment and completing the probationary period. As the number of policewomen increased, the problems experienced by the male FTOs increased as well. The close personal contact (male FTO/probationary policewoman) during eight hour patrol shifts over several weeks was resulting in marital problems and family conflicts. After consultation, Superintendent G.H. (Gil) Kleinknecht attempted to reduce the marital problems that were occurring by training a small group of five female FTOs. He established a policy that male probationary officers would be trained by male FTOs and probationary female officers assigned to female FTOs. As a result of this change, the number of marital problems associated with the FTO program was reduced significantly. As of 2014, there were 10 female police officers serving as FTOs. However, the training period has been extended to 15 weeks with the probationary officers receiving field training from three different FTOs, not just one as previously required. There is no longer a policy requiring a probationary female police officer to undertake field training under the direction of a female FTO.

Performance Evaluation.

During the early 1970's a police officer's performance evaluation consisted of a single page rating sheet that contained numerous performance characteristics. Each officer received an annual evaluation, with the supervisor/rater noting if the employee was “*Above Average,*” “*Satisfactory*” or “*Improvement Needed.*” Probationary employees received quarterly evaluations containing similar performance standards. After completing their five weeks with a FTO in the First District, Lieutenant Robert A. Crews, Acting Commander, submitted a performance evaluation for each of the probationary policewoman based on reports from the FTOs, preparation of police reports, traffic summons issued, as well as personal interviews. One policewoman was not included in this evaluation as she was assigned to the Second District at the time. The following are the relevant excerpts from the 1972 evaluation submitted by Lt. Crews:

“In general a review of the FTO reports revealed ... a high rating in overall performance. A review of their submitted police reports demonstrated a high quality of work performed. A review of issued traffic summons appears to be average overall, with the exception of one officer, which would be rated high. Personal interviews with the FTOs implies exceptional high quality of work performed. Personal interviews with the ... (female) officers reveal extreme lack of confidence, in spite of the high quality of work performed, when confronted with being placed on patrol duty alone. This phenomenon appears to be unique only with the female probationary officers. Continuing, with regard to the final FTO reports, three were recommended to be released to regular assignments, while two were not recommended to be released, at this time.”

In conclusion, the basic problem of lack of self-confidence will be emphasized greatly in their continuing training phase by closer supervision by their respective sergeants. An objective evaluation in the final analysis can only be made after these officers are assigned to patrol duties alone. In the interim these officers will now be assigned to different FTOs daily, so as to increase their self-confidence and to further their knowledge of the topography of North County."

During a December 1972 command staff meeting, the captain responsible for the First District offered a more critical evaluation of the new policewomen. The Captain stated that *"female officers will not be able to cope with certain situations and that the Department is putting the policewomen on the spot by sending them on certain calls."* He also advised that *"some of the policewomen have admitted that in some instances they could not handle some of the calls alone."* The Captain concluded his evaluation by stating that the new policewomen should be treated in the same manner as policemen, which is the only basis on which the Department can determine if the program is successful.

A November 1973 performance evaluation prepared by Lieutenant Norval Land, Watch Commander in the Second District, is representative of the *"Improvement Needed"* as experienced by a majority of the policewomen who were part of the control group. Professor Sherman, during his research, had also reported on similar performance issues found in other police departments who had policewomen assigned to patrol duties. The following key excerpts from one of Lieutenant Land's evaluation addressed two areas where improvement was needed – *"volume of acceptable work"* and *"accepts responsibility."*

"For the most part this officer is capable and is performing in line with this capability. But in the area of traffic law enforcement, which is also a responsibility of the patrol officer, she is not doing an adequate or sufficient job. This is in need of adjustment, and it is not a fair accounting of her work to state that she is meeting the standard. This will have to show much improvement before it can properly and fairly meet the acceptable standard in this area."

"It is believed in addition ... needs to show more initiative and to activate herself without the need for prodding. What she does, she does well. Her workload needs to increase; self-activity is her weakness. This then should be stimulated. In other areas the standard is being met and the officer is progressing satisfactorily."

