

**City of Cincinnati
Independent Monitor's
Twenty-First Report**

July 11, 2008

Monitor's Transition Year Progress Report on the
Collaborative Agreement between the Plaintiffs and
the City of Cincinnati

Saul A. Green
Monitor

Richard B. Jerome
Deputy Monitor

www.cincinnati-monitor.org

INDEPENDENT MONITOR TEAM

Saul Green
Independent Monitor

Richard Jerome
Deputy Monitor

Joseph Brann

Rana Sampson

John Williams

Timothy Longo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I. PROBLEM SOLVING DURING THE TRANSITION YEAR.....	3
A. Problem Solving Expectations for the Transition Year	3
B. Monitor Standards and Assessment	3
II. CPOP AND PROBLEM SOLVING	4
A. Process Improvement Team.....	4
B. CPD Problem Solving.....	8
C. Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV)	22
D. Systems in Place to Ensure that Problem Solving is the Principal Strategy for Addressing Crime and Safety Problems After the Transition Year is Completed.....	24
III. EVALUATION PROTOCOL AND BIAS-FREE POLICING.....	25
A. Evaluation Protocol and the Rand Report	25
B. Collaborative Agreement Communications Plan.....	26
APPENDIX 1: REVISED PROBLEM-SOLVING PROJECT AUDIT FORMS	28
APPENDIX 2: CINCINNATI INITIATIVE TO REDUCE VIOLENCE (CIRV) SERVICE TEAM UPDATE JUNE 30, 2008.....	30

**CITY OF CINCINNATI
INDEPENDENT MONITOR'S TWENTY-FIRST REPORT**

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Collaborative Agreement (CA) among the City of Cincinnati, the Plaintiff Class and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) was signed in April 2002 and approved by Judge Susan Dlott in August 2002, for a term of five years. It calls for the adoption of Community Problem-Oriented Policing (CPOP), mutual accountability and evaluation, bias-free policing and the establishment of the Citizen Complaint Authority (CCA).

In August 2007, the City and the Plaintiffs agreed to extend portions of the CA for one additional year to fully implement the adoption of problem-solving as the CPD's principal crime-fighting strategy.

In the first four months of the Transition Year, from August 2007 to November 2007, the Parties focused on putting problem-solving processes in place. The CPD adopted new policies and procedures and trained CPD supervisors and officers about their role in implementing community problem-oriented policing, as required by the CA. The Parties agreed on some objective measures to assess the progress that has been made in accomplishing the transition. The Parties also put together a Process Improvement Team (PIT) for problem-solving, and a smaller working group within the PIT to focus on what steps need to be taken.

In the last seven months, from December 2007 through June 2008, the CPD has begun to implement these changes. This Report is our effort to more specifically detail the implementation of problem solving for the time period April 2008 through June 2008 and to assess the CPD's accomplishments against the measures agreed to by the Parties. In addition, the Report also discusses progress towards bias-free policing.

This Report is the Monitor's last report before the completion of the Transition Year.¹ We believe that it is time for outside monitoring to end. The CPD continues to head in the right direction and continues to improve the quality of and engagement with problem-solving in the Department. While the CPD will need to do more to be able to claim that problem-solving is its principal crime fighting strategy and more to earn the trust of all Cincinnati citizens, many CPD members have expressed a

¹ The Monitor will also submit a report in October 2008 documenting progress over the six years of the different agreements. This current Report only documents progress during the final quarter of the Transition Year.

readiness for this to happen. The additional work will need to continue after the end of the Transition Year in early August. It will be up to the City, the CPD leadership and community members to ensure that this occurs. The same is true for bias-free policing.

In December 2007, RAND issued its third evaluation report on community-police relations in Cincinnati. Like the 2005 and 2006 reports, the 2007 report found that “Blacks continue to bear a disproportionate share of the impact of policing in Cincinnati.”

For the third year in a row, the Friends of the Collaborative held a Forum on the RAND Report focusing on the way traffic stops are conducted, and the impact of the stops on the African American community. Further, City Manager Milton Dohoney has recently convened meetings attended by Chief Streicher, members of the CPD command staff and citizens regarding traffic stop issues. These meetings provide opportunities for a productive examination of these important issues.

