



Cleveland
Police
Monitoring
Team

Community & Problem-Oriented Policing

Summary of Community Feedback
& Recommendations

July 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Consent Decree (“the Decree”) requires the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) to “develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated community and problem-oriented policing model” to “promote and strengthen partnerships with the community . . . and increase community confidence in the CDP.”¹ The Decree also requires that the Monitoring Team work with the CDP and the Cleveland Community Police Commission (CPC) to engage the community as the CDP develops its community and problem-oriented policing (CPOP) Plan. In the first half of 2017, the Monitoring Team, the City of Cleveland, the CDP, the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the CPC (collectively the “Stakeholders”) embarked on a collaborative engagement process (“community engagement process”) to solicit meaningful community feedback to guide the Division as it develops its CPOP Plan. This report summarizes this engagement process and the feedback received through it.

Cleveland community members were invited to provide input by completing an online or paper questionnaire or attending one of 18 community meetings for a focused discussion about community policing in Cleveland. Community groups and other organizations also were invited to attend the community forums and to submit written comments. Through this process, the Stakeholders ultimately reached over 1000 Cleveland community members, via the 18 community meetings, and received 600 online and paper questionnaires. A sample questionnaire is provided in Appendix A. The meeting dates and locations are provided in Appendix B. The Stakeholders also partnered with over 40 community organizations, which are listed in Appendix C.

Some key themes emerged from the process, elaborated upon briefly below and in greater detail in the report that follows. As a general matter, while the Cleveland community is overall critical of the CDP and its relationships and interactions with the public, participants also provided specific ways forward to improve the relationship, and expressed strong interest in being involved in the efforts to do so.

- **Community members do not feel as though CDP officers know or respect them or their communities.** A substantial majority of community members believe officers are often not familiar with local residents and their problems. Although the CDP does host a number of community-policing events, a majority of community members have not participated in them. Some community members also expressed the view that CDP officers treat them disrespectfully and make disrespectful comments.
- **Community members would like to see more ways for officers to get to know them**

¹ Dkt. 7-1 ¶ 27.

and more ways to promote more positive interactions between officers and the public. Cleveland residents generally are more interested in bike patrols or foot patrols rather than car patrols as ways for officers to get to know community members better and to promote more positive interactions between officers and the public. Community members also are more interested in seeing the same officers who patrol their neighborhoods at police-community events rather than specialized community policing officers or command officers. In order to better understand the community, Cleveland residents suggested officers receive additional training in cultural awareness and local Cleveland history.

- **While there are existing formal structures in Cleveland for community members to discuss policing concerns—namely, the District Policing Committees (DPCs) and the CPC—few people are aware of them or comfortable with them.** There are five DPCs in Cleveland—one per policing district—with the goal of “facilitat[ing] regular communication and cooperation between CDP and community leaders at the local level.”² The CPC was established in 2015 by the Consent Decree, and mandated to “work with the many communities that make up Cleveland for the purpose of developing recommendations for police practices that reflect an understanding of the values and priorities of Cleveland residents.”³ Based on the community feedback, however, not many Cleveland residents attend either DPC or CPC meetings. Additionally, few residents are aware of the purpose of these groups and whether they are productive.
- **Community members expressed trust and confidence in many existing local institutions and organizations, especially Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and block clubs.** A number of the questions in the questionnaire asked community members to state who they would turn to in their community for a public safety or community problem or who the CDP should turn to when seeking community input. For a variety of questions, community members suggested the CDP work closely with CDCs and block clubs and other existing local organizations for a number of different issues.
- **Community members are interested in providing input on CDP policies and training.** A substantial majority of community members think it is “very important” for the Division to solicit community input on use of force, crisis intervention team (CIT) training, and bias free policing policies, as well as on new community outreach programs. Community members also expressed a desire to participate in police training by either talking to recruits or attending a pilot training and providing feedback. With regard to

² Dkt. 7-1 ¶ 23.

³ Dkt. 7-1 ¶ 14.

officer and Division evaluation, many community members urged the Division to award community policing awards to officers based on community feedback. Community members also thought resident surveys and focus groups with residents are the most effective ways to evaluate the Division.

- **Community members would like the CDP's CPOP Plan to specifically address racial disparities.** Many community members expressed a desire for racial equity or diversity officer training. Community members suggested a variety of ideas for topics to incorporate into such training, such as implicit bias, the history of economic and housing bias, and the cultural traditions of new Cleveland immigrants, and they also suggested specific courses CDP officers could take.
- **Community members would like the CDP to better utilize social media and technology.** Community members highlighted CDP's inadequate online presence in a number of instances. Residents suggested hard-to-reach communities could be better contacted through improved social media efforts and a stronger online presence. Community members also suggested using social media to attract applicants from a cross section of the Cleveland community. They also expressed a desire to evaluate officers through a CDP app or web-based platform, which members of the public could use to file complaints or comment on an interaction.
- **Community members believe that the CDP and CDP officers are under-resourced.** Although Cleveland residents expressed a preference for alternatives to motorized patrol, community members noted that CDP does not appear to be adequately staffed to have extensive foot or bike patrols. There also is an understanding by community members that it is difficult for CDP to adequately serve the City of Cleveland due to funding and staffing deficiencies. CDP officer salary was a frequently cited challenge to the Division; many community members suggested salaries should be increased—not only to attract the best talent but also to compensate officers for the work expected of them.

I. BACKGROUND

The Consent Decree requires that the CDP develop a comprehensive CPOP Plan. Substantive community input is the first step in the development of a successful CPOP Plan. CDP's policies must directly respond to what the community expects. To that end, the Decree directs the Monitoring Team, the CPC, and the CDP to engage the community in identifying the strategies and approaches to community policing that will best address the needs of Cleveland residents and facilitate close partnership between the community and the CDP. This stage of community engagement has been an active effort to learn as much as possible about what Cleveland residents want the CDP's community policing plan to include.

A. Community and Problem-Oriented Policing

In December of 2016, the Stakeholders agreed on a framework for developing the Division's CPOP Plan as required by the Consent Decree. They agreed that the CPOP Plan, as well as the community engagement required by the Consent Decree to develop that Plan, needed to address the core components of community policing—collaborative problem solving, community input around policing policy and practice, and opportunities for officers to get to know their communities—as well as related areas of division management and organization that are necessary in order to implement the plan effectively. These include staffing and deployment, recruitment and hiring, officer training, and officer and department evaluation.

Core Components of Community and Problem-Oriented Policing

Community and problem-oriented policing—which will be referred to simply as “community policing”—requires that the police and the community work together to promote public safety and neighborhood well-being. The idea behind community policing is that the police and the community share responsibility for public safety, and that each has an important role to play.

The first component—collaborative problem-solving—is predicated on the idea that public safety issues sometimes reflect underlying community problems—like housing shortages, abandoned vehicles, empty lots, or poor street lighting. Often it is better to address these problems directly rather than treating them solely as a policing problem. The police then work with the community and other public agencies to tackle the underlying problems.

Soliciting community input on policing practices and policies is also an integral part of a successful community policing plan. Doing so helps to ensure that the police act in ways that reflect what the community expects. It also helps to build trust between the community and police.

Opportunities for officers to get to know the community also are vital to a successful community policing plan because they allow officers to become familiar with local problems and concerns. They help build trust between officers and community members and encourage collaborative problem-solving. It is also essential to reconsider Division patrol allocation and officers' patrol habits with the goal of integrating officers into communities, and providing officers and community members substantial exposure to each other and thus opportunities to get to know each other.

Staffing and Deployment

Staffing and deployment models should facilitate long-term police-community familiarity and relationship-building.⁴ Community policing can be resource intensive. Officers must have sufficient time in their schedules to engage with the community and address community problems—without undermining the Division's ability to respond to calls for service or other public safety emergencies. Deployment plans should be designed to provide community members and officers opportunities to get to know each other which will aid the development of strong community partnerships.

