

**STATUS REPORT TO THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR SUBMITTED BY THE PARTIES TO
THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement, the Plaintiff Class, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Ohio; the City of Cincinnati (CPD) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) (collectively referred to as “the Parties” or “the Collaborative Partners”) submit this status report to the Independent Monitor, pursuant to Collaborative Agreement, paragraph 105.

December 5, 2006

Reporting Period: May 6, 2006 – November 5, 2006

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
A. Community Problem Oriented Policing (Paragraph 29)	3
B. Mutual Accountability Evaluation	47
C. Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement	49
D. Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment	50
E. Citizen Complaint Authority	53
Appendix	55

INTRODUCTION

This Report is intended to advise the Independent Monitor as to the progress that the Parties have made during the reporting period of May 6, 2006 through November 5, 2006. This report covers both the third and fourth quarters of 2006 and only reflects information from the CPD and the CPPC. Attempts were made to solicit status updates from both the FOP and the Plaintiffs; however, those requests went unanswered. The Independent Monitor oversees implementation of both the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and the United States Department of Justice, and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) between the City, the ACLU, and the FOP. The MOA is appended to the CA and is enforceable solely through the mechanism of paragraph 113 of the Collaborative Agreement

The purpose of the Collaborative Agreement is to resolve conflict, to improve community-police relations, to reduce crime and disorder, to fully resolve the pending claims of all individuals and organizations named in the underlying litigation, to implement the consensus goals identified by the community through the collaborative process, and to foster an atmosphere throughout the community of mutual respect and trust among community members, including the police.

This report provides updates based on the following established committees to fully address each area stipulated in the Agreement:

- Community Problem-Oriented Policing Committee
- Mutual Accountability
- Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- Fair, Equitable, and Courteous Treatment
- Citizen Complaint Authority Committee

A. COMMUNITY PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING (PARAGRAPH 29)

Item 29(a). The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

As we noted in prior Reports, the Monitor's assessment of compliance requires documentation of the City's implementation of its coordination plan, which has changed again, this time back to a citywide plan. The documentation can include relevant information, such as the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation, and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem.

Based on a review of the July 2006 CA Status Report, the Monitor finds that the City is in partial compliance.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

As the Monitor noted, the City has modified its approach to coordinate City departments around the implementation of CPOP. Each approach utilizes CERT Teams to address properties generating multiple calls for service to certain City departments.

See Appendix Item # 1 to view CERT activity between May 1, 2006 and August 10, 2006.

Parties' Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

The Monitor notes, full compliance requires fairly extensive documentation of city-wide CPOP projects. The Monitor has been made aware of the recent funding issues that have arisen between the City of Cincinnati and Cincinnati Area Geographical Information System (CAGIS) and its impact on completing the information management system designed to capture the data. Recently, members of the monitoring team were invited to attend a meeting including representatives from the City Manager's Office, CPD and CAGIS to gain insight into the problem and to discuss related issues.

The CPD has continued to work with CAGIS on improving the system within the confines of the original scope of services. To that end, in November 2006, CAGIS added a link to the CPOP website allowing the user to search City Customer Service Requests (CSR). Users utilizing this function can query the activities of other City departments at a specific location without leaving the CPOP website.

Representatives from each City department continue to meet bi-weekly to address problem properties. CERT has reviewed a number of properties. More often than not, the owner of a problem property gives consent for inspection. Orders to fix problems are

issued on a majority of the locations. Problems not fixed by a specified date face required court action. On the average, CERT reviews approximately ten properties a month.

Because not all CERT actions result in an administrative search warrant, not all CERT activities are documented. The Police Relations Unit is currently working with each of the five districts in developing a uniform document to track all CERT activity.

Item 29(b), the Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem-oriented policing.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

Again, the Monitor compliments the Parties for their collaboration on a comprehensive library. The CPOP library may be the most comprehensive web library on a police department website. With the work of the Parties and the Partnering Center in developing the virtual best practices library and making these publications available in hard copy through the Hamilton County Library, the Monitor finds the Parties in compliance with CA ¶29 (b). The Parties have been in compliance with this section for eight consecutive quarters.

As we have noted in prior reports, section 29(b) is also related to sections 29 (c) and (d). We believe that compliance for 29(c) and 29(d), which we discuss below, will require training within the CPD of some of the 29(b) best practices, as well as their use in crime reduction efforts.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

There were no publications added to the CPOP Library during the third quarter of 2006. This was due, in part, to a decision from CAGIS to no longer provide technical support by CAGIS staff for the CPOP website, including any enhancements such as Partnering Center access, until the funding issue is resolved.

Parties' Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

Representatives of the CPD have had subsequent discussions with Ms. Barbara Quinn, CAGIS Director, and are in the process of resolving the issues of compensation and the related technical support of the CPOP website. Once this issue is resolved, additional "best practices" resource materials will be added to the website.

Item 29(c). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop a “continuous learning” process through the CPD. Experiences with problem solving efforts in the field will be documented and disseminated throughout the police department and made available to the public. Problem solving will continue to be emphasized in (included but not limited to) academy training, in-service training, and field officer training.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

We believe that the trainings undertaken during 2005 and the first quarter of 2006 were the first steps in introducing Department employees (sworn and civilian) to CPOP. This quarter witnessed some additional training as well.

Now that the CPOP role is expanding to all Patrol officers in the Department, we believe a number of additional trainings will need to occur. Given the expanded role Patrol will play in CPOP, additional training for officers is needed, particularly in light of complaints from CPOP groups that some of the officers attending CPOP meetings are unfamiliar with CPOP, SARA, and their role and responsibilities in problem solving. Some of that training will occur informally by former COP officers; however, some of it will require a consistency of message and approach and will need to be curriculum-based. The training should prepare officers to dig into problems; it will require training and mentoring on documentation, how to manage calls, community meetings, longer term problem-solving efforts, and the use of analysis. And, as we mentioned in earlier reports, expectations for involvement should be clear and ultimately supported by the performance appraisal system, which to-date is not the case.

As we noted in earlier reports, we recognize that training the entire Department is time-consuming, so planning for it is key. Folding the COP units into Patrol presents the CPD leadership with a new opportunity to impart its message. As well, with the CPD’s leadership requiring problem-solving reports from all Unit Commanders, it becomes important for those in those Units to have the training that gives them the skills to do some problem solving and more sophisticated analysis.

We recommend that the Department develop highly focused training for supervisors about guiding, coaching, and training officers in problem solving. An important aspect to the training will be the sergeants’ role in officer time management. The sergeant, rather than the 911 dispatcher, will help manage calls, making sure that officers have time to problem solve and that officers spend their proactive time wisely, not just on car stops or routine patrol. Sergeants will play a key role in ensuring or inhibiting the successful transition of problem solving responsibilities from specialized units to patrol officers.

Additional training for crime analysts in how to do longer-term analysis (rather than just tactical analysis) will also be critical. Both tactical and strategic analysis is involved in problem solving. Longer-term analysis reveals deeper, more robust patterns and intervention points that are more likely to have long-term impact. The training material on crime analysis and the new tracking system provided to the rank of lieutenants and above suggested that tactical analysis is the primary approach of crime analysis. But

given the CA emphasis on problem solving, it is important also to focus on strategic and longer-term analysis. Regarding the continuous training aspect of this subsection of 29(c), the CPD is in partial compliance.

With respect to documenting and disseminating problem-solving experiences in the field throughout the CPD, we are disappointed with the replacement of Chief Streicher's video on his commitment to CPOP by a PowerPoint presentation. A message from an organization's leader that everyone can see and hear is different than a PowerPoint presented by others. We also had hoped that the CPD would begin disseminating problem-solving write-ups so officers and civilians will have tangible examples of what is possible and what is expected. This has not occurred. The CPD remains in partial compliance on this subsection.

As for public accessibility of problem-solving efforts, the CPD's problem solving descriptions remain accessible to the public via the internet on the CPOP website. The CPD is in compliance with the public dissemination requirement of this subsection.

Concerning the emphasis on problem solving throughout the CPD, there was some problem solving training for CPOP liaisons, but the problem solving training for other officers in the Department was limited. The CPD remains in partial compliance with this subsection.

In earlier Reports, we noted that 29(b), (c), and (d) are linked. These and other CA sections are meant as ways to facilitate the adoption of problem solving as the CPD's principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati. We have found the Parties in compliance with the public dissemination requirements under 29(b) and (c). However, because problem solving is to be adopted as the "principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems," the portions of 29(c) and (d) that deal with training and dissemination within the Department require greater efforts, as they are meant as a way to effectuate significant change in the organization. The Parties are in partial compliance with the three other subparts of this CA provision (continuous learning, dissemination within the CPD, and emphasis on problem solving in training). The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

Problem solving training:

- *Academy Training*
 - May 26, 2006: CERT/NQOL training provided by Mr. Terry Cosgrove to the recruit class
 - June 1 and 2, 2006: New Employee Orientation/CPOP training provided by Lt. Larry Powell.

Continuous learning process:

- *Roll Call Training*
 - Due to the elimination of the CPD’s Neighborhood Officer Unit and the subsequent transition-related issues, the Community Police Partnering Staff continued to provide roll call trainings to officers in Districts Four and Five this quarter. Fifty five (55) additional officers were trained in the third quarter

Date	District	Shift	Number in Attendance	% new to CPPC	% new to CPOP	% new to SARA
May 2006	5	0700-1500	7	Data unavailable	Data unavailable	Data unavailable
May 2006	5	0800-1600	7	Data unavailable	Data unavailable	Data unavailable
May 2006	5	1400-2200	8	63	63	50
May 2006	5	1500-2300	6	100	67	83
May 2006	5	2000-0400	5	100	100	80
May 2006	4	0700-1500	6	Data unavailable	Data unavailable	Data unavailable
May 2006	4	1300-2100	9	89	78	44
May 2006	4	1500-2300	7	86	71	43
Total			55			

Collaboration and consistency in support of CPD/CPPC jointly facilitated neighborhood CPOP is now dependent on all field officers understanding their role, the role of the Partnering Center, and having an understanding of the SARA problem solving process – thus the relevance of this training.

Parties’ Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

Problem solving training:

- *Academy Training*
 - In October 2006 the CPD’s Police Academy developed a problem based learning program for Field Training Officers (FTO) and Probationary Police Officers (PPO). The Police Academy has been in the process of evaluating the effectiveness of its FTO program. The University of Cincinnati conducted focus groups with FTOs and the Police Academy subsequently facilitated Process Improvement (PIT) meetings with experienced FTOs. It was recommended that the Police Academy develop more adult learning and scenario based training concepts for both the

FTOs and PPOs. Both concepts are interrelated with the principles of CPOP.

The CPD realizes incident driven policing is ineffective and inefficient. With this in mind, the Police Academy must educate our FTOs and PPOs with the knowledge of in-depth analysis to community crime problems. Both the FTO and PPO must have a comprehensive understanding that responding to the same call for service numerous times is inefficient, costly and provides no long term crime reduction strategies. For that reason, the Police Academy developed a training exercise which will utilize the concepts of CPOP, Problem Based Learning (PBL) and adult learning concepts. This exercise will develop the officer's comprehensive approach to reduce crime.