RAND will issue its final comprehensive report at the end of 2008, followed by a small report in 2009 that just analyzes and summarizes 2008 traffic stop data.

The CA calls for an ongoing community dialogue and interaction between the CPD and numerous stakeholders in Cincinnati. The communication project, agreed to by the Parties, is intended to engage citizens and the CPD in a continuing two-way dialogue that will provide opportunities to report the continuing reforms, acknowledge what is going well, and determine where improvement is needed. Work on the project is ongoing.

United States District Court Judge Susan Dlott will hold a status conference on July 15, 2008 with the Parties and the Monitor. The Parties are to report on the status of implementation of problem-solving and bias-free policing, and plans for continued implementation, oversight and evaluation related to problem solving and bias-free policing after monitoring and court supervision ends.

I. PROBLEM SOLVING DURING THE TRANSITION YEAR

A. Problem Solving Expectations for the Transition Year

The expectation for the CPD for the Transition Year was a rapid ratcheting up of the quality and amount of problem solving engaged in by CPD employees at all levels, so that by the end of the Transition Year, the CPD uses a problem solving approach as its principal crime-fighting strategy.

During this year, the CPD made a tremendous amount of progress. The CPD developed protocols, policies and manuals to guide the development of collaborative problem-solving and the CPD leadership provided its Captains with expectations for problem-solving in their Districts and Special Units.

In this Report, we look to see if this quarter saw continued improvement in the quality of the problem solving efforts and a greater level of penetration of problem solving into the rank and file, including its use by other units in addition to Patrol.

B. Monitor Standards and Assessment

We noted in our last Report that during the Transition Year, we will assess the Parties' activities principally on the objective outcome measures included in the CPD's Problem Solving Procedures (12.370).

- Utilizing POP guides and other resources
- Opening five new projects per District per month (with the Patrol Bureau Commander making adjustments in the volume of projects as needed to ensure the quality of the projects)
- Reducing repeat crime locations, offenders and victims
- Resolving problems favorably with minimal displacement

In addition, we stated that we will also evaluate the following criteria:

- The development and implementation of problem solving training for CPD members at all levels in the Department, including the incorporation of problem-solving into the recruit and FTO training curricula

- The CPD's quality assurance efforts and auditing of problem-solving projects
- The CPD's use of its performance evaluation system and recently revised job descriptions
- The extent to which the problem-solving projects include interaction with the Partnering Center, community groups and other city and county agencies, where appropriate
- The systems put in place by the CPD to ensure that problem-solving remains the principal strategy for addressing crime and safety problems after the Transition Year is completed

To evaluate the Parties' progress in meeting these criteria during this quarter and last, we have reviewed problem solving cases included in the Problem Solving Tracking System (PSTS) to assess the quality of problem-solving efforts, use of POP guides, inclusion of community groups, city agencies, and the Partnering Center; visited some of the sites where problem-solving projects have been opened; reviewed the CPD's training curricula and lesson plans for problem-solving training (discussed in last quarter's Monitor report), and observed in-service training on problem-solving (also discussed in last quarter's Monitor's Report); reviewed the CPD's use of the new performance evaluation system (see last quarter's Monitor report); worked with the PIT working group in helping build problem-solving expertise at the CPD and providing constructive feedback on District-level problem-solving efforts; and observed CIRV call-ins and reviewed the University of Cincinnati's assessment of CIRV. We have also reviewed the Parties' efforts in advancing bias-free policing and the CA's Evaluation Protocol.