Recruitment and Hiring

Community policing requires recruiting and hiring candidates who are service-minded and committed to working in partnership with residents to promote public safety. Officers should be broadly representative of the community and be familiar with the cultures and traditions of the different neighborhoods they will serve.

Officer Training

Community policing requires officers to be familiar with the history, culture, and traditions of their communities. Ensuring that officers are equipped with these necessary skills and knowledge is an important component of any community policing plan because it helps officers and community members build mutual trust, and better understand and communicate with each other.

⁴ Lisa M. Graziano, Dennis P. Rosenbaum and Amie M. Schuck, Building Group Capacity For Problem Solving And Police-Community Partnerships Through Survey Feedback And Training: A Randomized Control Trial Within Chicago's Community Policing Program, 10 J EXP . CRIMINOL 80 (2014).

Officer and Division Evaluation

Officer and supervisor evaluations are essential to the success and sustainability of a community policing program. Evaluations provide supervisors, Division leadership, and the community with information about whether officers are following community policing practices. Evaluations can also incentivize officers and supervisors to pursue positive community relationships and engage residents in problem-solving efforts. Similarly, the Division as a whole also needs to be evaluated on its implementation of community and problem-oriented policing, in order to be able to assess how well it is doing overall and identify any needed changes in its policies.

B. The Community Engagement Process

Stakeholders' Community Engagement Process

In order to ensure the Stakeholders engaged in a streamlined process through which the CDP could develop and assess broad-based community input on community policing, the Monitoring Team worked closely with each Stakeholder to develop the engagement materials. The engagement materials consisted of (1) a PowerPoint presentation on community and problem-oriented policing which was used to frame the discussions at the various meetings and which outlined the areas discussed above; and (2) the online and paper questionnaires which contained background information on the components of community policing, as well as approximately 30 questions based on those components. The Monitoring Team prepared the initial drafts of these materials and shared them with each Stakeholder, and the materials were revised to incorporate the extensive feedback.

Biennial Community Survey and Community Focus Groups

To the extent it is relevant, this Report also incorporates the results of two other engagement mechanisms conducted in the period since the Consent Decree was first implemented, both of which were designed to assess the Cleveland community's trust and confidence in the CDP and individual perceptions of public safety and policing. These are the Biennial Community Survey ("Biennial Community Survey" or "BCS") from June 2016 and the Community Focus Groups ("Community Focus Groups" or "CFGs") from June 2017. The quantitative Biennial Community Survey captured the Cleveland community's perceptions about safety and policing.⁵ The findings reflect the content of telephone interviews conducted by Interviewing Service of America, an independent research firm, between May 4 and May 31, 2016, with a sample of 1,400 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Cleveland.⁶ The qualitative Community Focus Groups research

⁵ Biennial Community Survey at i.

⁶ Biennial Community Survey at i.

captured “underlying themes and assess[ed] the ‘why’ behind people’s feelings, beliefs, and perceptions.”⁷ These findings reflect the content of six focus groups consisting of 8 to 11 adults living in six Cleveland neighborhoods—Glenville, Central, Clark-Fulton, Cudell, Puritas-Longmead, and South Broadway.⁸ Although neither of these surveys was designed specifically around the CPOP engagement process, they provide important insight into community views of public safety and policing in Cleveland that the CDP should incorporate as it develops its CPOP Plan.

C. Public Outreach

Cleveland is a large city with many community members active in civic life. In order to ensure broad-based participation, the Monitoring Team and the Stakeholders reached out to community organizations and key community members in a variety of ways. The comprehensive process included multiple opportunities for participation:

- *Community Meetings*
 - *Two Cleveland-wide community roundtables:* The roundtables—one on the East side and one on the West side—included the PowerPoint presentation introducing CPOP issues, which also provided a framework for the ensuing small group discussions. Representatives from each Stakeholder group facilitated or participated in these small groups. Approximately 160 residents and community leaders attended the two roundtables, including police officers, several members of the clergy, residents and staff of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, Cleveland city council members, and representatives from the Hispanic Alliance, the Council on American Islamic Relations, Boys & Girls Clubs of Cleveland, and the LGBT Center of Greater Cleveland.
 - *Nine meetings throughout the city for deeper engagement within Cleveland’s neighborhoods:* These nine meetings involved partnering with community organizations and consisted of geographically-specific and/or stakeholder-specific meetings. The groups were chosen based on the diversity of the populations they serve and/or represent and, in order to ensure wide geographic coverage, encompassed every police district and a wide array of neighborhoods. The partner organizations, which have strong ties to the diverse populations of Cleveland, are listed in Appendix C.

⁷ Community Focus Groups at 5.

⁸ Community Focus Groups at 5-14.

- *Attending other established group meetings:* Monitoring Team members also attended DPC meetings in all five districts, several CPC meetings, and a Community Relations Board (CRB) meeting.
- *Traditional Media:* This included reaching out to traditional media outlets to advertise the events. The *Cleveland Call & Post*—an African-American weekly newspaper—advertised the community events. The Monitoring Team created flyers for each event and requested that each partner organization post an invitation in their online or paper newsletter. Additionally, the CRB sent a mailing blast to their various constituencies and posted information in their monthly publication. Channel 19, the local Cleveland station, also publicized the two Cleveland-wide community meetings.
- *Social Media:* Each day for about two weeks, through its Twitter feed, the Monitoring Team tagged different community groups, businesses, and faith-based organizations to encourage them to let their members and followers know about the opportunity to take the online questionnaire or attend a community meeting. Additionally, the Second District Committee posted a link to the online questionnaire on its Facebook page.
- *Online questionnaire:* The questionnaire and background materials were available in English and Spanish at www.clevelandpolicemonitor.net. The questionnaire and comment period ran for 63 days, from March 14 through May 16.
- *Paper Questionnaires:* Although the primary feedback mechanism was the online questionnaire and comment portal, the Monitoring Team also prepared paper questionnaires. These were made available at the community meetings and to any individual who expressed an interest in distributing them.

D. Demographics of Engagement Process

The online and paper questionnaires asked demographic questions including the respondents' race, age, and gender.⁹ Given the low overall response rate and the small percentage of minority group representation, this Report does not analyze all responses based on demographics, but points out where differences stood out.

⁹ Although respondents were prompted to include such demographic information, they were not required to.

Table 1: Respondents by Age (Versus Cleveland Population)

	Number of questionnaire respondents	Percentage of respondents who provided age	Percentage of respondents by age ¹⁰	Cleveland Population
Under 18	2	<1%	<1%	24.6%
18-34 ¹¹	72	20%	12.5%	34.3%
35-54	119	33%	21%	33.6%
55-64	86	24%	15%	16.1%
65 and older	75	21%	13%	16.0%

Table 2: Respondents by Race/Ethnicity (Versus Cleveland Population)

	Number of questionnaire respondents	Percentage of respondents who provided race/ethnicity	Percentage of respondents by race/ ethnicity ¹²	Cleveland Population
White	229	64%	38.6%	33.4%
Black	88	24%	14.8%	53.3%
Hispanic ¹³	17	5%	3%	10.0%
Asian	0	0%	0	1.8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	1%	0.4%	N/A ¹⁴
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	1%	0.5%	.03%
Middle Eastern or North African	4	1%	0.7%	N/A ¹⁵
Other	32	9%	5.4%	3.30%

¹⁰ 40% of the respondents did not indicate their age. This column represents the percentage of respondents in each age group based on the total number of respondents.

¹¹ The U.S. Census does not separate ages 18-25 from ages 26-34. For ages 18-25, there were 29 questionnaire respondents, making up 8% of the respondents who provided their age, and 5% of the respondents by age. For ages 26-34, there were 43 questionnaires respondents, making up 12% of the respondents who provided their age, and 7.5% of the respondents by age.

¹² 40% of the respondents did not indicate their race. This column represents the percentage of respondents in each race/ethnicity based on the total number of respondents.