At the beginning of week eight, during Phase II of training, the FTO and PPO will request a copy of their respective District's repeat call for service list. From this list, the FTO and PPO will pick an address in their beat with three or more calls for service within the stated time frame. After an address is selected, the FTO and PPO then must utilize the SARA process and systematically work through the steps of the model. The exercise will conclude at the end of week twelve of the PPO's Phase II of training. Each stage of the problem solving effort will be recorded (see Appendix Item #2). This exercise will make the FTO and the PPO ask questions, conduct research, and formulate an action plan based on a complete understanding of the problem.

After the FTO and PPO successfully identify the problem, conduct an in-depth analysis and respond accordingly, the FTO and PPO will conclude their exercise determining how best to evaluate their problem solving efforts. At this point, the FTO and PPO will present the action plan to their respective FTO Sergeant. The FTO Sergeant will review the training exercise form and present the effort via a Form 560 to the District Captain for possible consideration as either a CPOP or CPD Project. This will occur at the conclusion of week twelve.

If the District Commander believes the problem solving effort is laudable he can make the decision to enter the problem into the CPOP database for additional resources and resolution.

This training exercise is intended to be a hypothetical problem based learning exercise. However, the FTO and PPO should be able to demonstrate an in-depth knowledge and understanding about the dynamics occurring at the problem address. If the District Commander believes the problem area warrants attention, then he/she has a solid problem solving effort already completed.

The training objectives of this new training tool are as follows:

1. The FTO and PPO will use a problem based learning exercise to think critically in regard to repeat crime problems.
2. The FTO and PPO will understand what outside resources are available to assist them in understanding their particular crime problem.
3. This training exercise will reinforce and continue the PPO's learning process on CPOP from the Police Academy to the patrol function.
4. This training exercise will reinforce the CPD's commitment and goal to effectively partner with the community to reduce crime utilizing problem solving efforts.
5. This training exercise will teach FTOs and PPOs to collaborate with co-workers, community members and other city agencies. This form of collaboration is a foundation for effective police work.

- *Management Training*
 - See Appendix Item # 23
- *Recruit Training*
 - See Appendix Item # 24
 -

Continuous learning process:

- *Crime Analyst Training*
 - In July 2006 the CPD reported that Lieutenant Colonel Vincent Demasi, Administrative Bureau Commander, and members of the Police Academy staff met with representatives from the University of Cincinnati to discuss utilizing the University's expertise in crime analysis. That collaborative effort resulted in a proposal from the University of Cincinnati Policing Institute (UCPI) to provide an analyst and principal investigator for an extended period of time in an effort to bolster the Department's crime analysis efforts. Specifically, the objectives of the partnership would be as follows:
 - Facilitate best practices in crime analysis
 - Assist in identifying specific crime problems:
 - Neighborhoods/Communities
 - Repeat Offenders
 - Reoccurring Locations
 - Identification of crime pattern/trends using temporal analyses and geographic location
 - Utilize advanced statistical analyses

- Provide working knowledge and experience with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to assist in the geographic analyses of crime problems
 - Work directly with CPD crime analysts in an effort to educate and train while conducting analyses
 - Provide specific policy recommendations based on empirical evidence and review of literature for problem-specific approaches to reduce crime
 - Evaluate the effectiveness of alternative approaches utilized by the CPD
- *National Community Problem-Oriented Policing Conference*
 - The CPD sent eight members to the annual POP Conference held in Madison, Wisconsin in October 2006.

Item 29 (d), The Parties shall research best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods of problem-solving used by other professionals (e.g. conflict resolution, organizational development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering and business).

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

We noted last quarter that in the past year, we have seen more publications about reducing crime on CPOP's website. Use of the website can increase the range of countermeasures used to impact crime. We hope that the revised CPOP tracking system further points users to crime research. We are heartened by the mention of research in some of the projects submitted, but it remains rare. Each quarter, the problem solving efforts should reflect an increase in the variety of countermeasures that research reveals as effective for different crime problems. For instance the supervisor over the project about sexual activity in a park should immediately guide the officer to the guidebook, Sexual Activity in Public Places, which is on the CPD's website. The guides provide a one-stop shop about a particular crime and safety problem and can steer officers away from ineffective countermeasures.

Another resource underutilized by the CPD are the reports produced for the CPD by the Ohio Service for Crime Opportunity Reduction (OSCOR), a collaborative with the University of Cincinnati. The reports analyze seven drug markets in four neighborhoods for the CPD and offer interventions. There is also a report containing recommendations for constructing a citywide drug market reduction approach:

- Open-Air Drug Dealing in Cincinnati, Ohio: Executive Summary and Final Recommendations at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf
- Avondale Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/AVONDALE.pdf
- Evanston Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf

- Pendleton Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/PENDLETON.pdf
- West Price Hill Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/W%20PRICE%20HILL.pdf

The research reports contain the beginning analysis of these drug markets (specific analysis of the dealers and the buyers from arrest data was not available), along with information about the different types of interventions that have had positive effects on markets (48 different interventions are listed).

The seven drug markets studied generated over 3,000 calls for service to police in 2004. Although each of the markets is different, patterns were identified across markets concerning: types of drugs; dates/times of market operation; territorial behavior among dealers; methods of communication between market players; demographics of dealers, lookouts, and buyers; access to arterial routes; and the presence of nearby convenience stores.

These reports offer highly specific research that the City can use to reduce drug markets. In addition, the citywide report shows how a comprehensive approach to closing drug markets across Cincinnati is achievable. We hope to see increased use of research in the CPD's efforts to counter open-air drug markets, reducing reliance on less effective, scattershot strategies, such as sweeps and reverse stings. One of the recommendations the report makes is that the CPD quantify the number of drug markets in the City and give their precise location. In addition, the report suggests sources for the information and additional information that needs to be gathered:

- What is the precise location of each market? (Multiple sources of data should be used to identify discrete markets. Potential sources of information are calls for service, narcotic arrest information, and resident surveys. After the markets are located, the following site specific questions should be asked to help develop responses)
- Who are the dealers/buyers and where do they live?
- What environmental features make this location attractive to dealers/buyers?
- What interventions have been or are currently being used to disrupt this drug market?
- Once identified, is there evidence to suggest that these interventions have or have not been successful?
- What other crimes that occur in this location are related to drug market activities (e.g., loitering, theft from vehicles, homicide)?

It is important to note here that a number of other cities have closed open-air drug markets. Open-air drug markets are not necessarily something that a city has to tolerate or just nick away at. Strategies in other places, based on the analysis and countermeasures listed in these OSCOR reports provide the CPD with a blueprint for shutting them.

As we noted in our prior reports, the following developments would demonstrate compliance with 29(d): research is used in problem solving projects (see 29(b)); projects apply situational crime prevention if appropriate (the CA specifically mentions situational crime prevention); projects that are on POP Guide topics show awareness of the guide and its elements; research is used in crime reduction and traffic problem reduction efforts; best practice knowledge is used as a skills measure in the performance evaluations.

The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

An example of researching problem-solving best practices is demonstrated in the development and implementation of the CeaseFire program. The Community Police Partnering Center, in conjunction with the Uptown Consortium, coordinated and sponsored a site visit to CeaseFire Chicago, a gun violence reduction initiative highlighted at the White House Helping America's Youth Conference. The event was held in Indianapolis, Indiana in June of this year. The CeaseFire Chicago website (www.ceasefirechicago.org) provides the following description of this initiative:

Formed in 1995, the Chicago Project takes a strategic public health approach to violence prevention. This approach has been employed to address and reduce other serious health threats, such as child mortality, heart disease, HIV/AIDS, smallpox, and polio. It includes a full commitment to a specific objective (in this case stopping shootings), the setting of long-term and short-term goals, strategy development based on best practices and adapted to the local situation by local practitioners, and a management structure that works at both the community and city/county levels. The public health approach relies heavily on public education to change attitudes and behaviors toward violence, outreach using individuals recruited from the target population, community involvement to change norms, and evaluation methods to monitor strategy

The Chicago Project has formed partnerships with community-based organizations to develop comprehensive strategic plans for reducing violence. An Advisory Board and Steering Committee, comprising criminal justice, health, religious, and civic leaders, provide support for strategy development and leverage city and county resources for the project and its partners. The project is supported by private foundation grants and with local, state, and federal funds. The project is housed at the School of Public Health at the University of Illinois at Chicago

Sixteen persons attended the site visit including representatives of the Avondale Community Council, the Uptown Consortium, the Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, the Hamilton County-Cincinnati Community Action Agency, and Cincinnati Human Relations Commission Youth Streetworker Program. Upon their return, these representatives formed a Steering Committee and five subcommittees (Criminal Justice Collaborative, Youth Outreach, Community Mobilization, Public Education, & Faith-Based Leadership) to begin planning for a comprehensive local initiative to reduce gun violence in Avondale. As law enforcement is a critical participant, CPPC and the CPD District 4 Commander and investigators have met bimonthly with other law enforcement agencies to create the necessary systems to ensure the adequate flow of information and follow-up action.

During the September All Parties' Meeting Executive Director of the CPPC, Rick Biehl, gave an overview of the CeaseFire Cincinnati Roll-Out scheduled in the Avondale neighborhood on October 1, 2006.

See Appendix Item #3 to view more detail on this initiative.

Parties' Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

Members of the monitoring team and representatives from the CPD, ACLU and the CPPC met with members of the Avondale Community Council to provide an overview of the City's concentrated code enforcement approach utilizing CERT Teams and resources from appropriate city agencies. The approach discussed has been reported to the Monitor earlier in reference to the Over The Rhine Vine Street Demonstration Project. Other neighborhoods to also participate in this concentrated effort include East Price Hill and Northside. Other approaches discussed included the Baltimore Police Department's Community Safe Zones initiative to address gun violence. This initiative was highlighted at the July 2006 National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives Conference Town Meeting and the recent (October 2006) National POP Conference in Madison, Wisconsin.

The Baltimore initiative utilizes the following strategies to reduce gun violence as well as drug activity:

- Redirection of non-residential traffic patterns
- Coordination of targeted city resources
- Coordination and deployment of social service outreach terms
- Organization police sponsored community events
- Implementation of violence intervention program for "high risk" juveniles

The initiative will be presented to the entire Avondale Community Council before year's end to elicit community support.

CeaseFire Cincinnati Update – the Campaign to “Stop the Shooting” in Avondale

Much of the work of this reporting period involved the entire CPPC staff working with the Avondale Community Council to plan the kick-off of CeaseFire Cincinnati, a community led campaign to “Stop the Shooting” in Avondale.

The Partnering Center’s work on this initiative began in May, 2006 with the Executive Director leading the efforts to implement a Gun Violence Reduction Initiative in Avondale. Subsequent meetings were held with Avondale community representatives (Fulton Jefferson & Ozie Davis) and CPD District Four personnel (Sergeants Connors & Johnson and Police Officer Ladon Laney) to begin to develop a collaborative and strategy to address youth gun violence in Avondale.

These meetings grew to include Hamilton County Common Pleas Court Probation, Adult Parole Authority, Juvenile Court Probation, Ohio Department of Youth Services, and the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission Youth Streetworker Program, and focused on delineating the methodology and role of the participants.

In early August, representatives of the Partnering Center and six other agencies traveled to Chicago to learn more about the CeaseFire Chicago model. Since returning from the CeaseFire Chicago site visit, a Steering Committee was formed from the sixteen representatives that participated in the trip, and they have met weekly to roll out the work of CeaseFire in Cincinnati. While the overall methodology follows the SARA process, this initiative is being organized around the five core components of the successful CeaseFire Chicago initiative, which are:

- Criminal Justice Collaborative
- Youth Outreach
- Community Mobilization
- Public Education
- Faith-Based Leadership

Subcommittees have been formed around each of these core components and new stakeholders have been added to each committee since the initiative has gone public.