II. CPOP AND PROBLEM SOLVING

A. Process Improvement Team

Last summer, the Monitor requested that the Department establish a committee representing a vertical slice in the organization to expedite implementation of CPOP. The CPD established a Process Improvement Team (PIT) for problem-solving, which met in August 2007. A smaller working group of the Process Improvement Team now meets with the Monitor Team monthly to build advanced problem-solving skills and to review ongoing problem-solving projects. This smaller working group includes crime analysts from each of the Districts, neighborhood liaison sergeants and officers. Lt. Col. James Whalen and the head of Police Relations, Mr. S. Gregory Baker, attend the meetings, and Chief

Streicher also has attended several of the meetings. University of Cincinnati professors John Eck and Robin Engel also attend, as does Amy Krings Barnes, a supervisor from the Police Community Partnering Center. Recent meetings since February 2008 often include all District Commanders, district lieutenants (when projects in their District and on their shift are being presented), investigative personnel (when they are presenting), and additional Partnering Center staff. City Manager Milton Dohoney attended the June PIT meeting.

In the last Report, we described the content of the monthly meetings held between October 2007 and March 2008. In this Report we document the content of the meetings held since March and through June 2008, which included presentations on:

- District 1 Investigations Unit and Neighborhood Liaison efforts to reduce repeat domestic violence victimization at 78 Mulberry Street
- District 3 project to reduce domestic violence and other assaults at 1990 Westwood Northern Boulevard
- Research and information about reducing juvenile gang violence
- The process of change - from corporate change to changes advanced through the Collaborative Agreement
- Personal Crimes Unit's analysis and response to reports of repeat rape victimization
- District 4 copper theft reduction project
- Homicide Unit baby fatality reduction project
- District 2 update on crimes at Perkins Lounge
- District crime analysis updates

Since the start of the PIT team nine months ago, there appear to be significant changes in the level of knowledge about and engagement in problem-solving. The PIT team was exposed to a tremendous variety of crime/safety problems and approaches to reduce them. The core PIT team attendees developed a much greater understanding of problem-solving and with each meeting they brought more advanced efforts to the table. The crime analysts' contribution to projects expanded, improving the analysis in projects undertaken. Crime analysts also made greater

use of the repeat crime/victim/arrestee databases as sources for some of the projects their Districts selected.

As mentioned, attendance at the PIT meetings grew, ultimately drawing each District Captain. Lieutenants, sergeants, investigators, officers and analysts who worked on projects also presented in the PIT sessions. An increasing number of people gained exposure to different problem-solving efforts. Staff in the Community Relations Section have been the keenest learners, and over the nine months have become the most sophisticated students, mentors, and trainers in problem-solving. One of their roles is to help coach those who undertake projects. They provide quality advice and inform officers about more precise countermeasures, ones besides the more traditional responses that have often been applied.

During the first seven months of the PIT team meetings, the Monitor acted as facilitator, while working collaboratively with CPD and PIT attendees to craft each month's agenda. In May 2008, the Monitor turned over full responsibility for meeting facilitation, presentations and agenda development to the CPD, with June showcasing a CPD-developed meeting.

The Monitor devoted its May presentation (1.5 hours) to the process of change. By describing changes successful corporations made out of necessity, that helped them survive and thrive, the Monitor hoped to draw a comparison to similar changes the CA. The Monitor drew on examples from Proctor and Gamble and other successful corporations.

We chose corporate changes as the analogy because it showed how other professions adopted changes similar to those articulated in the CA. We felt it might be easier to accept changes if they are understood as part of a wider movement across other professions. That movement includes transitioning to more analysis-based decision-making, focusing on reducing problems, using a wider range of sources to understand problems, providing equitable services, using innovations from elsewhere, innovating within when needed, and including customers as part of the team.

The June PIT meeting included excellent presentations on the preliminary efforts by the Homicide Unit to analyze preventable infant fatality cases and an update of District 5's metal theft reduction initiative. Two other Districts gave short updates about in-progress problem-solving projects and then each District Captain talked about significant crime problems in their areas. At the close of the meeting, Mr. S. Gregory Baker, head of the Community Relations Section, told the attendees that the Chief approved a recommendation for a new Process

Improvement Team (PIT) led by Captains Issac and Weisman and tasked them to develop recommendations for a format for future meetings.

The July meeting will be the last meeting of this PIT team. Ltc. Whalen and Mr. S. Gregory Baker in a June 6th memo to the Chief recommended a new forum combining problem-solving reporting with reporting progress in reducing crime identified through HAZARD reports, a University of Cincinnati Policing Institute-developed mapping and Part 1-focused crime trend identification system.