In a memorandum dated October 31, 1973, Major J. Michael Bergauer, Division of Field Operations, presented a recommendation to Supt. Kleinknecht that the five remaining policewomen (Barnett, Burris, Carter, Imsande and Thiel) successfully complete their one year probationary period effective on November 1, 1973. However, Major Bergauer noted that one of the five policewomen still had need for improvement in a *"number of factors attendant to her work initiative, volume of acceptable work, work judgments, safety practices and care of equipment."* This recommendation by Major Bergauer was based on an extensive set of evaluations that included both strengths and deficiencies of each policewoman, the same standards as required for patrolmen. As an example, below is one of the policewomen evaluations prepared by a first-line supervisor:

"Strengths: This officer's outstanding point is the way she handles people. Her ladylike conduct is not only an asset to herself, but to the people she works with, and the department she works for. She is articulate in her dress, her conduct and character beyond reproach, and her desire to learn quite noticeable. Patrolwoman ... is a well-educated individual which is reflective in her written assignments."

“Deficiencies: Patrolwoman ... neglect of traffic enforcement and field interviews is all that keeps her from being an outstanding employee. Her production in these categories is quite low and does not nearly meet standard. More supervision will be applied the next quarter in order to eliminate this condition.”



G. H. (Gil) Kleinknecht
Superintendent of Police (1973-1990)



Ronald A. Battelle
Chief of Police (1990-2004)

Uniforms/Equipment.

Responsibility for designing or formulating the uniform and equipment specifications for the new policewomen was led by Major Thomas P. Moonier, Commander of the Division of Services. Based on his research as well as input from other police departments who had adopted uniforms for their female officers, a set of specifications was proposed in a July 1972 report to Supt. di Grazia. The Bureau of Personnel and Training had sent inquiries to several large police departments that were already utilizing female officers, seeking their specifications along with photographs. It was anticipated the uniform for patrol duties would *“match as closely as possible the uniform of the male officers while insuring attractiveness for a female.”* At the time the cost of the uniform and accessories was \$110.00 to be paid by each policewoman using her \$240.00 annual uniform allowance. Leon Uniform Company (St. Louis) was recommended as the best supplier due to costs and guaranteed delivery. The initial uniform/equipment specifications are summarized below. It is interesting to note that although the uniform selected was very similar to the military style male uniform and accessories, a couple of the specification accommodated female requirements, e.g., tie, hat, and shoes.

Jacket: Taupe Gabardine, “Thermal Queen Model,” 55% Dacron & 45% wool

Slacks: Dark Brown Gabardine, 14 oz., 55% Dacron & 45% wool

Shirts: Clifton Brand, tan permanent press, scotch-guard, 65% Dacron & 35% cotton

Tie: Women’s dark brown continental cross over

Hat/Cap: Policewoman "Wave" model, dark brown, naugahyde top, front brim down, back brim up

Shoes: Hush Puppy brand, shine able black, plain slip on or tie, with low heel

Hosiery: Required, natural skin tone

Firearm: Smith & Wesson, Model 10, .38 cal. revolver, 4 inch "bull" barrel, wood grips

Leather Goods: Safariland Model 11A belt and holster, Model 90D hand cuff case, Model 78HB cartridge case, and Model 91 key ring strap

As noted in the photograph on page 10, the six policewomen assigned to patrol duties were required to wear a simple pair of Khaki pants and a Khaki shirt until the approved female uniform arrived from the Leon Uniform Company. The following two photographs represent the uniform worn by policewomen the first three years of service as a uniform patrol officer.



**1st Policewoman Uniform
(Pre-1972)
P.O. Jan Brookshire**



**Policewoman Uniform
(1972-1975)
P.O. Cathy McDonald (Cahill)**

It was not until April 1974 that the Uniform Advisory Committee recommended that the wordage (PATROLMAN) on the silver badges issued to the new policewomen be changed. Male and female officers were issued the same PATROLMAN badge at the time. The recommendation was approved and 30 badge sets were ordered that replaced the designation PATROLMAN with POLICE OFFICER. One year later (July 1975) all issued badges, both male and female, were changed to POLICE OFFICER as the recognized rank or designation for sworn officers below the rank of sergeant. Therefore, starting in 1975, Supt. Kleinknecht also directed that the title "Policewoman" and "Patrolman" be changed to "Police Officer," making no distinction between female and male officers. As a result of this directive the term Police Officer was now considered a rank. Note: The historical display cases located on the 1st Floor of police headquarters contain a collection of badges issued

during the early years of the County Police, including the vintage PATROLMAN badge issued to the group of new policewomen.