A highly successful public kickoff of CeaseFire Cincinnati was held on Saturday, September 30th in the community of Avondale. Over 350 people participated in this public unveiling, and every major media outlet covered the day’s events. In the 22 days that followed, there was not a single shooting that resulted in an injury to or death of a citizen.

Over 350 people participated in the public unveiling of CeaseFire Cincinnati, a comprehensive campaign to Stop the Shooting which is being piloted in the community of Avondale.

The September 30th kick off began at 2:00 PM with three neighborhood walking groups stepping off from three different “high incident” locations in Avondale. One group met at

the corner of Reading and Martin Luther King Drive; a second group met at Martin Luther King Park, located at the corner of Reading and Burton Drive; the third group met at the Avondale Pride Center located at the corner of Burnet and Forest. Each group canvassed their area of the neighborhood, sharing information about the CeaseFire Cincinnati campaign and inviting residents to become part of the ongoing campaign. All of the groups then met up at the Avondale Pride Center at 2:45 PM where a Rally against Gun Violence and Press Conference was then held.

This portion of the day's event was emceed by Curtis Fuller, WLWT – Channel 5 Anchor, and included speakers, African drummers, dancers from W.E.B. DuBois Academy and personal testimonies by citizens impacted by gun violence.

A representative from CeaseFire Chicago visited Cincinnati in early October to witness what we have accomplished since our visit with them. He left Cincinnati impressed with the progress that had been made in only two months since our visit with them, and commented that he learned some valuable lessons here that he will take back to Chicago and implement as part of their CeaseFire campaign.

Although there were no shootings in Avondale in the first three weeks following the very well-publicized CeaseFire unveiling, on Sunday, October 22 the first shooting unfortunately occurred. A protocol had been pre-arranged with District 4 Sergeant Chris Connors to ensure that CeaseFire representatives were notified immediately after a shooting occurs, since community rallies within 72 hours in response to all acts of gun violence resulting in injury are an integral component of CeaseFire. Following notification of this shooting from District 4, a Community Response was quickly organized and held at the location where the shooting took place. Sadly, two additional shootings quickly followed the first, and again, a strong community response was held at both of these shooting locations to begin changing the norms about gun violence in the Avondale community. Visible and vocal responses are critical because they are an opportunity for residents, clergy, public officials, and other community members to come together and to speak with one voice against shootings and killings. They also bring awareness of shootings to the community and emphasize other ways to resolve conflicts. One thing that has been apparent at each shooting response is that the residents of Avondale are supportive of CeaseFire's efforts, with many people waving and giving the "thumbs up" sign from their homes, and others honking their car horns when they pass a CeaseFire response. This is very encouraging as we need to involve the entire community in taking a stand against gun violence.

To involve the youth in the CeaseFire movement, members of CeaseFire Cincinnati participated in the Cincinnati Public Schools and Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Students Crime Stopper "Make A Difference Day" Conference, which was held on Saturday, October 28th at Woodward Career Technical High School. This day offered an extended learning opportunity for students, families and community members on how to raise their voices and take action against guns, crime and violence. CeaseFire Cincinnati staffed a booth at this event, along with the Cincinnati Police and Fire Departments, Cincinnati Health Department, Crime Stoppers, Talbert House, and other community partners.

Additionally, CPPC Public Ally Intern Regis Jones wrote four rap songs especially for this event, and performed them. His performance included the catchy “CeaseFire” theme song, which has received attention from several local radio stations and members of Cincinnati City Council.

A Community Advisory Committee has also been formed to involve more of the residents of Avondale in the implementation of CeaseFire. Canvassing materials that have been distributed throughout the community contain this message:

“Now, more than ever, we need a strong and visible community response in order to be clear: The Shooting and the Killing Has to STOP. We are asking everyone to join the Avondale community stopping the shooting in this neighborhood and throughout the city.

For more information about how YOU can get involved in the CeaseFire Cincinnati campaign to STOP THE SHOOTING, please call the **CEASEFIRE CINCINNATI INFORMATION LINE** at 513-675-4102 or call or email the Community Police Partnering Center at 513-675-4102 / cpopcenter@gcul.org.”

We are encouraged that the momentum behind this important campaign has begun to build during this reporting period. (Please see the attached document “What Changed October 1st” for additional information about the implementation of CeaseFire Cincinnati since the September 30th kick-off)

(The above narrative, **CeaseFire Cincinnati Update**, was provided by the Partnering Center and reprinted without edit.)

Item 29(e). The Parties, consistent with the Community Partnering Program, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP and implement CPOP training.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

During mid-February through early May, the Partnering Center and the CPD participated in a number of valuable trainings and presentations. However, during this period, some CPOP teams voiced concerns about lack of consistency in the CPD’s commitment to CPOP and remain perplexed by the continued turnover among officers attending CPOP meetings. Some officers who have attended meetings have little knowledge about CPOP or their role, causing frustration among CPOP team participants. Last quarter, we reported that the CPD leadership was committed to monitoring the problem, although problems have persisted through this quarter. In addition, it appears that new CPOP teams and CPOP projects are not being developed.

The CPD has tried several different things to make District officers more responsive, including providing a CPOP cell phone to a District sergeant to give them responsibility for officers’ attendance at meetings. However, some community members have

complained that even that system is not working well. At this point, the CPD leadership is considering raising the level of accountability to lieutenants for ensuring that liaison officers know the problems their teams are working on and attend CPOP meetings. We discuss this more in section 29(m).

Although there continue to be concerns about the continuity and problem solving knowledge of CPD members involved in current CPOP teams, the Parties are in compliance with the CA's requirement for community training on CPOP.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

CPOP Training for Community Groups

During the period covered in this Report, Partnering Center Outreach Workers¹ have coordinated or conducted seventeen (17) CPOP and other safety-related trainings, details of which are outlined below. As of August 5, 2006, CPPC Outreach Workers are actively engaged in 28 Cincinnati neighborhoods, supporting existing CPOP Teams in the application of the SARA Process, encouraging developing teams, and engaging new citizens to participate in SARA trainings or other crime and safety-related trainings and presentations.

The status of CPOP efforts in which the Partnering Center is involved is as follows:

- Number of Active CPOP Teams: 17

- Number of Developing CPOP Teams: 13

During this reporting period, four (4) previously "active" CPOP teams completed the SARA process on their identified problems, and these cases were subsequently closed. As CPOP evolves in Cincinnati, and neighborhood problem solving teams become more knowledgeable and sophisticated about various crime and disorder prevention tools, techniques and best practices, the number of CPOP teams will ebb and flow as some

¹ During this reporting period, the CPPC changed job title of "Community Outreach Workers" to "Community Safety Specialist". This change was made to more accurately reflect the complete job responsibilities of these CPPC employees. While "outreach" is a vital part of bringing citizens to the CPOP process, once there, Community Safety Specialists also then train citizens in the SARA process and other Crime Prevention techniques, and provide support as citizen-led teams work through this process. This new job designation also reflects the variety of comprehensive Crime Prevention and Problem Solving trainings that CPPC staff has participated in, and acknowledges the status of each former Outreach Worker as an Ohio Crime Prevention Association Certified Crime Prevention Specialist.

problem solving efforts are resolved and closed out, while new problems are identified and new teams are formed to work on them.

During this reporting period, five (5) neighborhoods representing CPD Districts 3, 4 and 5 received training in the SARA process. These neighborhoods included Westwood, Mt. Airy, Mt. Auburn, North Fairmount and East Westwood. Additionally, a SARA training was held for the Jurisdiction-Wide Residential Advisory Board (J-RAB) of the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA). The J-RAB representatives who received SARA training have become important partners in helping to solve problems at locations where CMHA-managed properties are a factor.

In addition to these neighborhood-based SARA trainings, twelve (12) specialized trainings were conducted on topics which included: Community Organizing Training with Midwest Academy, Court Watch, Gang Prevention Telecast and Discussion, The Impact of Prostitution on Communities, and Environmental Approaches to Improving Neighborhood Safety. Citizens from multiple Cincinnati communities participated in these trainings. In total, 278 citizens were trained from May 6 – August 5, 2006.

As CPOP continues to grow and evolve, and new problem-solving partners are sought, several in-depth presentations were arranged to introduce participants (including members of Cincinnati City Council) to the Partnering Center, CPOP, and the SARA process. Groups receiving these trainings included Westwood Clergy, Youth Curfew Center volunteers, and the First Unitarian Universalist Church in Avondale.

See Appendix Item # 4 to view a spreadsheet of the number of citizens trained in various CPOP related topics.

May 12, 2006: Geographic Information System training by RCC-CAGIS to 14 CPOP Liaison Officers

May 31, 2006: CPOP/SARA (as it relates to GIS system) by RCC-CAGIS to 14 CPOP Liaison Officers

June 1, 2006: CPOP overview presented to new City employees

June 19 and 20, 2006: New building code (NQOL) provided to CPOP Liaison Officers

Joint Promotion of CPOP

July 20, 2006, Lieutenant Powell participated in the Friends of the Collaborative Meeting by giving the opening greeting. He also sat in on the focus group discussion entitled “A Blue Print for Friends’ Involvement.” Topics discussed included supporting the CPPC and CPOP, youth outreach and engagement, and community engagement. (See Appendix Item # 25)

Promoting CPOP

The Partnering Center continued their outreach to the community during this reporting period by continuing the monthly “BUZZ on CPOP” radio show during the month of

May. The first segment which aired on May 27th, at 10 a.m. featured Linda Holterhoff, of Keep Cincinnati Beautiful and Katherine Lein, of College Hill, who addressed neighborhood blight and its relationship to crime and disorder and the importance of community beautification initiatives to change the physical environment and accompanying conditions. The second hour of the show had Gwen Robinson, Hamilton County-Cincinnati Community Action Agency, Lesley Jones, Cincinnati Human Relations Commission, who spoke about the challenges facing urban youth, particularly in high-crime communities and their needs to help them become productive adults.

In May and July, 2006, the Executive Director, Richard Biehl, participated in the videotaping of two 30 minute segments of the local National Conference for Community and Justice’s “Dialogue” cable television program. The May show included a discussion with Professor John Eck, University of Cincinnati, who is a nationally recognized for this contribution to the evolution of Problem Oriented Policing. Professor Eck discussed successful approaches to addressing community crime problems, including gun crime and drug offending. The July show was a discussion with Stan Ross, Cincinnati Human Relations Commission Youth Streetworker Program, as it relates to the challenges faced by disenfranchised youth and the success of street level engagement to redirect youth away from crime or other unhealthy behaviors toward leading productive lives.

A newsletter titled *Collaborative Quarterly* was developed in May and disseminated in June both electronically and in hard copy form to over 1,500 contacts. The purpose of the *Collaborative Quarterly* is to inform more citizens and city change agents about the good work that has taken place as a result of the Collaborative Agreement and to provide a “call to action” for support of the “vision” of the CA beyond August 2007 expiration. Additionally, the Aria Group sent the electronic version of the newsletter to 1,800 individuals who were early stakeholders in creating the CA.