¹³ Includes both Black and White Hispanic, to better enable comparison with the total population.

¹⁴ Not included in the 2010 U.S. Census.

¹⁵ Not included in the 2010 U.S. Census.

In particular, there were some clear demographic differences with respect to the frequency and manner in which community members in different groups responded to the survey. The paper questionnaire solicited a more diverse response group, specifically regarding age and race, but neither questionnaire received a race or age sample representative of Cleveland's population.¹⁶ Tables 1 and 2 represent the percentage of the respondents to the questionnaire who fell into each demographic category.

¹⁶ UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU, QUICK FACTS CLEVELAND CITY, OHIO (2010).

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of this engagement process was to involve the community in a comprehensive dialogue about community and problem-oriented policing in Cleveland and to hear from residents directly about the reforms that they would like to see.

A. Summary of Engagement Framework

The questionnaire provided to community members (Appendix A) provided the framework for the discussions at the in-person meetings. The questionnaire and meetings followed the same general outline: explaining CPOP first, and then exploring participants' views on the key components of CPOP and its implementation outlined above. These are: first, the three key components of CPOP itself (collaborative problem solving; community input in policy and practice; and getting to know the community); and then, the more general aspects of policing management and practice that are essential for a successful CPOP Plan, including staffing and deployment, recruitment and hiring, officer training, and officer and Division evaluation. Each section contained a series of questions designed to elicit community members' views about and/or engagement in the status quo, as well as their ideal options. For example, "the opportunities to get to know community members" section asked community members to rank preferences regarding motorized policing or other types of patrol (i.e., bike patrols, foot patrols, and mini stations), as well as to indicate what major CDP-sponsored community policing events they have heard of and participated in. As another example, the staffing and deployment section listed a variety of tasks that may be performed by civilian employees rather than sworn officers—such as responding to noise complaints or parking enforcement—and asked community members to indicate whether they would be "very comfortable", "somewhat comfortable", or "uncomfortable" with a civilian employee performing the task in question.

The online and paper questionnaires contained both multiple choice and open-ended questions. The Monitoring Team determined the frequency of the responses to the multiple-choice questions, and also reviewed the answers provided or written in for the open-ended questions. It also reviewed the notes taken of community comments during the roundtables and other meetings. Highlights of the responses are provided below. As is specified below, the percentages refer to the responses to the online and paper questionnaires or to the BCS, and are approximations rounded to the nearest whole percentage.

B. Summary of Feedback

Certain overall themes emerge from a review of the feedback from both the responses to the questionnaires and the discussions at the in-person meetings regarding community policing in Cleveland. As a general matter, while the Cleveland community expressed dissatisfaction with

the status quo, residents also provided some specific ways forward to improve CDP-community interaction and are eager to be involved in the work to do so. Various themes from the feedback are discussed in greater detail below.

It should be noted at the outset that, as discussed above, the Stakeholders attended DPC, CPC, and CRB meetings and some of this feedback comes from the discussions at those meetings. Additionally, the Stakeholders advertised for the other community meetings through their many networking channels including through the DPCs and CPCs. To that end, many of those who were engaged in this process and provided their input were probably more likely to know about groups such as the DPC and CPC and/or attend a DPC or CPC meeting than the Cleveland population as a whole.

Most of the community members in attendance at the meetings were in support of the engagement process and eager to provide their feedback. A few also discussed their dissatisfaction with the Consent Decree process as a whole.

As discussed in the Monitor's Third Semiannual Report, "some conversations surrounding community participation in policing in Cleveland inevitably circle around to a discussion of who the 'real' Cleveland community is."¹⁷ The responses indicate that while it can be difficult to discern "one" community sentiment, many Cleveland residents agree on particular kinds of reform and community policing efforts. In this part of the report, we summarize the reforms and community policing efforts Cleveland residents agree on as well as note where there are divergences of views.

1. Community members do not feel as though CDP officers know or respect them or their communities.

A majority of community members believe officers are "rarely" familiar or only familiar "some of the time" with local residents and their problems. Similarly, the Biennial Community Survey Report found that only one-third of Cleveland residents think the police have taken the time to meet members of their community (33%) or have developed relationships with people like them (37%).¹⁸ The BCS Report further found that just over half of the residents surveyed (51%) believe Cleveland police officers are "very knowledgeable" or "somewhat knowledgeable" about their community.¹⁹

Some of the Community Focus Group participants expressed the view that police are either "not

¹⁷ Third Semiannual Report at 14.

¹⁸ Biennial Community Survey at 15.

¹⁹ Biennial Community Survey at 16.

present, even when you want or need them” or they are present but are “doing the wrong things and not solving their problems.”²⁰ Community members across various forms of feedback—questionnaires, community meetings, and community focus groups—expressed their dissatisfaction with only seeing officers in a law enforcement capacity rather than interacting with the public in non-enforcement ways. As one community member stated: “I rarely see a CDP Officer in my neighborhood. When I do, they are just passing through in their patrol cars.”

Not only did a substantial portion of Cleveland residents feel as though local officers do not know them or their communities well enough, many residents also reported feeling disrespected by police or that they are victims of profiling practices. Community members frequently stated that they have heard officers make comments indicating the officers do not live in Cleveland (or the particular neighborhood they are patrolling) and that the resident should move. One community member said “one phrase I hear all the time from Cleveland Police officers is ‘you live/work/travel there? You should get a gun to protect yourself.’ Regardless of how statistically violent an area may be, most residents do not want police telling them they need a gun for protection as they go about their everyday lives. Officers who live, or have family within the city, seem much more in tune to the neighborhoods.”

As is further discussed below, some residents also feel as though they are victims of “rampant racism by police officers.” These community members expressed feelings of dehumanization and disrespect when interacting with police officers.

There were also more complimentary views expressed about interactions with the CDP. In questionnaire comments and in the meetings, some community members emphasized their positive relationship with members of the Division. Particularly in the business district, residents voiced their satisfaction with how seamless and easy it has been to talk to officers and form bonds. These bonds then allow the officer to actually know the community member and be familiar with their problems.

2. Community members would like to see more ways for officers to get to know them and more ways to promote more positive interactions between officers and the public.

In various forms of feedback—questionnaire comments, community meetings, and the community focus groups—community members expressed a desire for or satisfaction with informal situations where officers and community members interact in non-law enforcement settings.

²⁰ Community Focus Groups at 24.

A substantial majority of respondents to the questionnaires (70%) prefer to see more CDP officers on bike or foot patrol as opposed to motorized patrol. Foot or bike patrols were seen as an opportunity for community members and officers to get to know each other more easily. One community member explained the preference in this way: “Foot patrol officers are visible, more inclined to interact with the people as they see them in passing on the sidewalk, I know I always speak and we can put a face to officer whoever, especially if they are the regular officers and not new people every other day.” Community members who live and work in the downtown area and often encounter officers on foot patrols suggest foot patrols have helped them form positive relationships with the officers they regularly interact with. Those that do not experience these easily accessible interactions expressed a desire for these sorts of relationships.

It was important to many participants that officers get to know community members. Over half of questionnaire respondents (55%) would like to see more patrol officers at neighborhood events rather than community policing officers or command officers. One community member stated, “I need to know the patrol officers in my neighborhood to build trust.” Another opined: “If you’re a cop and this is your daily route, there should be at least 10 people who know your name or you know them.”²¹

In discussions about training and evaluation, Cleveland residents again put significant emphasis on officers getting to know residents and encouraging positive interactions. Residents wanted CDP to incorporate cultural awareness into officer training. They specifically noted they wanted officers to have training in racial and economic bias, including understanding where there are higher rates of poverty and abandoned homes in Cleveland, and the history of housing discrimination. Residents also expressed a desire for training that provides officers with a deeper knowledge of their neighborhood, including the people, culture, and unique dynamics.²²

Similarly, to attract more recruits, community members urged CDP to change the perception of police especially in its advertising and training programs. One step suggested is for the CDP to publicly address the history of policing bias in Cleveland and its impact on marginalized groups. Residents also recommended that CDP rebrand itself to focus more on the public service aspect of policing and less on the “militaristic” aspect, and urged the Division to refrain from using language that suggests a military approach (such as “war zone”). Community members also stressed changing the perceived “hyper-masculine” or “macho” culture of CDP which was described as unwelcoming to many women as well as some men.