The next uniform and equipment problem was identified in September 1974. This issue involved the silver and gold tie bars/clips issued to all police officers and supervisors. The tie bar, which contained a mini police badge, was worn to hold the uniform tie against the shirt. Because the issue tie bar was designed to accommodate the male uniform shirt, the female police officers had to wear the bar and badge upside down. This situation was created because the female officers were issued uniform shirts that buttoned on the left side vs. the right side as for the male shirts. The problem was created when the tie bar was inserted from the left side. The initial staff recommendation was to have 50 tie bars re-soldered and converted to left hand so it would be adaptable to the female shirt. The final decision was to issue only one style uniform shirt - the male or right button shirt. When a couple of female police officers complained that the male shirt did not fit properly, the uniform supply officer was instructed to have the shirts tailored to properly fit the officer.

A more difficult uniform problem was identified in April 1975 when the Uniform Supply Officer, Police Officer (PO) Jack Thompson, reported the results of a meeting attended by 13 female police officers to discuss the "Wave" style female uniform hat. At the time there was considerable discussion, as well as disagreement, among the female police officers as to the best hat to be issued by the County Police. Twelve of the 13 officers voted to wear the military style hat currently issued to male officers. Police Officer Thompson also reported that 26 female officers were sent a personal communication requesting their thoughts and recommendations regarding continued use of the "Wave" style or the male issued hat as an alternative. Only six officers responded, four voted NO to the male hat two agreed to the male hat (only if they would not have to cut their hair or if a wig of a suitable hair style would be acceptable). The female officers who voted in favor of the male hat stated the hat would make for a more uniform look throughout the Department, and a rain cover was readily available.



**Policewoman Uniform
(1975-1991)
P.O. Becky Ruszella**

Police Officer Thompson submitted a recommendation that all police officers be issued the male or military style hat. However, he noted that should this uniform hat change be approved it *"would be opening the door to further changes in their clothing as I have already had some inquiries regarding whether females must take female clothing."* Not long after receiving the findings and recommendations from PO Thompson, Supt. Kleinknecht decided to require all police officers, regardless of gender, to wear the military style hat. This decision did not put an end to the discussion or attempts to locate a hat the female police officers would find acceptable and practical to wear while in uniform. By September 1976 a large majority of the females preferred the male or military style uniform hat, but had the option to wear either hat until the general order could be amended to make the male hat mandatory.

Today, the Department issues only two hats, the same for both male and female officers. These are the brown military style hat and a stocking hat that can be worn during inclement weather. However, it should be reported, that wearing the hat while in uniform is not mandatory as a part of the uniform. As with the uniform hat, the 2014 specifications for the police uniform and various accessories, including the issued firearms, remains the same today for both male and female officers.

Marriage.

Within one year following graduation from the training academy by the group of new patrolwomen, the question of marriage and special assignments presented itself for the County Police to resolve. In October 1973 a female officer requested in writing that police *“commanders, whenever possible, assign married couples to the same duties working the same shift with the same recreation days (days off).”* Supt. Kleinknecht responded to this request by stating that he had

“... searched both the formal and informal agreements that the Department would have contracted with you and your husband as employees (police officers), and was unable to locate any stipulation or agreement as to the future working hours and assignments. Nor, have I been able to confirm, either from personal experience or from that of other married couples that working together on a daily basis is directly related to a happy and successful marriage. There are some who contend that being together 24 hours a day may be a handicap to a good marriage. However, as this decision on my part will not give you immediate consideration of your request, I have directed the division and precinct commanders to give consideration to specific requests from married couples as to duty hours. Likewise, to assign married couples to functions (work units) where the nature of the job may be best handled by a male and female team.”

This County Police practice reference special consideration for married couples (job assignments and duty hours) has remained the same over the years.

Maternity Leave.