A CPOP website (www.CPOPCenter.org) has been completed, and now exists as an online resource to inform citizens about the Partnering Center, CPOP and other crime reduction techniques.

Parties’ Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

The CPPC conducted trainings for 140 citizens in SARA, CPOP and other problem-solving strategies (see below).

Forest Ridge Day Camp	Aug. 8	Hard Wear Training (Created and developed by City Law Department and CPD)	14
Ohio CDC Association	Sept. 21	Community Safety and Community Development	8
CeaseFire Cincinnati	Sept. 21	Orientation to CeaseFire Cincinnati	65
Lifeskills	Sept. 22	Hard Wear Training (Created and developed by City Law Department and CPD)	32
Northside	Sept.	CPD’s Landlords and Crime Prevention	17

	27		
North Avondale	Oct. 24	North Avondale SARA	4

Total Citizens Trained from Aug. 6 – Nov. 5 140

Highlights from these trainings include:

Hard Wear Trainings

Hard Wear is a community outreach program developed by the City of Cincinnati Law Department and the CPD including a video and curriculum designed to educate juveniles about the danger of gun violence and to provide training on how to reduce gun violence in their communities. Community Safety Specialist Valarie Brown-Green trained two groups of young people (46 total youth) with the video and follow-up facilitation on August 8th and September 22nd.

Community Safety and Community Development

The Ohio Community Development Corporation Association held its annual conference in Cincinnati in September 2006. Senior trainer, Amy Krings-Barnes, and Ozie Davis III from LISC co-presented a session on “Community Safety and Community Development” to eight audience members from various Ohio cities.

CeaseFire Cincinnati

On September 21, CeaseFire Cincinnati representatives presented an overview of the campaign, its public health model, and the role of community to sixty-five citizens. Audience members were signed up for the campaign and most participated in its kick-off on Sept. 30th.

North Avondale SARA Training

The majority of North Avondale CPOP team members were previously trained in SARA and CPOP, however, when the team identified a new problem, the team gained new members. This training was co-presented by Senior Community Safety Specialist Madeline Moxley and Police Officer Wiley Ross.

As of November 5, 2006 the status of CPOP Teams is as follows:

- Number of DEVELOPING CPOP Teams: 14
- Number of ACTIVE CPOP Teams: 22
- Total Number of Active CPOP Teams Year-to-Date 35

As CPOP evolves in Cincinnati and neighborhood problem solving teams become more knowledgeable and sophisticated about various crime and disorder prevention tools, techniques and best practices, the number of CPOP teams will ebb and flow. As noted in the YTD CPOP team initiatives, some problem solving efforts have been resolved and closed in 2006 while new problems have been identified and new teams have been formed to work on them.

As of November 5th, 2006, **13 CPOP Cases** previously appearing as “Active” teams in 2006 completed the SARA process on their identified problems, and these cases were subsequently closed. Additionally, some neighborhoods have multiple CPOP problem solving efforts simultaneously.

See Appendix Item # 6 to view the CPOP Monthly Status Report for additional information about the status of CPOP teams by neighborhood.

On September 11th, the S. Gregory Baker, CPD, and Richard Biehl, CPPC, attended the Hamilton County Violence Prevention Committee meeting which has been meeting for the past year and has been co-chaired by Gwen Robinson and Tim Ingram of Community Action Agency. Attendees at this meeting were briefed on the CeaseFire Cincinnati initiative.

On September 12th, the Baker and Biehl also attended that Law & Public Safety Committee meeting that was held at the Hirsch Recreation Center in Avondale. Many community members spoke on crime and safety issues. Flyers were passed out at the meeting announcing the orientation to be held September 21st for the CeaseFire Cincinnati kickoff scheduled for September 30th.

Item 29(f). The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Partnership Program to establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

This quarter, there were a number of activities that promoted CPOP as required by the CA. Some of the events were planned as bridge builders with the community; others were scheduled to address community anxiety produced by the reassignment of neighborhood officers. All of the Parties participated in some of the events, although many were done separately. We think it important that police leadership be at as many of these events as possible.

The CA requires the Parties, coordinated through the Partnering Center, to establish community dialogue and interaction with different segments of Cincinnati’s population. This quarter, the CPD and the Partnering Center have together engaged in dialogue with or participated in discussions sponsored by community organizations (NCCJ, Women’s Club, and Better Together Cincinnati). Also, the Parties participated in the CPOP Summit, attended by community residents. Separately, the Plaintiffs met with a faith-based organization, some additional community residents, and met with youth.

In prior Monitor Reports, we have stated that a plan for structured dialogue, joint promotion of events and a review of the feedback from those events would show

compliance with this CA subsection. It would also demonstrate compliance if the Parties scheduled follow-up meetings, and reported on the outcomes of the discussions and meetings, descriptions of areas of agreement and disagreement in the dialogue, and next steps.

The range and scope of the meetings and events this quarter are consistent with 29(f). We believe more joint forums involving CPD leadership would be beneficial, particularly since this last quarter revealed some unevenness in approach within the CPD as to its implementation of the wider adoption of CPOP. There is no question that joint forums sometimes bring out citizens who are displeased with the current status quo, but most citizens will walk away from these events feeling that progress is underway. Ultimately, it is to the benefit of all Cincinnatians for the Parties to proceed with these interactions, because the process of policing and the decisions that are behind police tactics and strategies are made more transparent and form the basis for dialogue and, hopefully, partnership.

We believe that if the Parties develop a written plan for structured involvement with the communities identified in 29(f) and jointly promote those events, full compliance is certain. The Monitor is also open to evaluating compliance with this CA provision based on new measures agreed to by the Parties. The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

Community Dialogue and Interaction:

- During this reporting period the CPD hosted the 2006 National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) Annual Training Conference. As part of the conference planning, CPD convened the Uptown Consortium and CPPC to participate in the planning of a Town Hall meeting. The July 9 Town Hall Meeting focused on “Cincinnati’s Youth Gun Violence: Strategies for Prevention”. There was an overwhelming turnout and show of community support on this Sunday afternoon, which demonstrated how critical and timely the topic of youth gun violence is in Cincinnati.

Sponsors of this Town Hall Meeting included the Cincinnati Police Department, Uptown Consortium and the Urban League of Greater Cincinnati. Speakers representing NOBLE conference attendees and local experts attested to the fact that youth gun violence has escalated to epidemic proportions in cities across the U.S. Local speakers Dr. Victor Garcia and Dr. Kenneth Davis depicted youth gun violence as the public health emergency that it is. All of the speakers shared information about the many comprehensive gun violence reduction strategies - led by both citizen groups and law enforcement agencies - that have been successfully implemented in other cities.

- The CPD began the formation of a Safe City Corridor project in the neighborhoods of Price Hill and Western Hills that will be known as the “Western Safe City Corridor.”

The Safe City project is similar to those currently in place in Minneapolis, Minnesota and Boston, Massachusetts where communities, businesses, and government work together to prevent criminal activity. The Western Corridor project is designed to encompass an area beginning at Warsaw and Grand Avenues and continuing westbound on Glenway Avenue to the city limits. (See Appendix Item # 7 to view a map of this area.) The corridor extends two blocks north and south of this route and includes every business, church, and school in the area.

Businesses along the corridor were contacted in early June 2006 and asked to complete crime prevention surveys. Over 350 surveys were completed. Each business also updated their night files contact information.

There are plans to establish a Safe City Committee with the assistance of the City of Cincinnati. The committee will be a Non Profit 501-C-3 corporation. District Three is responsible for the deployment of the corridor program as well as implementing any objectives or goals the Safe City Committee suggests.

Beginning in December 2006 through February 2007, District Three personnel will conduct ten large Neighborhood Watch sessions along the corridor route. Sessions will be scheduled throughout the day and on different days of the week so all residents have an opportunity to attend.

See Appendix Item # 7 to view additional details about this project. Items include PowerPoint presentations as well as an article from the local community newspaper, *The Western Hills Press*.

- June 21, 2006: Ohio 2006 Law Enforcement Torch Run for Special Olympics
- July 19, 2006: The CPD hosted two community dialogue sessions at the Police Academy to roll out the department’s Strategic Plan. The first included members of the corporate community and the second was attended by members of the community.
- July 28, 2006: Cincinnati Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired radio talk show (hosted by Robert Harris from the NCCJ). The discussion was CPOP issues and concerns with Lieutenant Powell.
- August 1, 2006: The Police Chief rolled out the Strategic Plan at City Council’s Law and Public Safety Meeting.

- August 2, 2006: National Night Out
- August 17, 2006: The Police Chief met with members from the Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition of Cincinnati (MARCC) to discuss the department's new Strategic Plan.

Ongoing dialogue with Youth

- On May 24, 2006, an anti-violence conference was held at Bloom Elementary School in the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood. The event was hosted by CPD's Youth Services Section. Guests included students in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades, parents, school administrators, psychologists, police officers, and members of the monitoring team. The guest speaker was the Hamilton County Coroner, Dr. Odell Owens. Following his presentation, students broke off into groups to discuss ideas and find solutions for youth violence in Cincinnati. (See Appendix Item # 8 to view the list of topics.)
- Over the summer months, the Executive Director, Community Safety Specialist Valarie Brown Green and several community partners including the Over-the-Rhine Foundation, and the Cincinnati Recreation Commission developed and implemented a Summertime Curfew Initiative. This initiative included significant community volunteer support as well as professional support from social service agencies. (See Appendix Item # 9 for additional details.)
- July 9, 2006: A Teen Town Hall Forum was held during the NOBLE Conference. University students, and various police personnel from other parts of the nation, were able to pose questions and answers regarding the increase of violence and, specifically, the use of guns among black youth.
- July 10 through July 14, 2006: Police/Youth Live-In at Camp Joy. Each summer the CPD in partnership with the NCCJ sponsors a week long camp that targets inner city youth. Seventeen officers participated this year. Demonstrations were provided by the Motorcycle, Bike, Underwater Search and Recovery, SWAT, Canine, and Mounted Units.

Parties' Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

Ongoing Dialogue with Youth:

An additional highlight during this reporting period was the continuation of the Curfew Center Initiative, which was a broad-based community led CPOP project designed to provide parents and youth with information about the city's curfew ordinance and to provide a safe & monitored location for youth who get picked up during curfew enforcement efforts.

This initiative began in and continued through August, 2006. The Curfew Center was open and staffed by approximately 30 community volunteers at the New Prospect Baptist Church in Over-The-Rhine. Youth who were processed through the centers completed a survey to determine their perceived treatment by Cincinnati Police, the results of which indicated a favorable experience notwithstanding being arrested. The youth also received gun violence prevention education through use of the recently developed Hard Wear video and facilitator's guide. Straight 2 the Heart provided initial screening of the youth and their families to determine if there was a need for intervention and when appropriate, followed up to provide needed services.

Additional partners on this initiative included the OTR Chamber of Commerce, Memorial, Inc., CHRC Youth Streetworkers, Cincinnati Recreation Commission and the Cincinnati Police Department. Parents and guardians picking up children at the Curfew Center also received educational resources and were offered follow up services by the social service providers who participated in the Curfew Center. A Volunteer Appreciation Dinner was held in October for all participants of the 2006 Curfew Center.

Item 29(g). The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The Parties have held one CPOP Awards Ceremony and are planning the second annual one.

The Parties are in compliance with this CA provision.