Similarly, with regard to evaluation, community members indicated that they would like officers and the CDP to be evaluated based on the relationships and partnerships the officer develops

²¹ Community Focus Groups at 50.

²² Community Focus Groups at 57.

with the community. A substantial majority of questionnaire respondents (73%) indicated that when evaluating the CDP's CPOP Plan, the CDP and the CPC should track "the [Division's] number of successful efforts to solve specific community problems." A substantial number (40%) would also like the CDP and the CPC to track the "number of positive interactions officers have during each shift" in assessing the CDP's overall implementation of its CPOP Plan. Community members also wanted the same metric used when evaluating individual officers—how often an individual officer identifies and solves community problems and the number of positive reviews they received from community members. Some suggested that the CDP should not count the number of positive reviews officers receive but rather should focus on tracking the number of negative reviews.

One portion of the questionnaire elicited substantial discussion directly related to the kind of relationship community members would like to have with CDP officers. The first question of the questionnaire offered a hypothetical based on the issue of abandoned or vacant houses. This was a recurring problem that was often mentioned when members of the Monitoring Team and other Stakeholders, in order to prepare materials for the engagement process, met with various community groups as well as DPCs to learn more about the issues that Cleveland residents faced that they would typically refer to the CDP. The question asked respondents to select who they would turn to if there were an abandoned home on their block attracting young people engaged in potentially criminal behavior. Many respondents objected to the framing of question, and suggested that if officers were to become involved, they should focus less on the potential crime the young people might have been committing and instead focus on the relationship they had with the police or address the underlying reasons that they were loitering at the abandoned house. Although the question did not specify the demographics of the young people, some community members felt like "the real problem was race."

On the other hand, other community members suggested a law enforcement-focused approach to this problem was the appropriate one, and urged the CDP to quickly reprimand and cite or arrest the individuals. Others thought the property owner should be contacted and given a citation for abandoning the property.

3. While there are existing formal structures in Cleveland for community members to discuss policing concerns—namely, the DPCs and the CPC—few people are aware of them or are comfortable with them.

The DPCs (formerly called District Community Relations Committees) are formal groups designed to advance problem-oriented policing. Each police district has its own DPC, which hold monthly public meetings to discuss policing issues or crime and safety concerns. The District Commander often attends these meetings, and some commanders have said that these meetings are helpful for identifying problems in their district. DPCs are the primary venue for Cleveland

residents to raise their public safety concerns directly with the police and get to know officers in their district.

When asked about the DPCs, it was clear the most Cleveland residents do not attend meetings because they are unaware of the existence of the groups, unaware of the meeting times, are too busy, or simply do not feel comfortable with them or understand the agenda. A little less than half (46%) of the questionnaire respondents have heard of DPCs. About a quarter (27%) have attended a DPC meeting. The most prevalent reason residents gave for not attending a DPC is a lack of awareness of the times or locations of the meetings. One community member stated: “I never remember when they are held. They need to be better advertised somehow.” Notably, a lower proportion of respondents ages 18-24 than respondents over 24 indicated they had heard of DPCs.²³

While some people are simply unaware of the DPCs or their meeting times, others do not feel empowered to address issues through them. Some community members believed their districts are too big and they could not relate to other residents in the same DPC from the opposite side of town. Others expressed the belief that the DPCs’ work was unproductive and only served a few people in Cleveland. However, despite the concerns respondents generally have with the Committees, of those questionnaire respondents who said they had attended a DPC meeting before, a majority (63%) thought the DPC did an “acceptable” or a “good” job representing their district.

The CPC was created by the Consent Decree to represent community voices and interests, and make recommendations on CDP policies and practices. The CPC meetings could be an appropriate venue for community members to discuss and review CDP policies. The Commission has 13 members who represent various groups and communities, and it holds monthly public community meetings. Unlike DPCs, a majority of questionnaire respondents (60%) had heard of the CPC, but only a minority (20%) had attended a meeting. Residents provided a variety of reasons as to why they did not attend meetings. Most community members were unaware of their meetings times or locations. One person expressed surprise that the general public was invited. Notably, a lower proportion of respondents ages 18-24 than respondents over 24 indicated they had heard of the CPC.²⁴

²³ 17% of 18-24 year old questionnaire respondents indicated they had heard of the DPCs, while 42% of 25-34 year olds, 41% of 35-54 year olds, 51% of 55-65 year olds, and 53% of those 65 years and older indicated they had heard of the DPCs.

²⁴ 17% of 18-24 year old questionnaire respondents indicated they had heard of the CPC, while 56% of 25-34 year olds, 55% of 35-54 year olds, 58% of 55-65 year olds, and 53% of those 65 years and older indicated they had heard of the CPC.

For those individuals who did not attend meetings, three common themes stood out. Some people shared the sentiment that they do not believe the City is invested in the reform effort. One community member stated: “It is all smoke and mirrors. The City and police do not, in reality, want the DOJ here, and DOJ is only here because they were ordered to be here. Has the City met any deadlines yet? I don’t believe they have.” Others strongly felt as though the Commission did not demographically represent Cleveland and that therefore the Commissioners were out of touch with Cleveland residents. Lastly, several community members mentioned that the Commission is still very new and it is too soon to tell. Despite the concerns respondents had generally have with the Commission, of those questionnaire respondents who said they had attended a CPC meeting before about half (51%) said the CPC does an “acceptable” or “good” job.

4. Community members expressed trust and confidence in many of their local existing institutions and organizations, especially CDCs and block clubs.

In several instances throughout the engagement process, community members referenced partnerships with CDCs and block clubs as an optimal way for the CDP to improve community and problem-oriented policing in Cleveland. For example, in response to the first question of the questionnaire, which stated the hypothetical based on the issue of abandoned or vacant houses discussed above, a majority of respondents (63%) selected the option of turning to the CDP in the first instance. However, community members generally listed the CDCs and block clubs as organizations the CDP should partner with to solve this problem or as organizations the respondents themselves would prefer to address the problem.

Similarly, in the community engagement around substantive policy section, community members recommended meeting with CDC leadership and attending block club parties as ways for CDP to better engage with hard-to-reach communities. A majority of questionnaire respondents (60%) also suggested the CDP and CPC work closely with CDCs and block clubs—as well as businesses and schools—in evaluating the effectiveness of the CDP’s CPOP Plan.

While often times community members simply listed “CDCs” generally, some respondents took the time to reference a particular CDC. In most cases when a particular CDC was mentioned it was Old Brooklyn CDC and Belle Puritas Development Corp.

5. Community members are interested in providing input on CDP policies and training.

In numerous instances, Cleveland residents expressed a desire to be involved in providing input on Division policies, training, and evaluation. A substantial majority of questionnaire respondents (greater than 70%) thought it was “very important” for the community to be able to provide feedback on revised use of force, CIT, and bias free policing policies, as well as on new

community outreach programs. About one-third of community members would like to participate in CDP police training. Notably, a higher proportion of Black respondents than White respondents indicated it was “very important” to provide feedback on the listed policies, with the greatest disparity between White and Black respondents being for revised use of force policies.²⁵

Community members also wanted to provide input on CDP evaluations. Community members noted the Division should make an effort to consult Cleveland residents who had recent interactions with officers, either positive or negative, in evaluating officers. Most (57%) questionnaire respondents selected resident surveys and focus groups with residents as the “most effective” ways to evaluate the CDP and “measure community trust and perception of law enforcement.” Many residents expressed the view that community input should be essential to determining recipients of CDP’s officer community policing awards. As one community member wrote: “I don’t know what the criteria should be, but awards should be nominated and selected by the community, not the police force itself. The community should reward such behavior. Without that input, what’s the point?”