As the number of female police officers on the Department increased, the number of extended leave requests due to a pregnancy, or special consideration for a non-hazardous duty assignment, increased as well. While the County Police supported establishing and raising a family, the Department did not have in place the rules and regulations required to properly respond to this new set of special leave or assignment requests. It was not until March 1978 that legal opinion was requested from the St. Louis County Counselor's Office seeking counsel on three questions that required resolution. First, was the Department required to accommodate female police officers who requested special assignments during a pregnancy? Second, could a police supervisor request a medical examination of a pregnant officer to determine her ability to perform the duties of the position assigned? Last, must the Department allow a pregnant police officer to use accumulated sick leave prior to going on non-pay status? Assistant County Counselor Betty Jane Okenfuss provided the following legal opinion dated April 11, 1978:

“... it is our opinion that your department is not required to allow pregnant officers to utilize accumulated sick leave prior to going on leave of absence without pay, that you can request a medical statement to determine if the officer is capable of performing her duties, and that you do not have to provide alternative employment assignments

for pregnant employees unless such is your procedure and policy when other employees are temporarily disabled.”

The 1978 amendment to the 1964 U.S. Civil Rights Act provided the County Police with further guidance when adopting policies and procedures associated with an employee pregnancy and requests for leave. The amendment to the Civil Rights Act addressed employment discrimination, particularly sick leave benefits and special assignments for pregnant police officers. As a result the Department adopted a policy requiring the pregnant officer and/or her attending medical doctor to make the decision when she was no longer physically able to perform “all the duties” of a police officer. At the time of this determination the female officer was required to utilize the types of leave available (sick leave, compensatory time, vacation, leave without pay) until she was able to return to her duty assignment. The policy did not include transfers to a limited duty assignment or “desk job” while maintaining her police officer status and salary. Chief Ronald A. Battelle, in 1994, amended the pregnancy policy and designated several limited duty assignments where the pregnant officer could work during the length of the pregnancy, e.g., communications dispatcher, precinct desk officer).

Testimonials

To collect and record the history of policewomen on patrol with the County Police requires more than reporting on what was found in the vintage files of the Superintendent's Office, newspaper articles and research reports from the 1970s. The personal experiences of the female officers who were a part of the experiment, as well as those who served during the subsequent years, best describe and reveal the issues and difficulties that had to be overcome. The following personal experiences or testimonials are a major contribution when recording the history of females entering a profession previously dominated by males.

"A Land of Opportunities"

Lieutenant Margaret "Maggie" Clayton (Retired), DSN 1545.

I applied to the County Police in 1976 because my university professors described it as one of the leading law enforcement agencies in the country. They indicated the police officer selection process as one worth the experience even if I was not selected. When two background investigators came to the campus and spoke to my employers and references, I was certainly impressed. During the year after starting the May 1976 academy class, I observed the department make changes to the female uniform and equipment specifications. Female detectives went from wearing issued skirts to issued uniform pants and blazers. The hat worn by female patrol officers became the same as the one worn by the males. I recall the Uniform Supply Officer issuing me two female hats (Wave model) in two sizes so I could wear one comfortably with a wig. The initial pants for female patrol officers had a "shoestring" stripe and a zipper on the left side. The pants were soon changed to match the males with a zipper in the front and a two inch stripe down the legs.

Patrol assignments reflected the equality I expected. I would describe the County Police as a land of opportunities; but I faced the same challenges all officers did with each radio assignment or self-initiated activity. I was fortunate to work with and for people throughout my career who wanted me to succeed and provided the support and encouragement which made the department my career. As a field training officer I trained both men and women. As for any police officer, I had the opportunity to compete for detective positions and was able to work with drug enforcement and special investigations units. I was also fortunate enough to be detached to personnel office to assist in interviewing potential applicants and role playing at the training academy. During the promotional processes for sergeant and lieutenant, I was able to compete equally with my fellow officers.

As a lieutenant assigned as a patrol watch commander I felt the support of both the community and members of the platoon to meet the new challenges each day. I was fortunate enough to work for many excellent commanders and was able to borrow the best from them. I enjoyed encouraging officers to set some personal goals and giving them the opportunity to achieve them through academy classes or special assignments. I enjoyed working partnerships the department established through municipal contracts and contracts with the school districts.