Parties' Status Update (May 6 – August 5)

The date of October 26th, 2006, has been established for The Second Annual Community Problem Oriented Policing (CPOP) Award Banquet to be held at the Cintas Center at Xavier University. The Community Police Partnering Center, CPD, FOP and ACLU disseminated award nomination packets to the public in June. The deadline for submissions is August 31, 2006.

In addition to the funding provided by the Community Police Partnering Center for this event, the CPOP Awards Committee, comprised of representatives of the Parties and the Community Police Partnering Center staff, has raised \$10,150 in private donations to underwrite the cost of the banquet to allow participants to once again attend without cost. The principal sponsors at this time are Stanley M. Chesley, Esq., and the Uptown Consortium. In partnership with the effort, CPD assisted with the layout of the 26 page program and had printed over 200 copies gratis.

A selection committee has been formed including representatives of the CA Parties, the Community Police Partnering Center, and citizens to compete the selection of award

winners in September. The five categories for awards are Outstanding Community Efforts in CPOP, Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP, CPOP Partnering Award, CPOP Innovation Award, and Comprehensive CPOP Award.

See Appendix Item # 10 for additional information.

Parties' Status Update (August 6 – November 5)

The **CPOP Awards Committee** met multiple times during this reporting period to plan for the 2nd Annual CPOP Awards Banquet in October. More than \$10,000 in private funds was raised through this committee to support the Awards Banquet. More than 30 award nominations were received and disseminated to the Selection Committee to determine the 2006 CPOP award winners.

On October 26th the Executive Director and CPPC staff hosted the Second Annual CPOP Awards Banquet at the Cintas Center at Xavier University. Approximately 440 persons were in attendance, almost 200 more attendees than in 2005.

Sasha Rionda of WKRC-Channel 12 and Jeri Tolliver of WDBZ, 1230 AM “The BUZZ” served as co-emcees for the evening, and a stirring keynote address was delivered by Hamilton County Coroner O’dell M. Owens, M.D., M.P.H. Additionally, representatives of the Parties to the Collaborative Agreement spoke about CPOP’s Contribution to Community Safety.

Several comments have been received since the banquet commending the Partnering Center’s honoring and recognition of the efforts of citizens and police to improve community safety.

Additionally, the Partnering Center produced a 26-page Program Book for the Second Annual CPOP Awards Banquet, which contained photos and narratives of CPOP Team activities in 2006. This program book was given to all of the attendees. Also, copies of the Collaborative Agreement Annual Problem Solving Report were provided by CPD and distributed to attendees.

Item 29(h). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The CPD’s policies and procedures remain accessible and available to the public on the CPD’s website, <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cpd> . The City is in compliance with this part of paragraph 29(h). There is also a link in the City’s CPOP website (<http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/>) to the CPD’s procedure manual. The link

provides access to community members who are engaged with the police through CPOP involvement. We believe that this sends a signal to the Cincinnati public of an increased willingness to create more transparent police operations, which is essential to building trust in the community.

Concerning the second part of this CA section, while the City conducted a communications audit and developed a plan for improved communications (based on the scope of services developed for the community relations coordinator), last quarter's redeployment of COP personnel without prior communication to those personnel or the community showed a lack of transparency that required attention this quarter. Transitioning a community from single officer to multi-officer community engagement and problem solving can be difficult, but we hope that the CPD will recognize the importance of engagement and consultation, even when the CPD has the formal authority to make decisions and take action.

The CPD is in compliance with this CA provision.

Parties' Status Update

CPD's Internal Communications Council continues to meet monthly discussing potential news items keeping the public apprised of police activities, developments in CPOP and overall CA implementation. Appendix Item # 11 to view the minutes from this reporting period's Internal Communications Council.

Item 29(i). The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The City is in compliance with this CA requirement.

Status Update

The Police Relations Unit is staffed, effective, and fully operational.

Item 29(j). The Parties shall describe the current status of problem-solving throughout the CPD via an annual report. Each party shall provide details on what it has done in relating to its role in CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The 2005 CPOP Annual Report documented the progress the Parties achieved individually and collaboratively. Those efforts were the result of significant hard work. We expect that success and inspiration to continue into 2006. The third CPOP Annual Report is due in late August, 2006.

The Parties have been in compliance since September 2003.

Parties' Status Update

The 2005 CPOP Annual Report was developed by CPD's Police Relations Unit with assistance from CPD districts, sections and units; the Partnering Center and the Hollister, Trubow and Associates.

See Appendix Item # 12 to view a copy of the 2006 CPOP Annual Report.

Item 29(k). The CPD Commanders shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem-solving activities within the Districts. Reports shall identify specific problems and steps taken by the City and community toward their resolution. Reports shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for the future. Reports should be available to the public through the Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

There is one fewer Unit Commander quarterly report than last quarter. While Districts 1, 2, 4 and 5 reported (including District 1's Downtown Services Unit), District 3 did not. There is also one fewer of the Special Units reporting. The Street Corner Unit has been folded into other narcotics units under the Vice Section, and the remaining mid-level drug unit did not report, but is required to report next quarter. Special units reporting this quarter include: Central Vice Control Section; Criminal Investigations Section (Homicide Unit, Personal Crimes Unit, Major Offenders Unit, Financial Crimes); and Special Services Section (Traffic Unit, Youth Services Unit, Park Unit).

In prior Reports we noted that compliance with this CA provision will be demonstrated when all of the District and Unit Commanders prepare quarterly reports that detail problem solving. We have been encouraging in prior reports, applauding projects that show some aspect of problem solving.

It is highly disappointing that only a small number of the projects from this quarter contained in the Unit Commander reports reflect any familiarity with problem solving. Some merely use the same strategies as prior years; although the problem remains or has recurred, most contain no relevant analysis and show no evidence of seeking out information that might direct them to sources that are currently on the CPD's website. Some just state a problem without documenting anything further. Others discuss already adopted programs and try to back them into a SARA form. Clearly there is a lack of oversight, guidance, coaching, and perhaps adequate training since the majority of the efforts should not be of this quality after four years of stated commitment from the CPD. None of the reports follow the template the CPD adopted in its December 2005 form, "Critical Elements that Must be Included in the Quarterly Problem Solving Report."

The projects reported in the Unit Commander Reports (even after several years of requests) do not contain start dates for each project, only the date the report was submitted to the Captain or to Chief Streicher.

The Department states that reports from the Planning Unit and Crime Analysis Units are not relevant to this section. The CPD states that the Planning Unit does not engage in analysis related to call loads and staffing. If this is the case, a report is not needed. As for the Crime Analysis Unit, the CPD states that the efforts of the crime analysts will be documented in the individual reports from officers and special units, so no Crime Analysis Unit report is necessary. Typically, crime analysis units work on larger analysis projects, not just individual beat level projects. However, if this is not the case, we will evaluate what is before us as the sum total of the problem solving engaged in by the CPD.

Judging from the Unit Reports submitted, after four years of CPD effort, they show that extremely little problem solving is occurring in the CPD.

The reorganization, while intended to expand the use of problem solving beyond just neighborhood officers, abruptly gave District Captains the responsibility for ensuring problem solving and community engagement in their command. CPOP teams have felt the lack of CPD involvement in problem solving in the last quarter, and the District and Unit Commander Reports similarly reflect that. In the July 5, 2006, CA Status Report, the Plaintiffs separately cited their concerns about the reorganization and the lack of consistency in working with CPOP teams, and the need for improved training for officers who were not previously involved in CPOP efforts.

We mentioned last quarter that it is an opportune time for the CPD to ramp up the knowledge-base of officers, supervisors, managers and commanders about crime and safety problems. In the last five years alone, there has been a substantial increase in terms of what is known about crime and countermeasures. A fair amount of that is now contained in the problem oriented policing guides, over 40 of which are now available (the CPD website states that there are 19). With this knowledge, we believe that District and Unit Commanders will be well equipped in their new responsibilities, although accountability mechanisms must be put in place as well.

As we see it, the CPD has several tasks before it regarding this section. The CPD has recognized that making time for officers to problem solve is important; now that must be made an objective (and placed in the Strategic Plan so that it will be measured and managed). Improving the quality of the problem solving, the quantity of the problem solving, and the oversight and management of systems designed to track and support problem solving requires more of the CPD leadership's vigilance.

The CPD is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Parties' Status Update

See Appendix Item # 13 to view the Quarterly Problem Solving Reports for this reporting period.

Item 29(l). The Parties shall review existing Police Academy courses and recommend new ones in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers, and supervisors about the urban environment in which they work.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

This quarter showed continued progress. Last quarter, the CPD included the FOP on its Training Committee and this quarter the CPD responded to Plaintiffs' suggestion that Academy training include a more culturally relevant piece. In addition, the recruit training is becoming more inclusive of community crime and safety concerns by having recruits attend a community meeting and participate with ongoing problem-solving efforts.

We also recommend that the Academy staff review prior quarters' Unit Commander Problem Solving Reports, so they can help craft tailored training for officers and supervisors around problem solving.

The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

Parties' Status Update

Evidence of new training that may include steps to introduce recruits to communities, community events, community leaders, and citizens

The 100th Recruit Class assisted in working on a CPOP project in the Northside neighborhood (SAR0600100). See Appendix Item # 14. This class was also involved in the Great American Clean Up, cleaning several vacant lots of debris and litter in the Over the Rhine neighborhood. In addition, the 100th Recruit Class gained practical experiences with community groups by attended several community meetings including a community council meeting in the neighborhood of College Hill.

Item 29(m). The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem-tracking system.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

There have been a number of disappointments involving the tracking system and its use this quarter.

First, CAGIS halted work on the tracking system and seeks additional funding from the CPD to complete the progressive functionality of the system. The CPD and CAGIS are in negotiations. Although the system has been operable for nearly a year, it does not provide access to some of the functions that will give users their own investigative tools: calls for service, crime reports, etc.

Second, we hope that progress in providing the Partnering Center with its own desktop application proceeds quickly. Offering Partnering Center staff access to District computers is not an adequate substitute. Very few District computers have access to this EZ Track application, so any access for the Partnering Center in a District would be quite limited. Officers need access to these computers and should not have to compete with Partnering Center staff. Supervisors need access to their own computers so they can coach and guide officers and also should not have to compete for time with others either. (In fact, the quality of the entries in the system, which we discuss below, suggests that sergeants need to spend additional time reviewing these projects.)

Third, during our site visits over the last 10 months, officers have told the Monitor that the EZ Track system was “constantly down.” A system that works only some of the time can discourage officers from its use. This may be part of the reason for infrequent entries within projects.

Fourth, the project contents of the tracking system remain a serious problem. There are a numerous issues:

- Some projects appear to be simply abandoned.
- Many projects are listed as resolved that are likely not.
- The descriptions of analysis done are very weak, suggesting that there is insufficient understanding of what is needed.
- For the most part, traditional responses are over-used, suggesting that supervisors are doing very little coaching on other problem solving approaches.
- A number of these projects are simply an account of a complaint and a response, not problem solving.
- The amount of information missing in these project descriptions leads to the conclusion that supervisors have little involvement or oversight on projects.

A review of cases for the short time frame of January 2006 to early May 2006 shows inadequacies in most of the entries, suggesting a lack of adequate training for users and/or oversight of the system. We also reviewed these projects through to early August 2006, and it appears that little has been done on many of the projects; some have been silent since February or March. We mentioned in prior Reports that mentoring would be

required as the new system was brought on-line, but the persistence of inadequacies in entries shows that little attention is actually being paid to the system or its contents. Examples are below.