The goals of the new PIT team, as stated in the memo, are to:

1. Design a process to efficiently marry crime analysis with problem-solving to improve efficiency and garner the maximum benefit to the agency and the City of Cincinnati.
2. Design a process whereby the senior command staff is kept apprised of criminal conditions and problem-solving efforts throughout the city in a timely and efficient manner.
3. Do so with a projected five-year term in mind, to coincide with the Strategic Plan. This will include recommended revisions to the Strategic Plan to ensure consistency across the agency and appropriate sustainability of the effort.
4. Recommend procedure changes that become necessary as a result.

Ltc. Whalen and Mr. Baker also recommended the PIT team include, "at a minimum, members of the Community Relations Section, a representative from Investigations Bureau, Information Technology Bureau and the University of Cincinnati Policing Institute." They expect the PIT team to finalize recommendations by September 1, 2008. We see this as a positive development. It can mainstream problem-solving into the Department's other crime discussion forum. If sufficient time is allowed for presentations of some POP projects and for feedback about them, it can boost the profile of CPOP in the Department. The challenge will be to ensure that responses to Part 1 trends are not solely drawn from traditional responses and that sufficient time is allowed for problem analysis before responses are expected.

We believe that for a more complete adoption of a CPOP approach, CPD management will need to do more to lead on the issue of *why changes are needed*. Many members of the community, particularly the African American community, supported the adoption of the CA in response to a time of great racial tension in Cincinnati. In our meetings with community members, we find that they continue to hope to see

these changes fully implemented and continued beyond the tenure of the Agreement. It will be important to guard against retrenchment, which can happen if there is resentment within the Department of the CA reforms. We believe this can be remedied (not fully, but significantly) when upper leadership support, explain, and become opinion leaders on the need for change from past practices. Without that support, the CPD may speak about problem-solving, but it will more often resort to traditional police responses.

B. CPD Problem Solving

1. District and Special Unit Problem Solving

Police Districts and Special Units within and outside of the Districts in Cincinnati are responsible for implementing problem-solving, using as a guide the SARA model and following CPD's problem-solving procedures. The procedures provide clarity to the different parts of problem-solving and situational crime prevention, and lists the steps an officer, sergeant and lieutenant must take in a District or in a Unit when using a problem-solving approach. Working with the Partnering Center and other stakeholders is encouraged and problem-solving and the SARA process is openly acknowledged in the procedures as the CPD's principal crime-fighting approach. In addition, the procedures note that participation and success in problem-solving will be weighed in every sworn employee's annual performance assessment, for all ranks and assignments.

The CPD has also placed responsibility with crime analysts for using the repeat databases and recommending suitable "repeat" projects to the District Commander. Projects may come from the repeat databases, from the community, from the Partnering Center or from CPD members. The District Relief Lieutenant is responsible for ensuring coordination and completion of all projects assigned to that relief. Community Relations Section staff provide some analysis and response assistance, and monitor the project through its different stages. Section members are expected to consult problem-oriented policing guides, other relevant material and situational crime prevention techniques as part of their assistance on a project. The Section is expected to conduct quality control reviews at different intervals.

During this latest quarter, the Monitor Team conducted a review of all problem-solving efforts District personnel and Special Unit personnel developed and included in the problem-solving tracking system. We also looked at the number of open and new problem-solving projects in the system. In addition we looked to see how problem-solving POP guides or other sources of problem-specific research is included in the system

write-ups. We also visited some of the chronic crime locations. We met with the Community Relations Section to discuss and review the CPD's auditing and quality control efforts. Finally, we reviewed a report describing Year-1 progress in Cincinnati's inter-group gun violence reduction initiative - CIRV, and attended a recent CIRV call-in session in April.

2. Use of Improved Problem Solving Tracking System

The CPD's Information Technology Management Unit and the Community Relations Section co-developed last year an improved, more user-friendly system for recording and tracking problem-solving projects. The responsibility for the internal monitoring of the system rests with the CPD's Community Relations Section. As mentioned above, this team is also tasked with assisting problem-solvers in the analysis phase of their projects, and recommends responses after reviewing the research about the particular crime/safety problem.