As a female I admired some of the women that came before me, especially the female officer, Detective Jean Schrieber. She was a source of support and encouragement to us all. Detective Judy Durso quietly showed us the dedication and importance of working closely with the community. The first female Sergeant, Margot Warmann, inspired many with her lively wit and undying friendship. Female police officers of this caliber provided the example for the rest of us to succeed. I hope that I had a similar effect on the women I worked with for 29 years before retirement.

“Police Academy Training”
Detective Yvette Summy (Active), DSN 3927

As a second career I chose in 2009 to become a police officer with the County Police. I looked forward to the many challenges of academy training and the experiences that lay ahead. Eleven of the 33 recruits in my graduation class were females. I thought very little, if any, about how being female might affect my police academy experience. It was not until we began sparring with each other during self-defense training that any of my classmates considered their gender. At that point, I contemplated how to compensate for my opponent's upper body strength advantage. Although we did not spar at 100 percent effort, none of the recruits went easy on me because I was a woman or older. I recall one male classmate who was about 6' 4" and 220 pounds. If I did not perform a physical maneuver properly, he did not budge and I found myself on the mat. As far as he was concerned, if a recruit could not take him down in the classroom, he/she could not take someone down while making a street arrest. So, going down easy in the classroom may cost someone's life in the future. Given my prior military experience (retired), I was quite able to handle the academics as well as the mental stress I endured. Nor was I concerned with passing the physical fitness test. However, the physical stress was a different matter. While I was physically fit, I was also 38 years of age, whereas the average age of my academy class was around 24 years. I needed to prove to my classmates that they could trust me with their lives. This commitment pushed me harder than I ever did in my life. I would go home each evening tired and aching, ice my knees and go to bed early so I could wake up and exercise on my own to stay up to par with my classmates. In this experience I was not alone. We bonded more during physical training than any other time. I am sure that was partially due to sharing in the same pain. Most of it was seeing the officers next to you, male or female; pushed themselves to their limit to be prepared for the police patrol duties that lay ahead - and you wanting to do the same.

“Balancing Family & Career”
Anonymous (Active)

I have served actively as a police officer for several years – no different from any other officer on the County Police. Therefore, I do not differentiate myself based upon my gender or race. Although a single divorced mother for a short period of time, I was able to maintain my career as a uniform patrol officer while seeking to be the best at whatever task assigned never trying to be labeled as a “female officer.” I wanted the label as a permanent “beat officer.” After some initial reservations by my commanding officer at the time, I obtained my goal of being assigned to a sought after patrol beat within the precinct. The success of that goal was reached by being chosen as a field training instructor (FTO) and subsequent assignments as a Neighborhood Police Officer, detective, and ultimately a promotion as a supervisor. During this period I successfully balanced raising a child, remarrying, and a police career. My commitment to the police job has not waived; and I am fully engaged in promoting the County Police and succeeding at the tasks assigned. Because I live in St. Louis County I want to see the County succeed and prosper for the future of my family and fellow police officers.

“Brains, Not Brawn”
Catherine “Cathy” McDonald (Cahill) (1973-1981), DSN 1098

I remember it was a cold, winter morning in 1977 with about six inches of snow on the ground. Following roll call at the precinct station, I was just beginning my 6:30 A.M. patrol assignment when a report was dispatched that an attempted armed robbery had just occurred at a car wash at the corner of Lemay Ferry and Reavis Barracks Road. The perpetrators could still be in the area? I was not the beat officer given the call, but assigned to an adjacent patrol beat. My first thought was to check out a neighborhood near the location of the reported robbery. I drove the patrol cruiser down a side street and into a parking lot where I headed off on foot through the snow into a wooded area. I walked, and

I walked drudging through the deep snow. It was quiet that morning, as still as it could be. As I approached a small creek that ran between the woods where I was, and the woods that backed up to the car wash, I suddenly heard voices. The creek was about four feet deep, and on the other side maybe 50 yards away were three young men. Could these three be the perpetrators? There was no way to get close to them without being observed. Even if I identified myself as a police officer and ordered them not to run, there was no reason for the three to stop due to the creek and cold water that ran between us. They could have easily fled and why wouldn't they. Although possibly armed, I didn't feel threatened as no weapon was observed. Therefore, I decided that to act as if I had assistance, as if there were several police officers nearby. So, I yelled to my left and to my right, "Hey, Joe, they're over here, hey, Don, here they are." The young boys, thinking they were surrounded by police officers, stopped in their tracks and waited as I approached. Two of the boys surrendered without incident, while the third fled on foot without the other two noticing.