1. SAR0500008 – Panhandling problem. The problem is listed as resolved using the following responses, although no analysis of the problem is contained in the project: Concentrated enforcement – criminal; Concentrated enforcement – traffic; Criminal action – arrest; Criminal action – citation. The assessment contains the following comment by the officer suggesting that alternate responses are required although none are proposed: “The individuals at this intersection were the [sic] rarely incarcerated for [more?] than one day for the various offenses.”
2. SAR0600007 and SAR0600008 are the same project.
3. SAR0600005 has not been updated since February 6, 2006 (through August 11, 2006)
4. SAR0600013, traffic congestion due to construction on E. 5th Street. Response is the assigning of 2 motorcycle officers to give tickets (Response: “Concentrated enforcement – traffic” and “Target those responsible for problem”). This is clearly not a problem-solving project.
5. SAR0600024. This project is listed as “RESP CMP” although responses are not listed in the entries.
6. District 2 had no projects entered into the system between January 2006 and May 2, 2006 (on May 3rd, two projects were entered). In fact, District 2 had no projects entered between October 20, 2004 and May 2, 2006.
7. District 3 lists no projects for this quarter.
8. SAR0600009 is an apartment complex with calls for service involving drug sales and crimes of violence, mainly felonious assaults, but no entry has been made updating the project since March 6, 2006 (through August 11, 2006). It is still listed in the Scanning stage.
9. SAR0600010 – apartment complex with drug dealing and illegal alcohol sales. No update on the project since April 6 (through August 11, 2006) to document if the interventions reduced the problem.
10. SAR0600015: The first and last entry on the project is made on March 9, 2006 (nothing has been entered on the project through August 11, 2006).

11. SAR0600016: First and last entry into the tracking system for this project is March 10, 2006 (nothing through August 11, 2006), and the entry from March 10, 2006 simply gives the location of the project, nothing more.

12. SAR0600018 is the same project as SAR0600019.

13. SAR0600020 involves students of a high school fighting and in the section that asks the officer "What should be done or was done prior to implementing the response?" the following responses are listed: Define community problems; Identify External Community Resources; Meet with school administrators; More business participation. Nothing is listed as occurring after this, although this entry was made April 5 and the school term ended somewhat later.

14. CPOP050013 is the same problem as CPOP050014. In addition, even though in both cases it is listed as resolved, in neither listing is the assessment page completed, leaving actual resolution in doubt.

15. SAR0600003 is a motel with drug dealing and prostitution. The entry states that responses were implemented in January and it is in the assessment stage, but no entry has been made since January 24, 2006 (no entries made through August 11, 2006).

16. SAR0600011, an abandoned building with drug activity, assaults, robberies, prostitution, criminal damage and thefts. No entries have been made since the day the project was opened on March 4, 2006 (no entries made through August 11, 2006).

For the last two quarters, we have suggested the importance of providing mentoring and coaching to officers in the first few months of the system's operation. Mentoring will add precision to the problem solving projects and help advance the Department's knowledge base about problem locations. We also highlighted that the system, like any new information system, will only be as good as the information inputted. We had hoped to see significant improvements this quarter. This was not the case.

As for the projects listed in the CPOP website tracking system, we noted last quarter that a number are labeled "resolved." This quarter nearly 90 are listed as "resolved." We are doubtful that they are actually resolved; more likely they are merely closed because of the reassignment of neighborhood officers or abandonment of the effort. These types of distinctions are important. It is the difference in investigative parlance between a cleared case and a closed case. We believe that accuracy is important, because these are records of actions in addressing chronic community crime/safety problems.

Two quarters ago, we noted that the descriptions of the call for service information in the projects were weak and provided the CPD an excerpt from one of the OSCOR reports to show the type of sorting one can do with call for service information for a specific location. The descriptions in the projects still remain weak.

Of the 20 projects added to the system this quarter (February 6, 2006 through May 5, 2006) many of them are CPD projects that do not involve the Partnering Center (13). Of those that are listed as CPOP Team cases (7), most of the write-ups do not include information regarding the involvement of the Partnering Center or community residents.

District 3 did not add one new SARA project this quarter, and managed only four projects between September 2004 and May 9, 2006 (more than an eighteen-month time frame) suggesting that the CPD leadership is not holding its command staff accountable for engaging in problem solving. This is probably also the reason that District 3 failed to produce a District Commander quarterly problem solving report, as required by the CA. There was a similar problem with District 2 in prior quarters. District 2 added two cases between October 21, 2004 and May 6th 2006 (also a period exceeding eighteen months), and both cases were added only on May 3, two days before the reporting quarter ended. We are certain that these Districts are not relatively free of chronic crime problems. We believe that these examples, coupled with the low quality of the problem solving cases submitted in the District Commander reports reveal a lack of accountability at the top of the CPD concerning CPOP.

We fully recognize that there will be many projects that do not involve the Partnering Center. We also understand that the Partnering Center is providing information at CPD roll calls about how the Center and its outreach workers can help CPD officers. We again encourage the CPD to further publicize the Partnering Center to its members, and collaborate with the Partnering Center as part of the CPD's Strategic Plan. Staff Notes and the Blue Wave may also be ideal vehicles for an article about the Partnering Center.

So that we have a better understanding of what is occurring regarding the CPD and CPOP teams, we ask that the CPD and the Partnering Center provide a joint explanation in the next Status Report for the slower than expected increase in new CPOP efforts, along with recommendations that each can do to increase the use of the Partnering Center as a resource in quality problem solving.

Last quarter, we deferred determining compliance or partial compliance with the new tracking system. We said:

Given the changes this quarter in assignment of responsibility for problem solving efforts, and the large number of projects now listed as "resolved," we are concerned about the status of the projects that are in the tracking system. We will defer judgment about compliance until we have a better understanding of how projects are being handed off and assessed for impact.

We believe similar issues remain. It is over three years and there is not yet a good, functioning and appropriately-used tracking system for problem solving efforts. The lack of quality control in the system and over the system is extremely concerning. Therefore, the Monitor determines that the Parties are not in compliance with this provision.

We hope that by next quarter, the CPD can present a system that is:

- Fully functional
- Where Captains are held accountable for the quality of the problem solving
- Projects are completed or handed off to other officers appropriately
- The cases contain few errors or omissions
- Free form boxes are completed with relevant descriptions, data, analysis, response information, and assessment outcomes
- Supervisors and mentors are actively engaged in coaching and guiding officers so they can succeed in producing higher quality efforts that are consistent with the CPOP definition adopted by the Parties.

Parties' Status Update (May 6– November 5)

- May 2006

The Partnering Center agreed to pay licensing costs affiliated with the installation of the CPOP/SARA application to provide access for CPPC staff members. The Executive Director had previously requested crime data from the CPD to assist in their analysis of community problem-solving efforts. The CPD, on a monthly basis, has provided calls for service information, crime, arrest and traffic data to the CPPC. Originally, CAGIS's response was to place the matter on their agenda for Board consideration. Shortly thereafter issues with funding occurred and CPPC access was placed on hold.

- June 9, 2006

CAGIS staff upgraded the SARA / CPOP application to make querying and mapping police data possible. Benefits to the user include: having data that is current with only a 24 hour delay and utilizing that data for more complex analysis. The mapping tool includes the time of day as part of the starting date and ending date. Therefore, it is now possible to query a time range within a specific day or for a specific time period over a number of days (i.e. Friday evening through Monday morning).

A brief user's guide was created (see Appendix Item # 15).

- June 13, 2006

The following updates were made to the CPOP website:

1. Each case record shows whether it is a CPOP Team case, CPD case, or CPPC case.
2. Each case record shows the size of the area of the problem
3. The following documents were added to the "best practices" links:
 - a. Video Surveillance of Public Places
 - b. Tackling Crime and Other Public Safety Problems

c. “Glitter Track”: The Use of a Temporary Restraining Order to Solve the Prostitution Problem

▪ July 2006

CAGIS requested additional compensation to accommodate for future demands concerning the CPOP website. Until funds can be allocated, CAGIS staff will no longer provide the CPD with any changes or modifications to the current website and application.² CAGIS will, however, continue to host the current site and officers may continue using the system as is. In the interim, the CPD is currently researching a way to provide a substitute problem tracking system. (See Appendix Item # 16 to view the memo re: Departmental Funding Requests)

▪ October 2006

The following updates were made to the CPOP website:

1. Any content appropriate websites or documents mentioned in the Monitor’s report have been added as links if not already present.
 - a. OSCOR reports re: drug dealing in Cincinnati neighborhoods (under “best practices”)
 - b. A link to the index of all reports available at the University of Cincinnati CCJR site (under “best practices”)
 - c. “Cincinnati in Black and White 2001 – 2006: A Report to the Community” (on the CPOP main page)
 - d. CPD Collaborative Agreement links (on the CPOP main page)

Several meetings convened to discuss funding issues between CAGIS and requirements that are still outstanding which are necessary to achieve compliance under the CA. The following is a list of concerns/problems with the current system as well as the most current status of each:

Problem: The CPOP/SARA application needs to function properly and consistently. As a result, very few cases have been entered because the system appears to “freeze” during input. Information and time have been lost.

Status: “Potential reasons the application may freeze are technical/and/or/ training derived and should be easy to resolve:

- The user may not have rights within CPDIT to obtain GIS data (GIS data is tied to a user id – If CPDIT has not mapped the GIS drive for the user, the user may start up a GIS session that has no data and therefore SARA/CPOP can’t link to the address, etc.
- The user may not have added in the CSR extensions in the GIS and therefore the link between the SARA/CPOP and the GIS has not been established. This will cause the SARA/CPOP session to freeze.

² Members of CAGIS and CPD have since had discussions and changes/modifications within the original scope of services of the agreement have been made.

- The user did not start the GIS before trying to enter data into SARA/CPOP.”³ (Quinn)

Problem: Customer Service Request (CSR) access to the SARA/CPOP application to tie in to other City departments was not available.

Status: The collaboration tools to involve all City departments have been present since the creation of the application. The problem, in fact, is training. The only department that has been trained on the SARA/CPOP application is the CPD. Therefore, if an officer attempts to involve a member of another City department to work on a problem-solving effort via a collaboration tool within the application, that invitee will be unaware of how to respond because he/she has not been trained.

CAGIS did, however, provide a link on the CPOP website to allow users to search CSR records.

Problem: CPPC access to the SARA application so that members of the Partnering Center may enter and edit projects as needed.

Status: CAGIS plans to restart contractual negotiations with the CPPC.

Problem: Comprehensive training.

Status: CAGIS has agreed to collaborate with the CPD with training in the GIS and the SARA/CPOP interface. The CPD’s ITMU has included members of the Police Academy and the Police Relations Unit to assist with training as well.

It had been previously reported that the SARA/CPOP application would have the capability to house 911 data, arrest and crime data, mug shots, a parole and probation interface, and contact card information. Due to difficulties with software version conflicts and conflicting name extensions, all softwares are not compatible. Therefore, the data will not be accessible through the application and the issue has been tabled. The CPD recognizes that while this enhancement would be an excellent and convenient tool, it is not necessary for the compliance aspect of the problem tracking system. The information is still available through the “Repeat” database on the department’s H-Drive as well as through the Crime Analysis Unit.