Notably, the Biennial Community Survey found that just under half of all residents believe it is “very easy” or “somewhat easy” to provide input on CDP policies.²⁶ The feedback from the engagement process provides guidance on how Cleveland residents would like to provide such input. Most questionnaire respondents were interested in providing input through online questionnaires (68%) or attending community meetings in their district (52%). With regard to how community members would like to provide input on training, slightly over half (53%) of the questionnaire respondents indicated they are “somewhat interested” or “very interested” in “talk[ing] to recruits” or “attend[ing] a pilot training.” Community members emphasized the importance of ensuring diversity in the views of community members who serve as interlocutors for the community with the CDP. Several individuals noted, for example, that if CDP were to develop a community member panel for new recruits, such a panel should not just consist of residents from policing districts one or two where community members gave the CDP the highest rating (as may have been done in the past).²⁷ A quarter of respondents indicated they would like to participate in training and offered a wide variety of topics they would like to teach. In particular, several people indicated they would like to teach a session on how to interact with

²⁵ 64% of White questionnaire respondents indicated it was “very important” for the Division to get feedback while 81% of Black respondents indicated it was “very important.”

²⁶ Biennial Community Survey at 17.

²⁷ According to the Biennial Community Survey “nearly three-fourths (73%) of residents living in the Far-West area (similar to District 1) and 62% of residents living in the Mid-West area (similar to District 2) rated overall police performance as good or excellent, compared to 49% of residents in the North East (similar to District 5), and 44% of residents living in the Mid-East (similar to District 3) and South-East areas (similar to District 4).” Biennial Community Survey at 5.

those with mental illness or with youth.

6. Community members would like the CDP's CPOP Plan to specifically address racial disparities.

In numerous instances, community members expressed their belief that the CDP treats people of color differently. The Biennial Community Survey, for example, found “perceptions of differential treatment are more widely held among Black and Latino residents. A total of 70% of White residents believe the police treat all racial and ethnic groups equally at least some of the time compared to 55% of Latino residents and 49% of Black residents. Two-thirds of Black residents (66%) believe they are treated worse than other members of the community.”²⁸ In the focus groups, “many people expressed their belief that there is a deep-[seated] culture of racism and long-established patterns of racist treatment of the Hispanic and African-American communities by the police officers.”²⁹ According to the CFG report, “Hispanics, African-Americans, and young White males were particularly likely to report having experienced profiling and harassment.”³⁰ In Glenville, young Black males emphasized the lengths they go to in order to avoid interacting with the police because of the “perceived profiling and constant harassing.”³¹

Community members recommended that the CDP specifically address the impact of CDP policing on minority populations, especially on Black and Latino communities, through training and a change in policing practices. Community members specifically noted they wanted officers to have training in implicit bias as well as in racial and economic bias, including understanding where there are higher rates of poverty and abandoned homes in Cleveland and the history of housing discrimination. One person suggested officers receive a “high-quality racial equity training course,” and recommended a course called “Prism: a Racial Equity Laboratory,” given through the group “Neighborhood Connections.” Another recommended CDP incorporate the City Club of Cleveland’s “Race Anthology” into training. In terms of Division evaluation, community members suggested the CDP and the CPC track officers’ racial equity training.

In several instances, community members suggested White officers are suspicious of Black Cleveland residents. During the meetings, community members suggested that officers should spend a day riding with a qualified community member of a different race. This might, for example, encourage White officers to spend time in predominantly African-American churches and be in Black cultural venues.

²⁸ Biennial Community Survey at 28.

²⁹ Community Focus Groups at 55.

³⁰ Community Focus Groups at 56.

³¹ Community Focus Groups at 47.

As the CDP attempts to improve its engagement with the entire Cleveland community, it is important for the CDP to note that fewer Black and Latino residents reported that it was “very easy” or “easy” to provide input, as compared to White residents.³² At the same time, as noted above, African-American questionnaire respondents were more likely to report wanting to provide input, especially on certain policies.

Some community members felt as though the CPC—which was established by the Consent Decree to represent community views to the CDP—did not adequately represent the entire City of Cleveland because it did not have enough representation by residents from the West Side of Cleveland, where a majority of White residents reside.

7. Community members would like the CDP to better utilize social media and technology.

A common theme throughout many of the responses was that CDP should have a stronger online presence. Community members felt that would aid the CDP in its effort to contact hard-to-reach communities, such as younger residents, poorer residents, and people of color. For example, a majority of questionnaire respondents (56%) indicated that “using social media” would be a “very effective” way to attract applicants for employment at the CDP from a cross-section of Cleveland. Cleveland residents also noted it is difficult to attend community meetings in person, and they would like an online stream of community meetings.

In the Division’s evaluation efforts, residents expressed a preference for technology that can track, evaluate and analyze CPOP-related data—such as the number of positive interactions or informal police-community interactions—for each district. Community members also indicated a desire to evaluate CDP officers through an online website or app. Some suggested a “Yelp for officers,” where officers could be individually evaluated.

8. Community members believe that the CDP and CDP officers are under-resourced.

In many instances, community members expressed the belief that officers and the Division are inadequately resourced to handle current policing needs. Community members emphasized the lack of personnel. When asked how familiar officers were with their communities, for example, many community members expressed the view that CDP cannot adequately serve the City of Cleveland due to funding and staffing deficiencies. One community member wrote: “[T]hey have a lot of ground to cover and too few people with which to do it.” Another commented: “[I]f they had more funding and personnel, there would be more relationships.” Community members also expressed concern about the feasibility of foot and bike patrols, particularly the CDP’s

³² Biennial Community Survey at 23.

current ability to staff those sufficiently.

Community members also emphasized the low salary CDP officers receive because it limited the CDP's recruitment ability and did not adequately compensate officers for the work they are expected to do. Many expressed the view that qualified and smart Cleveland residents are deterred from applying to be a police officer because they are paid so little. Others noted that being an officer in Cleveland is very demanding and the low salary does not provide adequate compensation. Many suggested incentives—such as bonuses, days off, gift cards, or compensatory time—to encourage officers to take the extra time needed to better engage with the community. Community members also offered a variety of suggestions of ways to maximize recruitment efforts. Many of these suggestions, recognizing the financial burdens the job imposes, involve providing incentives for residents to join the force, such as tax breaks, loan forgiveness and scholarships for students who plan on becoming officers.

Community policing can be very resource-intensive. Keeping this in mind, community members were asked to indicate tasks they would feel comfortable having sworn civilian personnel performed instead of police officers.³³ Unsurprisingly, questionnaire respondents were generally most comfortable with tasks that had a low probability of escalating into something more serious. A substantial majority, for example, were “very comfortable” with civilians taking administrative roles (73%) and answering non-emergency phone calls at the police station (61%). About half were “very comfortable” with civilians handling parking enforcement and responding to a road hazard (e.g., a pothole or broken glass). Auxiliary officers are volunteers who assist the CDP and community by responding to non-policing requests and enabling officers to respond to higher priority events. About 18% of questionnaire respondents expressed interest in serving as auxiliary police officers.

C. Additional Comments

A few other aspects of the feedback are worth noting, even though they do not necessarily fall into the themes described above. These responses relate to officer and CDP evaluation and officer recruitment.

1. Evaluation

³³ The tasks listed as options in the survey were administrative work (e.g., payroll, planning and research, etc.), answering non-emergency phone calls at the police station, responding to noise complaints, parking enforcement, responding to a traffic incident to take reports, responding to a road hazard (e.g., a pothole or broken glass), responding to and investigating vandalism, administrative work (e.g., payroll, planning and research, etc.).