I was able to obtain arrest warrants and the suspects were prosecuted for attempted armed robbery. The third suspect, who fled the scene, was arrested at the St. Louis County Courthouse by another police officer who found his behavior suspicious and recognized him from a description given. The point of this real story is no force was needed; the suspects were not put in fear of losing life or limb, but rather they felt surrounded and that there was no escape. Crime solved! This is an example where common sense and intellect can often have good results vs. the use of just physical strength.

"Male Supervisors"

Lieutenant Andrea Kuhnert-Heyert (Retired), DSN 1436

In the mid 1970's, female police officers were still somewhat of a novelty throughout the United States. The Equal Employment Act passed in the 1960's opened many doors for women and minorities. Just because those doors opened did not mean that passing through them would be an easy task. The selection process was lengthy and difficult. There were tests, a physical and the dreaded polygraph examination. The most difficult step was the final interview board. Somehow I waded through it and for the first time in my life became a part of something much larger than I could have ever imagined.

I was hired in 1975 and attended the Greater St. Louis Police Academy. The sixteen weeks spent training were hard; however, the instructors and academy staff were supportive. More importantly, everyone was treated as an equal, male or female. Friendships were forged that would last a lifetime. I looked forward to graduation and getting out on patrol to use what I learned at the academy. Over the course of my 33 year career, I worked a myriad of assignments, special events, and details. I worked for men who were in various stages of their careers and all had a unique style of supervision. To my surprise, a few told me how I was the first woman they had ever supervised and they did not really know what to expect. My response to them was that I was to learn to work with my assigned supervisor and toward the goals of the County Police. One supervisor in particular had a great deal of faith in my abilities and pushed me beyond what I thought I was capable of achieving. To him I owe a great deal of gratitude for his believing in me. His coaching and mentoring were invaluable and made me a better person and department employee. Every employee should be so fortunate to have this type of supervisor, a true leader and life coach. Now retired, the bonds of friendship with fellow employees are still there. I often think of the supervisors who worked with me in such a positive manner, all through my career. I do miss the daily contact with my police family. It truly was something much larger than I could have ever imagined.

“Uniform Patrol/Light Duty Policy”
Esther Snelson (Angelos) (1972-1989), DSN 1068

I started working for the County Police back in 1972 and was I was one of the first 10 women hired for patrol duties. I had no idea what the citizen response would be to a female officer answering calls-for-service. I was pleasantly surprised that the majority of people were supportive and followed suggestions and directives as they were given. Now, the police officers in the precinct station were another matter entirely. Many went out of their way to be crude and offensive in their language and behavior. I would smile and thank them for their input. I would be called to suicides and shootings to see if I would be able to handle the blood and gore. After a while it became obvious to most of them that I was not bothered by their behavior and they accepted that I was there to stay. I left the department in August 1989 to teach a law enforcement program at a technical school in the area.

I also represented another first for St. Louis County when I became pregnant and refused to take a leave of absence. According to my supervisors the higher brass in headquarters refused to transfer me to a desk assignment because they did not want to set a precedent of special treatment for women. I remained on patrol duty for eight months. All the police officers on my platoon expressed concern for my health but were supportive of my decision. Every three or four weeks I would go into Uniform Supply office for larger uniform pants to wear. My supervisors would call me in periodically and ask about taking a leave but could find no deficiency in my work output. By the time the next female police officer became pregnant the policy had been changed.

“A Male Dominated Profession?”
Sergeant Jenifer S. Williams (Active), DSN 2938

My first night on the job was a midnight shift in 1990; I was 21 years old, and so excited. As I entered the roll call room, the first police officer I saw stopped me and said, "Just so you know, I've got no use for female officers." I was young and dumb and all I wanted to do was fight crime and evil, so I ignored his comment. Although ignored, the inappropriate comment always stuck with me and I always keep the memory close by. I actually commend that officer for his honesty because I later learned there were many more male police officers that felt the same way, but did not have the courage to say those words. A citizen once stopped me and said he was shocked that I patrolled without a partner. My response to him was simply, "Yes, and if you didn't hear, we also have the right to vote." I do not think he got the joke. I also think some of our fellow male officers still do not get it.