Despite the setbacks, CPD officers continue to enter and edit cases in the system. To date 71 new cases have been entered in this reporting period. (See Appendix Item # 17 to view the summary of cases)

³ Quinn, Barb. "RE: CPD Items Needed from CAGIS to achieve Compliance w/ CA." E-mail to Baker, Greg; Holsten, Deborah; Streicher, Thomas. 24 October 2006.

Item 29(n). The City shall periodically review its staffing in light of its commitment under CPOP and make revisions as necessary subject to funding provisions of this Agreement.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The CA requirement suggests an assessment is required of the Department's organization in light of the adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems.

The redeployment of COP officers back into patrol, widening the responsibility for problem solving, has also allowed the CPD, through transfers of officers, an opportunity to increase staffing at Districts that had high crime and calls for service. This is an important move and consistent with the principles of this CA section. We also believe that the hiring and training of additional crime analysts is an important step in moving towards a more information-driven department. These crime analysts will need to have a full understanding of problem-oriented policing so they can provide greater assistance on projects of increasing complexity. The crime analysts should be extremely well-versed in the type of analysis problem solving typically involves and the wide variety of countermeasures that can be used to stem crime. The problem-oriented policing guides on the CPOP website offer a good start to begin their education about problem solving.

To meet the goal of problem solving as the principal strategy for crime fighting in Cincinnati, the Department requires additional crime analysis. Advanced knowledge about analyzing crime and analyzing crime and safety problems is highly advisable. As the monitoring of crime continues in the coming years, the CPD may find it requires more crime analysts to help unravel and digest data, and direct police responses to crime.

The Monitor noted in last quarter's Report that the strategic plan should support and accelerate the move towards CA compliance, so the CPD can fulfill its already defined responsibilities under the CA. These responsibilities form the basis for both impacting crime and establishing trust between Cincinnati residents and the police. The new Strategic Plan mentions both CPOP and problem solving. In the Chief's letter introducing the plan, he states,

Through the use of crime analysis and problem solving, we will target issues more precisely, which will reduce crime and more effectively use our resources.

We think the plan includes a number of good things, including sections or subsections on:

- increasing the use of non-criminal strategies as problem solving tools
- implementing and following up on CPOP problems
- augmenting police-community involvement in problem solving projects
- training all employees in CPOP and SARA

- increasing community involvement in education programs
- developing programs for diverse communities
- expanding CPOP philosophy to the entire department
- introducing more beat officers at community meetings
- creating mailers for stakeholders advising them of events
- creating new standards for evaluation of performance
- training all employees in crime analysis
- expanding recruiting efforts to maintain hiring of qualified, diverse workforce
- utilizing civilians instead of sworn employees to free up officers for redeployment
- utilizing students from local universities to assist in satisfaction surveys, grant writing, and operational studies
- expanding volunteer opportunities for assisting the Department in daily operations

We believe that the Strategic Plan also is a good place to state the CPD's commitment to the MOA and the CA. Although the plan is fluid to meet changing conditions, it is expected to last five years until the next CALEA accreditation timeline. We believe that the Strategic Plan can be used to more quickly operationalize the CA. We ask that the CPD consider inserting additional items from the CA in the strategic plan so that these can be accomplished more quickly, such as revising job descriptions, having a fully functioning, high quality on-line POP project tracking system, increasing officer proactive time to problem solve and attend community meetings.

As we noted last quarter, the CPD's efforts to increase participation in CPOP, the redeployment of officers to higher crime areas based on analysis, and the hiring of crime analysts places the CPD in compliance with this subparagraph of the CA. The CPD has acknowledged that making time for officers to problem solve is an important objective (so it should be placed in the Strategic Plan as it is more likely then to be measured and managed). To maintain compliance with this provision, the CPD leadership must advance its efforts to improve the quality of the problem solving, the quantity of the problem solving, and the management of systems designed to track problem solving.

Parties' Status Update

CPD command personnel, in addition, the Mayor and City Manager recently met with a number of community council representatives to discuss the “redeployment of neighborhood officer issue.” Discussion is on-going regarding the resolution of this vision, however, District Commander have been given greater latitude to assign personnel to address community issues.

In regard to hiring more crime analysts, this is highly unlikely due to the city’s current budget outlook. Additional training for the crime analyst and greater utilization is currently occurring. While CPD agrees with the Monitor’s comment in support of the Strategic Plan, no further modifications of the document are planned. The Monitor’s comments have been provided to the appropriate members of the Command Staff as they develop the necessary work plans to operationalize the goals and objectives stated in the Plan.

See Appendix Item # 18 to view the CPD Strategic Plan and Chief’s Vision

Item 29(o). The City shall review and, where necessary, revise police departmental policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

Performance Evaluations. The performance evaluations adopted in 2004 will not place the CPD in compliance. We encourage further discussions with the FOP to devise a system that will put the CPD in compliance. Any new performance appraisal system should be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department. We expect the Chief of Police to provide the Monitor with a draft of any new performance evaluations prior to adoption for review.

Job Descriptions. As we have noted in prior reports, the CPD will also need to revise its job descriptions in light of CPOP, particularly those relating to patrol officer, police specialists, investigators, FTOs, sergeants, FTO sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and lieutenant colonels. Revising job descriptions allows a police organization the opportunity to redefine its approach and what is expected of its employees, as well as the type of skills it seeks for different positions. It even helps clarify the types of skills sought through recruitment. If problem solving is central to how the CPD will police, then it is these skills and evidence of their use (among other things) that will be reflected in selecting people who should be promoted or assigned to special assignments. In addition, revised performance evaluation systems and job descriptions can help support the strategic plan, which is discussed in 29(n).

Policy Revisions. CPD leadership directed specific Unit Commanders to file a quarterly problem solving report and will use the form titled *Critical Elements That Must Be Addressed in Quarterly Problem Solving Reports* to improve upon the type of information that is contained in these reports. We believe that it will be helpful if the CPD provides examples to the Unit Commanders of a thorough, complete project-write, just as examples are used when introducing other types of reports in a department. It does not appear that the Critical Elements form is being used. We ask the CPD to revisit this with the Unit Commanders, so next quarter's reports will be consistent with what is required.

Organizational Plans. Progress on the Strategic Plan is discussed in 29(n) and the changes resulting from the COP redeployment are discussed in several earlier sections.

The City made progress two quarters ago by adopting the new Critical Elements form, but it is still not in use by the Unit Commanders. Revisions to performance evaluations and job descriptions are key elements in this section, as they can help drive the type of change the CA requires. Further progress is needed in these three areas. The redeployment is a significant step towards wider adoption of CPOP, but the CPD must make sure that its District Commanders and Unit Commanders are accountable for the implementation of CPOP in their commands and that this is not considered incidental to their other responsibilities. We withheld judgment last quarter regarding compliance believing this quarter to be critical for making this new approach work. We believe that not enough was accomplished this quarter to place the CPD in compliance.

The CPD is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Parties' Status Update

Revision of department policies and/or procedures

On October 3, 2006 Procedure 12.370: Problem Solving Process (see Appendix Item # 19) was revised requiring the following districts/sections/units to provide quarterly problem solving reports to the Police Chief: all five districts; the Downtown Services Unit; Central Vice Control's Mid-Level Drug Unit; Criminal Investigations Section's Financial Crimes Unit, Homicide Unit, Major Offenders Unit, and Personal Crimes Unit; Special Services Section's Park Unit, Traffic Unit, and Youth Services Section. Additionally, the Form 562, CPOP Resource Request, was created to request department resources or funding for CPOP projects.

Review or revision of job descriptions

Job descriptions were updated in **November 2004** requiring a strong commitment to CPOP and the use of the SARA model of problem solving in every area of police operations and specific positions. On February 12, 2006, the Police Chief directed the integration of CPOP into all operations. This should satisfy the monitor's requirements

that the staffing review and job descriptions are updated to reflect the CPD's strong commitment to CPOP. (See Appendix Item # 26)

Review/Revision of performance evaluations

In January 2006, the Police Chief reviewed a comprehensive update about the progress of the annual performance evaluation project. The Police Chief has asked the PIT team to continue their work.

On May 11, 2006, the entire PIT team met to discuss selection of core performance anchors and assignment specific performance anchors for Uniform Patrol, the Investigative Units, Administrative Staff, and Supervisory Personnel. The meeting was very productive. The team is recommending ten core performance anchors for all sworn employees and five core performance anchors for the four assignment specific categories listed above. Additionally, CPD's Planning Section has created a draft revision of a new sworn performance report, Form 448.

During August and September 2006, the PIT team met again to formulate "behavioral guidelines" for scoring each core and assignment specific performance anchor under the five performance standards of "Exceptional, Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Needs Improvement, and Unacceptable."

See Appendix Item # 20.

Item 29(p). The City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information including repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or locations.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

We noted in prior reports, the new system the CPD has selected is expected to be capable of retrieving and linking information in the CPD's current computer information systems to enable the CPD to track repeat offenders, repeat victims, and repeat locations. This information can then be used in problem solving, CPOP cases, and District/Unit Commander reports. The system will increase the CPD's ability to identify trends and patterns and use them to undertake problem-solving efforts. While the CPD's current information systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on traditional models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender "m.o.," rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization locations. Up until now the CPD was not using its current system to this capacity.

During last quarter's site visit, we were extremely pleased that the Department is now able to provide some repeat-victim and repeat-offender information, which the CA has called for and we have requested. We said that beginning this quarter, we expected to see

projects associated with the people identified by the repeat data. Unfortunately, this has not occurred.

Last quarter, we also said that if CPD makes a few changes in the databases it will be in full compliance. We noted that there is an excellent, brief publication on repeat victimization titled, *Analyzing Repeat Victimization*. We noted two particular suggestions from that publication regarding lengthening the time frame for data on repeat locations and victims, and on improving the accuracy of call taking, report taking and data entry.

The CPD states that it is still reviewing the information we provided last quarter, and that it is considering changes to report taking (a newly designed m.o. sheet to be completed with an offense report is being piloted in two Districts for certain offenses) and using a larger time frame to identify repeat victimization. We expect to see the information from the databases, particularly drawn over a longer period of time, to be the basis of problem solving efforts initiated by the police around repeat victims, locations, and repeat offenders. We suggest that the CPD partner with the Partnering Center on some of these. Using the data is just as important as creating the databases.

The CPD is in partial compliance with this CA provision, and it can use the information in the *Analyzing Repeat Victimization* publication to move into full compliance relatively quickly.

Parties' Status Update

Evidence of crime analysts providing specific repeat address information to District Commanders:

See Appendix Item # 27.

Item 29(q). The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The CPD has reported that it expects the CAD portion of the new system to be on line between January 2007 and April 2007. Some modules of the RMS portion of the system are expected to be on line by June 2007, with the total system on line in 2008.

The CPD cites its use of its current systems, and the fact that the new CPOP tracking system is now on-line, as a basis for a determination of compliance. The Monitor has noted in several CA sections that the CPD needs to improve its problem solving analysis, and use that analysis in its CPOP and problem solving efforts. In only a few projects is there mention of the number of calls for service at a location, most projects do not

include an analysis of the calls, and almost none include an assessment using data from the CPD's systems. Nonetheless, we believe that the work done under 29(p) also puts the CPD in partial compliance for 29(q). The repeat location, victim and offender databases are a beginning, although improvements are still needed along the path described in 29(q). Once the new systems are up, they will need to ease access to this type of information and improve the CPD's capacity to scan, analyze, respond to and assess. The City is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Parties' Status Update

The Crime Analyst Unit maintains the previously posted Repeat Calls for Service/Victims/Arrest data in a secured folder on the Department's H-drive. All department personnel have access to the files and can easily combine the data into a single spreadsheet. The process limiting the time periods of data allows for an easier analysis related to emerging trends and evaluating the success of implemented projects. Expanded use of the data as proposed in the *Analyzing Repeat Victimization* publication is being reviewed.

B. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATION

Evaluation Protocol

Items 30-46, Evaluation Protocol

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The CA provisions call for a comprehensive approach to evaluation that is broader than efforts in most other cities. We believe that the efforts undertaken in 2005 provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and advance the goals of the Collaborative Agreement.

RAND's 2006 research and its second Evaluation Report will provide additional information about the progress made by the Parties in achieving the goals of the CA. We are convinced that the results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of a system of evaluation, and implementation of the Evaluation Protocol (CA ¶31-43).

The CA continues to require that the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results" (CA ¶30). Paragraph 46 of the CA also states that "measurement of the success of the mutual accountability process" will be based on whether the evaluation data was "fully and fairly used to assess progress toward attaining the goals" of the CA, and whether the data was used "to adjust City, police and community strategies to address problems, reduce police and citizen use of force and improve police/community interaction."

In the RAND 2005 Report and in our earlier Monitor's Reports, we have set out several recommendations for actions that the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. One area that has a significant prospect for improvement in police-citizen relations is communications in traffic stop encounters. A second recommendation is RAND's call for a larger dialogue about how black neighborhoods are policed. This would include discussions regarding incorporating problem solving and CPOP into hot spot/crime sweep efforts, and an examination of how and where arrests are being made and how they correlate to reported crime. Aggressive traffic enforcement may engender greater distrust, and may not be effective in reducing crime or improving traffic safety. Whether the evaluation protocol was "fully and fairly used" to assess progress towards attaining the goals of the CA depends on the actions taken to address these areas.

The RAND citizen survey demonstrates the wide gap in perceptions between whites and blacks in Cincinnati that must be addressed. Similar findings were made in the NCCJ surveys in 2006. These gaps must be reduced in future years for the CA to be successful

and its goals to be achieved. Central to this issue is the impact on the black community of decisions about police strategy. The right police strategy is one that effectively reduces crime, makes people feel safer, and reduces perceptions of police unfairness and bias. As noted by RAND, police research has shown that traditional reactive policing can create frustration and distrust of the police, and its effectiveness is questionable. This is why the CA emphasizes problem solving and problem oriented policing. Research shows that CPOP is effective policing.

Parties' Status Update

The "Cross Cultural Communication" class presented during CPD's Management training addresses the results from the RAND report and perceptions in the community. The class facilitators open the floor to generate dialogue among the attendees as to possible reasons behind those community perceptions. The curriculum was developed and presented by Mr. Barry Webb, Mr. S. Gregory Baker, Lt. Anthony Carter and Sgt. Thomas Tanner.

C. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Collaborative Items 47-49

Pointing Firearms Complaints

The investigations of complaints of improper pointing of firearms from March 2000 to November 2002 were forwarded to the Conciliator, Judge Michael Merz, in July 2003. The Parties also submitted supplementary materials to Judge Merz for his review in making his decision under Paragraph 48. On November 14, 2003, Judge Merz issued his decision. Judge Merz determined that there has not been a pattern of improper pointing of firearms by CPD officers. Therefore, CPD officers will not be required to complete a report when they point their weapon at a person. The Parties are in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 48.

D. FAIR, EQUITABLE AND COURTEOUS TREATMENT

Collaborative Items 50-54. The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.

- 51. Training and Dissemination of Information** *The Parties shall cooperate in the ongoing training and dissemination of information regarding the Professional Traffic Stops Bias-Free Policing Training Program.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The Monitor looks forward to seeing the results of the CPD's efforts. We note, however, that the CA provision requires the Police Department to work collaboratively with the Plaintiffs and the FOP in developing its enhanced training on bias-free policing. Also, in the March 2006 CA Status Reports, the Parties reported that the Academy was incorporating lessons from the RAND report into its training on strategies to assist officers when approaching and communicating with citizens who are different from themselves in regard to race or ethnicity. The Police Academy was also in the process of producing a five-minute training video on the topic of professional traffic stops and bias-free policing. We have not yet seen the fruits of these efforts. With new training efforts and coordination with the FOP and Plaintiffs, we are hopeful that the Parties will be in full compliance with this provision. At present, the Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Parties' Status Update

The CPD's Training Staff developed a course titled "Cross Cultural Communication" to be presented during management training for all supervisors (late October to early December) and during in-service training for all police officers (January through early April 2007). See Appendix Item # 21 to view the PowerPoint presentation that accompanied the course.

The FOP and the Plaintiffs were invited to participate in the facilitation of the class. However, neither party responded to the invitation. The CPD is compelled at this time to address the Monitor's comment, "We note, however, that the CA provision requires the Police Department to work collaboratively with the Plaintiffs and the FOP in developing its enhanced training on bias-free policing." The CPD provided the Plaintiffs with training schedules as

requested (see Appendix Item # 22) and sent letters to both Parties in reference to the “Cross Cultural Communication” class. The CPD feels that every effort has been made to include the other Parties to the CA in training under this subsection of the Agreement.

52. Professional Conduct *In providing police services the members of the CPD shall conduct themselves in a professional, courteous manner, consistent with professional standards.*

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

The CPD has put policies and procedures in place in compliance with this CA provision. However, the RAND report does identify concerns with cross-racial communications between officers and drivers that could be improved by additional training.

Parties Status Update

The data analyzed by RAND for the Year two report was collected during 2005. The CPD is currently conducting training to address the issues outlined in the Year one RAND report which analyzed data from 2004.

In response to the concerns with cross racial communications identified in the RAND report, the CPD developed the “Cross Cultural Communication” class.

53. Data Collection and Analysis *The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, shall in all public reports, include detailed information including but not limited to the racial composition of those persons stopped (whether in a motor vehicle or not), detained, searched, arrested, or involved in a use of force with a member of the CPD, as well as the race of the officer stopping such persons.*

Monitor’s Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

a. Traffic Stop Data Collection

The CPD is collecting traffic stop data on Contact Cards, which are now being used by RAND for analysis. The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

b. Data Collection on Pedestrian Stops

The Parties are not in compliance with this requirement, but have requested a meeting with the Monitor to address how the data collection and analysis can be accomplished. This meeting will be scheduled for this quarter.

Parties' Status Update

The data from all Contact Cards (which includes motor vehicle, pedestrian and field interview stops) has been collected and provided to RAND. Issues with the analysis of data collected on stops not involving persons in a vehicle were discussed with RAND researchers and at the November All Parties meeting. At the All Parties meeting, the CPD believed there was a general understanding of these issues and limitations and agreement that analysis of non-motor vehicle stops would not be beneficial due to those limitations.

c. Use of Force Racial Data

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

d. Favorable Interactions

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

e. Unfavorable Interactions

The Parties have developed a protocol for reporting unfavorable interaction by CPD officers with citizens. The protocol has been approved and entered by the Court. Mutual Accountability Forms have been developed. The Parties will be in compliance with this CA requirement when these forms are available for completion and then collected. The Parties are not in compliance with this provision.

Parties' Status Update

In preparation for this report, the CPD attempted to collect an update reference this subsection and did not receive a response from the responsible party.

E. CITIZEN COMPLAINT AUTHORITY

Collaborative Items 55-89

Monitor's Previous Assessment (9/1/06)

The City is in compliance with the provisions relating to establishing the CCA and the CCA Board. However, we note that in addition to the vacancies that have recently been filled, the terms of three current Board members will expire at the end of 2006. We urge the City of Cincinnati to prepare for the Board appointments to this critically necessary institution.

While the Parties are in compliance with these provisions of the CA [paragraphs 65 – 67], the selection of a new CCA Executive Director is a vital step to maintain the confidence of the public in the CCA's work. We recommend that the City proceed expeditiously.

The Monitor's review of CCA investigations, discussed in Chapter 2, indicates that the CCA and the City are in compliance with CA ¶¶70-79. Now that the CCA and the CPD have developed written procedures for the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of the CCA and the CPD investigations, the City is in compliance with CA ¶74. Also, with these procedures in place, it appears that the City is in compliance with ¶70, requiring that each complaint be directed to the CCA in a timely manner. As reported by the CCA, the City is also now in compliance with CA ¶71, requiring that the CPD not interfere with the ability of the CCA to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene, and monitor CPD interviews.

The coordination of the CCA and IIS procedures, and the new SOP setting out procedures for CPD action in those cases where the CCA sustains complaints has also put the City in a position to comply with CA ¶78, requiring that the City Manager and the Chief of Police refrain from making a final decision on discipline until after receipt of the CCA investigation and report. Based on the manual spreadsheet of CCA and CPD complaint cases, it appears that the City is in compliance with this provision.

With regard to the CA requirement (¶80) that the CCA and CPD create a "shared electronic database that will track all citizen complaints," this provision has not been fully implemented. The CCA has access to the CPD's ETS system, which includes data on completed complaint investigations, and the CCA now has a new Case Management System, but the two agencies do not have a shared electronic database that tracks all citizen complaints. Instead, the CCA and CPD have developed a manual spreadsheet that includes information on IIS and CCA complaints.

The City and the CCA are in compliance with CA ¶¶82-86, relating to prevention of police misconduct and reducing citizen complaints, and to public dissemination of information about the CCA and how it operates. The CCA has drafted a report on complaint patterns and trends, and has issued its 2005 Annual Report. The CCA has also recently disseminated its first newsletter. The City is also in compliance with CA¶87, requiring that the City Council allocate sufficient resources for the CCA to accomplish its mission. However, we encourage the City to evaluate the CCA's work and consider whether there are additional goals that could be accomplished with even slight supplemental budgetary funding.

Parties' Status Update

During the most recent All Parties Meeting, the CPD and CCA made the Monitor aware that the current system regarding the shared database is sufficient.

See Appendix Item #28 to view the CCA's newsletter, *CCA Speaks*.

APPENDIX

1. CERT Activity
2. Problem Based Activity Worksheet
3. CeasFire Cincinnati Information
4. CPPC Training Numbers
5. *Collaborative Quarterly* newsletters
6. CPOP Monthly Status Report – CPPC
7. CPD Western Corridor *Safe City* Project
8. Bloom School Itinerary
9. 2006 Curfew Center Initiative
10. CPOP Annual Awards
11. ICCM minutes
12. 2006 CA Annual Problem Solving Report
13. Quarterly Problem Solving Reports – 3rd & 4th Quarters
14. Training Section's Recruit QPSR
15. CAGIS's User Guide
16. Memo: **CAGIS Meeting re: Departmental Funding Requests**
17. CPD CPOP Team Summary / Case Status
18. CPD Strategic Plan
19. Procedure: 12.370 Problem Solving Process
20. Update of 2006 Performance Evaluation PIT Team
21. Management Training and Bias Free Policing
22. Email: RE: Training Schedule
23. Management Training agenda
24. Recruit Calendar with CPOP Highlights
25. Friends of the Collaborative
26. Job Descriptions
27. D1 Crime Analyst Report
28. *CCA Speaks*