During this quarter, the Monitor team reviewed over 110 cases entered into the system. The large majority of these projects are efforts by District personnel; the remaining ones are from members in Special Units, such as the Vortex crime suppression unit, the Park Unit and Homicide. In March 2008, the Community Police Partnering Center also gained access to, and was trained on, the Problem Solving Tracking System. Hopefully, this can facilitate collaboration on problem-solving projects.

The Monitor supplemented its review of problem-solving projects in the tracking system with site visits (with staff from the Community Relations Section) to some of the problem-solving project locations.

a. Quality of Problem-Solving

In this last quarter, we have seen an improvement in quality in some of the problem-solving efforts and a wider participation by Special Units. Officers, investigators, sergeants, crime analysts and lieutenants opened a wide variety of projects. This quarter saw about 30 new projects.

For projects that were opened in prior quarters that were incomplete, the Community Relations Section contacted the people who opened them, drew out more information about them, put that information in the tracking system so older cases more accurately reflect what actually had been done on the project. This was not an easy process. After a project is open, the lead person on it might be transferred, promoted or moved to other shifts, so gathering project

information is difficult. The Community Relations Section expended considerable effort to capture information that otherwise would have been lost. In many cases, it revealed that projects had more substance than originally described; in others, the additional information showed that the project really was not a problem-solving project - it was only an already-decided-upon solution recast as a problem-solving effort. Most of these were eliminated from the database.

In reviewing cases in the tracking system, sources for identifying problems varied. Some came from repeat databases (repeat calls, repeat call locations, repeat victims, repeat arrestees), others from a community member or from phoned-in complaints, some from community organizations, others from on-view officer observations, some from a noticed crime spike, and others from repeat problems an investigator identified in his/her workload.

In a number of cases, the responses resulted in a decreasing number of calls for service to the location, or a reduction in the number of crimes at particular locations. However, for the most part, assessments tracked a very short period of time, sometimes only a month, making it difficult to assess real impact.

In many projects, there is still skimpy analysis. The member opening the project (or perhaps the one who types it into the system) simply writes that calls for service and crime reports were analyzed but the case does not include the numbers or types of calls, or the number and types of crimes and their significance. This may change with training. Some of the projects that were entered into the system (or updated) during March and April contain more precise information and examples of these are noted below:

In one project, the officer writes that an apartment complex has over 250 calls to police during 2007, including 31 for family trouble, 22 for fights and disorderly behavior, 19 for drugs and 10 involving guns.

In another project at a problem apartment complex, the officer writes that during 2007, nine individuals accounted for 43% of the arrests at the complex and only one of them actually lived at the complex. Five suspects were identified three or more times as suspects in different incidents at the complex. In this 114 unit complex, 8 individuals were identified as "high risk victims" based on their involvement in 40% of the victimizations at the complex. Fifty-one percent of the cases brought forward from arrests at the complex resulted in dismissal due to lack of victim cooperation. The property owner of this complex owns over 190 properties in

the city and his property management is on-site at the complex Monday through Friday but only from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

In terms of analysis, some of the projects entered into the tracking system provide more robust descriptions of the problem than others. For instance, in one case, identified through the repeat call database and based on officer observations, a nursing home had 582 calls to police over ten years. These calls included 124 calls involving patients who walked away, and calls leading to the discovery of unsafe and unsanitary conditions, lack of heat, overcrowding, smoking/oxygen hazards, rodent infestation and suspicion of criminal activity.