Being a female officer in a male dominated profession is difficult. I knew that when I signed up. Perhaps that is why I have been a bit more resilient than some of my fellow female officers. What hurts, and still hurts to this day, is that the job is tough enough without your fellow male co-workers making it even more difficult. Through the years I have seen improvement in how female officers are treated in the workplace. Whether or not the work environment is free of these demeaning comments is for future generations of law enforcement officers to decide. I have and will continue to “go into battle with my fellow brothers” with pride and professionalism because I believe in our mission and our duty. I could never imagine a time where I would treat a police officer differently because of his/her race, gender, religious beliefs, or sexual orientation. No matter what, I will always be there to back up my fellow officers without consideration of other factors. It is not who I am to judge others in such a way. These are my brothers in arms. To me there is no difference between us. I am a police officer, nothing more and nothing less.

The Results

Over 40 years has passed since the experiment was approved to evaluate if females adequately perform, while working alone, as uniform beat patrol officers. Should the Department continue to assign only males to such hazardous assignments, e.g., uniform beat officer, K-9 handler, helicopter pilot, or tactical operations? As the reader will have noted, the preceding pages of this history report describe the key implementation issues and personnel problems that had to be resolved, plus several testimonials written by current and past female police officers.

One significant piece of history, however, could not be located among the vintage files and related documents associated with the project. The missing piece involved the question, "Was the experiment ever concluded or declared a success by the County Police or Board of Police Commissioners?" Before the initial group of six policewomen completed their one year probationary period, Supt. di Grazia accepted an appointment as Commissioner of Police for the Boston Police Department. In April 1973, the Huntington, West Virginia Chief of Police, G.H. (Gil) Kleinknecht, was appointed as the new Superintendent of Police (Chief); however, he was not briefed on the ongoing experiment/project involving females serving as uniform patrol officers. Therefore, no conclusion to the experiment has been approved stating that a female is, or is not capable of performing all the duties of a police officer assigned a one-person patrol vehicle or other hazardous police assignments.

One of the purposes of this history report, "Policewomen on Patrol," is to bring to a conclusion the experiment that involved the performance of nearly 200 female police officers during the period 1957 to 2014. Based on the evidence collected and the performance recorded, the County Police supports Professor Sherman's determination that female police officers are "*able to perform the duties of one person motor patrols ... equally as well as men.*"

This determination is based on the following findings:

- Female police officers are or have been assigned to each division, precinct and bureau within the Department, not based on gender, but their ability (including physical) and personal performance. Assignments to patrol beats or specialized units make no distinction between male and female officers. Likewise, the gender of the nearest police officer is not considered when dispatching officers to a dangerous call-for-service.
- Female police officers have complied with the same set of rules and regulations and operational policies and procedures as required of male officers. The qualifications and standards for promotion to a supervisory or command position make no distinction as well. Both the police uniform and issued equipment and firearm (Sig-Sauer, Model P229R, 40 cal. Pistol) have the same set of specifications for both male and female.
- There are currently 117 active duty female police officers (including supervisors and commanders), which represents 14 percent of the total number of sworn officers.

"Women were able to perform the duties of one person motor patrols in a suburban police department equally as well as men." Professor Lewis J. Sherman, 1974