Community members offered a variety of metrics CDP should track when evaluating its CPOP Plan as well as evaluating individual officers, in addition to those already discussed. Suggestions include, for example, that the CDP compare different districts within the city to each other on their community engagement efforts and also that these efforts of Cleveland officers should be compared to those in comparable cities. Residents also suggested a number of training and certification programs that they would like the CPC and CDP to keep track of for individual officers (such as suicide prevention).

2. Recruitment

Community members expressed great interest in the well-being and emotional stability of new recruits and current officers. They urged comprehensive psychological pre-screenings before an officer joins the force as well as ongoing screenings or re-evaluations. A number of community members also suggested requiring ongoing physical fitness examinations, and opined that those in poor physical health may rely on force more than others. Because of the possible trauma, community members also urged that CDP conduct a separate screening process for individuals with prior military service.

III. CONCLUSION

The goal of this joint community outreach process was to give the Cleveland community a voice at the outset before the CDP embarks on developing its CPOP Plan. The engagement process found there are many areas of agreement in the community regarding issues relevant to CPOP. The results above elaborate on the key themes that emerged from the process. As a general matter, Cleveland residents expressed dissatisfaction with CDP's current community policing efforts. However, the feedback also provides a roadmap for many reforms and policies that community members are most interested in seeing in their city.

Appendix A

Community & Problem-Oriented Policing Discussion Guide

INTRODUCTION

The Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) is developing a new Community and Problem-Oriented Policing Plan. To help guide that process, CDP, the City (including the District Policing Committees and the Community Relations Board), the Cleveland Community Police Commission, and the Federal Monitoring Team are gathering input from Cleveland residents about what the plan should include.

This discussion guide provides an overview of the key components of community policing.

The guide is divided into three parts:

1. Community and Problem-Oriented Policing
2. Recruitment and Officer Training
3. Staffing and Officer Evaluation

PART I: COMMUNITY AND PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING

Community and problem-oriented policing—which we will refer to simply as “community policing”—involves the police and the community working together to promote public safety and neighborhood well being. The idea behind community policing is that the police and the community share responsibility for public safety, and that each has an important role to play.

There are three main parts to community and problem-oriented policing:

- A. Collaborative Problem Solving
- B. Community Input on Policing Practices And Policies
- C. Opportunities for Officers to Get to Know the Community

The following sections describe each of these parts and include questions about each.

COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A key part of community policing is “problem-oriented policing” or collaborative problem-solving.

The idea behind problem-oriented policing is that public safety issues sometimes reflect underlying community problems—like housing shortages, abandoned vehicles, empty lots, or poor street lighting. Often it is better to address these problems directly.

Community Partners

Community partners play an important role in problem-oriented policing. They can help the CDP identify and prioritize community problems. They also can help the CDP identify the best ways to solve problems in their neighborhoods.

The CDP can identify partners through formal groups, such as the District Policing Committees (DPC) (formerly called District Community Relations Committee). Each police district already has its own District Policing Committee, which has monthly public meetings to discuss policing issues or crime and safety concerns. The District Commander often identifies district problems by attending these meetings.

The CDP also can reach out directly to groups of residents, local businesses, non-profit organizations, community and faith-based leaders, and other government agencies.

COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

To help focus the discussion, the following questions ask about one common problem that residents have identified: abandoned homes.

1. If there were an abandoned home on your block, and you started to see loud groups of young people hanging out late at night, who would you be most likely to bring your concern to? And why? Some ideas include a neighbor or friend, a specific community group, a city council member, a city housing agency, and the CDP.

2. If someone complains to the CDP about an abandoned house with loud groups of young people hanging out late at night, officers can take a variety of steps to address the problem. For example, they can:
 - Work with city agencies or neighborhood groups to board up windows and doors;
 - Ask the City to try to take over the property through eminent domain and sell it to a developer.
 - Ask the City to fund cleanups and improvements like landscaping and painting for the house, and ask neighborhood groups to volunteer a hand as well.

Are there any groups in your neighborhood that the CDP could partner with on any of these efforts? What other actions would you want the CDP to take?

District Policing Committees

3. Do you know what police district you live in? Have you ever attended a DPC meeting? If so, how many? Do you think the DPC does a good job representing your district? Why or why not? Where do get your information about the DPCs?

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A community policing plan should include regular opportunities for community members to provide input on policing policies and practices. Doing so helps to ensure that the police act in ways that reflect what the community expects. It also builds trust between the community and police.

For this reason, the Consent Decree created the Cleveland Community Police Commission (CPC) to represent community voices and interests, and make recommendations on CDP policies and practices. The Commission has 13 members who represent various groups and communities. The Commission holds monthly public community meetings.

In addition to working closely with the CPC, the CDP also can get input directly from residents about its policies and practices.

Three important questions about community engagement are:

1. What policies and policing practices should residents be able to provide input on?
2. How can the CDP and the CPC make sure that they hear from all of Cleveland's many communities?
3. What are ways to make sure the input is appropriately considered?

Deciding When to Get Community Input

The CDP's manual has policies on everything from officer uniforms to the use of force. The CDP updates its policies on a regular basis, and sometimes changes are quite minor. Due to time and resource limits, it might be difficult for the CDP to gather public input every time it makes a change. On what sorts of policies should the CDP seek community input? Should the CDP get input from the community before adopting a new technology, like body-worn cameras? What about if the CDP wants to make changes to its recruitment practices?

Ensuring Broad Participation

Both the CDP and CPC will need to make sure that they hear from all of Cleveland's many communities. They can get input in a number of ways:

- **Online questionnaires and surveys:** Online surveys make it easy for people with Internet access to give input. A person can take a questionnaire from their home or office. On the other hand, taking an online survey is an individual activity. There is no opportunity to interact with others, bounce ideas around, or learn more. It is also hard for people without Internet access to participate.
- **Attending a Cleveland city-wide forum or small district event:** In-person gatherings give people an opportunity to talk with one another, and with policing officials. People can ask questions, and learn more about the issue before giving input. On the other hand, planning such events takes a lot of time. And community members must give up their free time (usually on weekday evenings or weekends) to attend.

- **Attending a CPC or DPC meeting:** These organizations already have formal relationships with the CDP. The CDP does not need to organize a separate meeting to collect feedback. But again, community members will need to give up their evenings or weekends to attend.

Acknowledging and Responding to Community Input

A police department will not always be able to do everything that the community asks. And community members may not always agree on what the department's policies should be. But police officials can still show that they have taken community input seriously by responding to the input they receive and explaining their decisions. Departments can do this through social media, follow up presentations, or even a press release.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

4. Going forward, what kind of policies should the CDP solicit community input on? Some examples of CDP policies are: use of force, interacting with individuals living with mental illness, bias-free policing, the use of a new technology (like body-worn cameras), new community outreach programs, and personnel matters (like recruitment strategies).
5. If the CDP asks for input on a new policy, how would you prefer to provide input? By filling out a questionnaire? Attending a community forum? Attending a Community Police Commission meeting or District Policing Committee meeting? Participating in a task force that meets regularly with the CDP?
6. Not everyone can attend a community meeting or take an online questionnaire. Younger people, for example, are less likely to attend community events. Not everyone has access to the Internet. How can the CDP get input from community members who may not attend events or who are otherwise hard to reach?
7. Have you ever attended a Community Police Commission meeting? If so, how many? If not, why not? Do you think the CPC does a good job representing Cleveland residents? Why or why not? Where do get your information about the CPC?

OPPORTUNITIES FOR POLICE OFFICERS TO GET TO KNOW COMMUNITY MEMBERS: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A community policing plan should include opportunities for officers to get to know community members and become familiar with local problems and concerns. Doing so helps build trust between officers and community members and encourages collaborative problem-solving.