Bibliography/Resource

- Bloch, Peter B., and Deborah Anderson. "Policewomen on Patrol – Final Report." Police Foundation, Washington, DC 1974
- Horne, Peter. Women in Law Enforcement. Second Edition. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1980
- Milton, Catherine. Women in Policing. Police Foundation. Washington, D.C. 1972.
- Neumann, Gail L., and Professor Lewis J. Sherman. "An Evaluation of Policewomen on Patrol in St. Louis County." , University of Missouri-St. Louis. 1973.
- Police Foundation. Toward a New Potential – A Progress Report. Washington, D.C. 1974.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J. "Use of Women in Patrol in D.C. Police Department." University of Missouri-St. Louis. January 1972.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J. "Women in Police Work." Draft of Unpublished Research Paper. University of Missouri-St. Louis. April 26, 1972.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J., and Gail L. Neumann. "Anonymous Patrol Survey." University of Missouri-St. Louis. April 1973.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J., and Gail L. Neumann. "Encounter Survey (Observer), Policewomen Experiment." University of Missouri-St. Louis. 1973.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J. "A Psychological View of Women in Policing." University of Missouri-St. Louis. 1973.
- Sherman, Professor Lewis J. "Policewomen on Patrol in St. Louis County." Unpublished Research Paper. University of Missouri-St. Louis. June 25, 1974.
- St. Louis County, MO Police Department. Office Files, Superintendent (Chief) of Police. 1955-1981.
- St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Local News Articles. 1971-1972.
- St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Local News Articles. 1971-1972.

Appendix A

ST. COUNTY FEMALE POLICE OFFICERS

Retired*			
Lieutenant Margaret Clayton Lieutenant Cynthia Golden Lieutenant Andrea Kuhnert-Heyer Sergeant Maria Gomez Patrice Billings	Linda Guccione Lynda Hartwick Mary Monteleone Laura Nehring Rebecca Ruzala	Winona "Jean" Schrieber Betty-Ann Stiern Karen Swanson Barbara Sydnor Margaret Trittler	
Active Duty			
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Captains:</u></p> Mary Barton	Desree Dickerson Amy Dlugos Aimee Doering Danielle Durham Tara Edsall Tracie Eldridge Patricia Eller Kelly Finn Eva Fischer Melody Fisher Kristina Fosdick Michelle Fournthey Jody Franey Meaghan Gaffney Tracy Gailis Rebecca Gardiner Peggy Gardner Solana Garner Nicole Gentry Shelli Greenblatt Lisa Hale Ashawnti Hamilton Stephanie Hamilton Kimberly Haus Stephanie Hausfels Ann Hayes Kimberly Helwig Gwenda Hoskin Morgan Hubbard Heather Jagulli Joya Jordon Kathleen Kelly Brittany Klein Gina Koenig	Casey Lambert Barbara Lane Angela Logaglio Nicole Martin Elizabeth Matoushek Gillien McCarl Christine McHugh Amy Meyer Ebony Miller Karen Mueller Toni Mullins Kathryn Mumford Dawn Neuman Janet Nisbet Crystal Patterson Stephanie Percich Chiquita Pullen Jamie Reiter Lisa Reynolds Sheree Reynolds Christine Romo Chrystal Ruhmann Lynette Ryan Jasmine Schmidt Alexandra Schrader Connie Sharp Kristin Short Katherine Simmons Samantha Sirles Amy Speer Courtney Spiess Katelyn Stinson Kathryn Styer Yvette Summy	Lisa Sutter Margaret Tierney Laura Vineyard Martha Wainwright Lauren Wandless Angela Waterkotte Lakeshia Wells Julia Weston Amanda Wilhelm Jessica Wilken Amy Willenbrock Arrethie Williams Mattie Williams-Johnson Stephanie Woolfolk
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Lieutenants:</u></p> Diane Leonard Leslee Tate Melissa Webb			
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Sergeants:</u></p> Susan Doherty Emily Gilyon Joanna Jensen Dale Johnson Colleen Moran Donna Ostendorf Jenifer Williams			
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Police officers:</u></p> Tara Ammel Shanna Bahr Lauren Bamvakais Sophie Berman Deborah Bradley Ashley Brandt Shoni Brevik Nikki-Qui Brown Angela Candler-Bruno Krystle Carroll Lauren Carter Jennifer Clay Laura Clements Donna Creach Samantha Crespo Ashley Cummins			<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Police Recruits:</u></p> Kelli Bax Joanna Brueggemann Katherine Curran Katie Fildes Shanette Hall Catelin Koerber Nicole Norberg Monica Wasem

***Retired.** Defined as a commissioned officer who served for an aggregate of 10 years or more of service, currently receiving monthly retirement annuity from St. Louis County, and possessing a retirement identification and badge issued by the County Police.