Alternatives to motorized patrol, such as bicycle or foot patrols, or mini-stations are some ways for the CDP to encourage regular contact between officers and community residents. Three approaches the CDP could take are:

- **Foot patrols** put officers into direct contact with the community. Officers can stop by neighborhood businesses, introduce themselves to residents, or simply stop to have a friendly conversation. Community members often report that officers are more approachable when on foot. On the other hand, an officer can only cover a very small area when patrolling on foot—often just a few blocks, or a stretch of a busy commercial street. This means it can take officers longer to respond when people call the police. District 2 currently uses foot patrols.
- **Bicycle patrols** were used in Cleveland during the Republican National Convention this past summer. Many residents enjoyed seeing officers on bikes and officers found that residents were much more willing to talk with them. Bike patrols can cover a much larger area than foot patrols—and can more easily and quickly respond to a call for service when additional units are needed. Still, using bike patrols can result in slower response times. District 4 has bike patrols.
- **Mini-stations** are neighborhood police centers set up in storefronts or in dedicated trailers. Residents can visit officers to share community concerns, file complaints, and simply just chat. Unlike bike patrols and foot patrols, officers are located in a mini-station rather than on the street. This means community members must come to officers, instead of the other way around. The CDP used to have a number of mini-stations, but closed them in 2005 because of concerns about costs. A mini-station requires that the CDP put 2-3 officers there throughout the day. These officers would not be available to respond when people call the police.

Opportunities for social engagement, such as Athletic Leagues, “Coffee with a Cop,” and participation in community events are another way for officers to get to know their communities. Officers also participate in a variety of parades, special events, and block parties throughout the community. In developing its plan the CDP will need to decide what sorts of events to prioritize, and which officers to send to the events.

Various Kinds of Community Events

The CDP hosts a number of programs and events throughout the year for community members of all ages.

The main cost to many of these programs is officer time. Attending the events takes officers away from their regular patrol duties. The CDP can either use overtime (which of course costs the City money), or put fewer officers out on patrol, which can lead to slower response times.

Many officers have said that they really enjoy the large annual events (like Halloween, or Easter Egg Hunts) because these attract community members who do not typically attend other police-sponsored activities. This allows officers to connect with new faces and get to know more people in the community. However, such events take a lot of time to plan.

Officers also say they enjoy going to schools and reading to children. These activities take less effort to plan, but may not reach as many people.

Officers Attending Social Events

In some police departments, specialized “community policing” officers attend most programs and events. In others, regular patrol officers participate. Sometimes, command officers, like the Chief or District Commander, attend police community events.

- Some argue that it is better for *specialized community policing officers* to attend, because they may be better trained to interact with community members. Their attendance at such events also wouldn’t take away from response times for emergencies or other calls for service.
- Others think it is better for residents to see the *same officers who patrol their neighborhoods* at community events, because then patrol officers and community members can get to know and trust each other.
- Some see *command staff participation* as a signal that department leadership is committed to the community.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR POLICE OFFICERS TO GET TO KNOW COMMUNITY MEMBERS: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Officers can patrol by foot or on a bicycle, or work out of a neighborhood mini-station. Which of these would you most like to see in your neighborhood and why? (Please rank 1-3)

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

8. Officers also get to know residents by participating in or hosting neighborhood events. The CDP supports a number of community programs. Have you heard of any of the following? Have you or a family member participated in any of these programs? (Please check all that apply)

	Heard of?	Participated?
a. CDP ice-cream social		
b. Coffee with Cop		
c. Celebrity basketball game		
d. Safety seminars		
e. Law enforcement breakfast		
f. Cleveland Muny Football League		
g. Bigs in Blue		
h. Cops for Kids fishing outing		

Are there any other activities you have participated in?

9. Command officers, community policing officers, and patrol officers could attend neighborhood events. Which officers would you most like to see at neighborhood events and why? (Please rank 1-3)

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

RECRUITING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Successful community policing requires departments to recruit and hire officers who are service-minded and committed to working closely with residents to promote public safety. Important traits include problem-solving skills, emotional maturity, good communication skills, and openness to new experiences. The Cleveland Division of Police is working to develop a new recruiting plan to recruit officers who represent all of Cleveland's many communities. Cleveland Police Chief Calvin Williams recently announced the division "is seeking young, energetic, intelligent and compassionate people to join" the division.

Departments use a variety of creative strategies to recruit service-oriented candidates. Some focus on advertising—through flyers and recruiting fairs—in locations where they are likely to find individuals with strong communication skills and service-oriented personalities. This could include schools, social service providers, and even restaurants. Others work with community groups and local businesses to get the word out and suggest outreach strategies.

RECRUITING: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

10. What methods do you think will be effective in attracting recruits from your neighborhood? Where should the CDP host recruiting events? Where and how should they advertise? How should they use social media? And what community group events should they attend?

11. What do you see as the biggest obstacles that discourage people from applying? In other departments, some common obstacles are that people are unaware of the application process, unsure about the contents of the police test, worried about disqualifying behavior in their past, worried about danger, and the media portrayal or public perception of police officers.

OFFICER TRAINING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Officers should be familiar with the history, traditions, demographics, and quality-of-life challenges of the various communities they work in. Many departments provide what is called “cultural competency” training to teach officers about local communities and traditions. This kind of training can reduce the chance of biased policing by building stronger ties between officers and minority communities. It also can help officers to be sensitive to different communities’ needs. For example, in San Diego, which has a growing Muslim population, officers were trained on how to properly search a woman wearing a hijab, a headscarf worn by some Muslim women.

Cultural competency training also can reduce the risk of misunderstandings in police-citizen encounters. In Seattle, for example, officers who worked in a predominantly Latino district were taught that it is custom in some Latin American countries for a person being pulled over during a traffic stop to exit their vehicle and walk over to the officer. Knowing what to expect helped officers respond in these situations in a calmer and safer manner.

OFFICER TRAINING: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

12. What specific aspects of Cleveland’s local history, politics, culture, and changing demographics should be incorporated into office training?

13. Some departments include qualified community members in police training by having residents with particular areas of expertise or experience talk to recruits or teach a training session. Would you be interested in participating in officer training if given the opportunity? If so, how would you like to participate? Some ideas include talking to recruits about your personal experiences, teaching a session on culture or history, attending a training session and providing feedback, and reviewing training materials. We are not asking you to commit to volunteering for this right now—we are just trying to learn more about the ways in which community members might want to take part.

STAFFING: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Effective community policing requires officers to devote a lot of time and effort to building bonds with community members and solving problems. At the same time, they must still respond to calls for service. In order to allow more time for officers to engage in community policing, some departments use civilians to do certain jobs that would otherwise be done by officers.

Civilian employees or unsworn officers cost less to train, equip, and pay, and can replace sworn officers in non-policing assignments so that officers can spend more time on the street. In some police departments, civilians or unsworn officers assist with dispatch, record keeping, and parking enforcement. In others they respond to traffic incidents and take the first statements, help preserve crime scenes, and help officers investigate minor quality-of-life offenses.

CDP also has the Auxiliary Officer Program for interested citizens. Auxiliary officers are trained, unpaid volunteers who help the police and community by assisting the CDP with securing the scenes of downed power lines or flooded roads, handling vehicle tows, attending special events, and performing other activities that enable officers to respond to higher priority assignments.

STAFFING: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

14. How comfortable would you be with having a civilian perform any of the following tasks?

	Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Uncomfortable
a. Administrative work (e.g., payroll, planning and research, etc.)			
b. Answering non-emergency phone calls at the police station			
c. Responding to noise complaints			
d. Parking enforcement			
e. Responding to a traffic incident to take reports			
f. Responding to a road hazard (e.g., a pothole or broken glass)			
g. Responding to and investigating vandalism			
h. Administrative work (e.g., payroll, planning and research, etc.)			

15. Auxiliary officers are volunteers who assist the CDP and community by responding to non-policing requests and enabling officers to respond to higher priority events. Would you be interested in serving as a CDP Auxiliary Police Officer?

OFFICER AND DEPARTMENT EVALUATION: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

It is well known that “what you measure is what you get.” Departments that embrace community policing need some way of knowing whether individual officers are spending time getting to know residents and addressing their concerns. Departments also need some way of knowing whether the overall community policing plan is working and is consistent with what the community wants.

Officer Evaluation

If officers are evaluated based on their number of arrests or citations, then that is likely what they will focus on. As departments move towards community policing, they often find ways to give incentives to officers and supervisors to focus on building positive community relationships as well. Some departments track an officer’s progress in identifying neighborhood problems, soliciting community input, and crafting solutions to those problems. Other departments track community partnerships an officer develops by measuring the officer’s meaningful outreach and contacts with community members.

Department Evaluation

Once the CDP adopts a new Community and Problem-Oriented Policing Plan it will need to know how well the plan is working. The Consent Decree requires the Cleveland Community Police Commission (CPC) to come up with an assessment plan to evaluate the CDP’s community policing and engagement efforts.

Three important questions about this community assessment plan are:

1. How should the CPC measure what community members think about the community policing plan?
2. Who should inform the CPC about whether the community policing plan is working?
3. What factors should the CPC consider and keep track of?

Measuring What Community Members Think

The assessment plan should include opportunities for feedback from ordinary residents about how well the CDP is doing. This can be done through a variety of approaches.

- Some methods—such as online surveys—allow as many people as possible to provide feedback. In some departments, officers hand out comment cards after each interaction with a resident.
- Focus groups are another approach to finding out what community members think. Although not every community member would be able to participate, a focus group could include a diverse group of residents who could represent the larger Cleveland population.

Groups Informing the CPC

Any community policing evaluation should capture the full range of community views on the CDP’s community policing efforts. Some individuals may not have the time to provide the CPC with input on how well the CDP is doing in its community policing activities. For this reason, the CPC will need to talk to a broad range of groups and organizations—from church groups to local businesses. The key question is whom should

the CPC look to in order to determine whether the plan is working and is consistent with what the Cleveland community wants?

Factors the CPC and the CDP Should Consider and Keep Track Of

There are many ways to measure how well the CDP is carrying out the community policing plan. As the CPC develops its assessment plan, it needs to determine what activities are worth keeping track of. These activities should reflect what community members expect of officers and of the Division as a whole. Some ideas include: the number of events and activities that officers participate in, the number of community group meetings that officers attend, successful efforts to solve specific community problems, and positive interactions with residents.

OFFICER AND DEPARTMENT EVALUATION: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

16. Who should the Community Police Commission consult as they evaluate the CDP's community policing and engagement efforts? Some ideas include local businesses, schools, city council members, local universities, and community organizations.
17. What sorts of activities would you like to see the Community Police Commission and the CDP keep track of? Some ideas include: the number of events and activities that officers participate in, the number of community group meetings that officers attend, successful efforts to solve specific community problems, and number of positive interactions with community members during each shift.
18. What do you think are the most effective ways to measure community trust and perceptions of law enforcement? Some examples include resident surveys, comment cards that an officer can give community members after each interaction, and focus groups with residents or community group leaders.
19. What sorts of positive behaviors and interactions would you most like to see the CDP keep track of for individual officers? Some ideas include attending community meetings, positive reviews from community residents, number of community contacts, identifying and solving community problems, responding promptly and effectively to safety concerns, and treating community members respectfully.
20. The CDP and specific districts give out awards to police officers to reward their behavior, including for their successful community engagement work. What do you think the criteria should be for any such awards for community policing?

Appendix B: CPOP Meeting Dates and Locations

Date/Time	Meeting	Location
Tues, 3/21/2017	Cleveland City-wide East side	Tri-C
Wed, 3/22/2017	Cleveland City-wide West	Urban Community School
Tues, 3/28/2017 6:00pm	CPC Full Commissioner	Tri-C
Tues, 3/28/2017 7:00pm	3rd District DPC	3rd District Police Department
Tues, 4/11/2017 7:00pm	2nd District DPC	Applewood Center, 3518 West 25th Street
Wed, 4/19/2017 8:30 am	Community Development Corps	CornUcopia Place, 7201 Kinsman Road, Suite 103B
Wed, 4/19/2017 11:30 am	Business District	Midtown Cleveland Inc., 5000 Euclid Ave.
Wed, 4/19/2017 7:00pm	5th District DPC	Five Points Community Center- 813 East 152nd St.
Thurs, 4/20/2017, 3:00pm	Community Relations Board	City Hall, Mayor's Red Room
Thurs, 4/20/2017, 6:00pm	Detroit Shoreway Neighborhood	Detroit Shoreway Community Room. 6516 Detroit Avenue.
Wed, 4/26/2017 7:00pm	4th District DPC	Covenant Community Church of Cleveland- 3342 East 119th St.
Thurs, 5/4/2017	1st District DPC	St. Ignatius Antioch. 10205 Lorain Avenue
Sat, 5/6/17, 11:30 am	Lower Southeast Side	E Prep & Village Prep Woodland Hills, Corner of East 93rd & Union
Mon, 5/8/2017 6:00pm	Old Brooklyn CDC	Mary Queen of Peace. 4423 Pearl Road
Wed, 5/10/17, 4:00 pm	Cleveland Job Corps Center	Music Room, 13421 Coit Road, Check-In at Administration Building
Thurs, 5/11/17, 6:00 pm	Upper Southeast Side	Peace in the Hood, 13512 Kinsman Road
Sat, 5/13/17, 11:30 am	Northeast Side	Rainey Institute, 1705 East 55th Street
Sat, 5/13/17, 1:30 pm	Central Eastside	2239 East 55th Street, (New Building)

Appendix C: Partner Organizations

The groups were chosen based on the diversity of the populations they serve and/or represent and in order to ensure wide geographic coverage, encompassing every police district and a wide array of neighborhoods. The partner organizations, which have strong ties to the diverse populations of Cleveland, include:

Bellaire-Puritas CDC	Boys and Girls Club
Burten, Bell, Carr Development, Inc.	Cleveland Job Corp
CMHA Riverside Estates	Cleveland Neighborhood Progress
Denison Ave. UCC	Detroit Shoreway CDC
Downtown Cleveland Alliance	East End Neighborhood House
Fatima Community Center	Gunning Recreation Center
Hands on Ohio	Harvard Community Center
Hispanic Alliance	Hispanic Pastors Fraternity
HUMADAOP	Kamms Corner CDC
Lexington Bell Community Center	LGBT Center
Lutheran Metropolitan Ministries	Merrick House
Midtown Cleveland Inc	Murtis Taylor
Mt. Pleasant Now Development	Neighborhood Family Practice
Neighborhood Leadership Institute	Northeast Shores Development Corp
Nueva Luz URC	Old Brooklyn CDC
Old Brooklyn Crime Watch	Peace in the Hood
Rainey Institute	Recovery Resources
Renee Jones Empowerment Center	Slavic Village Development Corp
Spanish American Committee	St. Clair Superior Development Corp
The Campus District	The Warehouse District
Union Miles Development Corporation	University Circle Inc



Cleveland Police Monitoring Team

Matthew Barge
Monitor

Commissioner Charles H. Ramsey (ret.)
Deputy Monitor

Chief Timothy Longo (ret.)
Director of Implementation

Charles R. See
Director of Community Engagement

Christine Cole
Director of Outcome Measures

Chief Hassan Aden (ret.)
Dr. Modupe Akinola
Chief Joseph Brann (ret.)
Brian Center
Dr. Randolph Dupont
Maggie Goodrich
Ayesha Hardaway
Richard Rosenthal
Victor Ruiz
Captain Scott Sargent (ret.)
Dr. Ellen Scrivner
Sean Smoot
Timothy Tramble
Monitoring Team

Barry Friedman
Ruby Nidiry
Nonny Onyekweli
Maria Ponomarenko
NYU School of Law Policing Project
Consultants