In terms of responses, the majority of efforts still rely on directed patrol, saturation patrol, off-duty details and increased enforcement. This suggests that for most of the problems, the officers believe that the answer is simply a dosage problem - *if more of the same is done, the problem will decrease*. In some cases this will be true; however, many problems are not a dosage problem, rather, they are a countermeasure problem. They require a different, tailored, precise, problem-specific solution. This too may present an opportunity for additional training in the coming year. As an example of a project that includes more precise solutions, we include a description of one of the problem-solving projects in the system:

The repeat location database helped identify a large store with a high number of calls to the police. Some of these calls were for theft but others were for drunken homeless people outside the store aggressively panhandling and harassing customers. They also used the alley beside the store as a bathroom. The Community Relations Section suggested that two POP guides might be helpful to this project; one of the guides, Partnering with Businesses to Address Public Safety Problems, suggests that businesses be the frontline of defense against crime, not just callers to the police. The second guide, entitled Shoplifting, includes reasons why some stores have higher theft numbers, including store design, placement and security of highest risk items. In a meeting with the store manager, police learned that the store's annual shrinkage is between \$70,000 and \$100,000. The police suggested that selling alcohol to chronic alcoholics contributed to the problem, as did the type of alcohol they sold, which included 40 ounce beers. Police also recommended that the most stolen items should be better secured and under greater surveillance. The Police offered to meet with the homeless to see if they might help improve the area. Ultimately, the store agreed to stop selling 40 ounce alcohol and to better secure the most stolen items or move them to places where employees could properly

watch over them. The store also agreed to take a more active role in telling loiterers, alcoholics and harassers to leave the area in front of the store. The Police agreed to directed patrols at precise times for the problems in front of the stores and helped organize an alley clean up, which involved the homeless helping with the clean up. This project is still in the response stage and so an assessment has not yet been done.

In our review of cases in the PSTS, we see significant improvements. While some projects in the tracking system have blank screens or lack analysis, these are fewer than in prior quarters. We believe the Community Relations Section is methodically going through all the cases and removing ones that should not be in there.

The tracking system can become a resource for others in the organization who take on a project. To that end, it is important to categorize problems as precisely as possible, using identifying descriptors, so others can easily search for projects that might be similar to their own. Drug sales in an open-air market is significantly different from drug sales in an apartment complex; the solutions for one are different than for the other. Since the tracking system now only contains certain categories as its descriptors, the Community Relations Section may want to consider having an excel database containing the project number and the type of problem(s) the project involves, and if relevant, the type of place where it is located. This way, if someone opens a project, the Community Relations Section can recommend the case number of an in-house project as an appropriate example, if it is of high quality.

The CPD's problem-solving projects vary in size and scope, reflecting the problems in Cincinnati's communities. A metal theft problem, while neighborhood-focused at present, may go citywide if reductions are achieved. Other projects focus on one apartment complex or a bar, another on an open-air drug market or an accident prone part of a highway, and yet another on preventable infant fatalities or on reducing inter-group gun violence². This range in scope is to be expected and encouraged and shows that problem-solving can be used across an extraordinarily wide variety of problems. This also shows that CPD is encouraging problem-solving efforts across different problems.

Overall, we believe the CPD is headed in the right direction and is working on improving: (a) the quality of the projects; (b) the advice that Police Relations staff provides to problem solvers who are working on projects; and (c) the quality of the project write-ups in the PSTS (which

² A description of the CIRV project's progress is contained later in this report.

may or may not reflect the quality of the project itself). We outline below some general observations and follow with some areas where we think improvement would be beneficial.

- More and more, officers have rightly shifted their focus from handling an incident to looking across incidents and identifying the most competent entity to reduce the problem. Instead of repeatedly arresting a problem tenant, recognizing that the illegal activity and the tenant engaging in it is best addressed by the property owner, who has legal responsibility for dealing with that problem tenant and problem activity. Rather than repeatedly taking shoplifters out of a place, having store owners secure the most at-risk items. Rather than repeatedly arresting drunk panhandlers who harass a store's customers, have the store suspend selling the type of alcohol that produces the chronic problem behavior.

As the Department expands its use of problem-solving, there may be other opportunities to improve the quality of the projects. Some possibly fruitful avenues might include:

- Suggesting officers interview the people involved in the problem behavior about their choice of place to behave this way in. For instance, in the case of intoxicated persons, disorderly juveniles or homeless people in a park, interviews may reveal useful information about why the person(s) choose(s) this place for their behavior (the library, the corner, the park, this apartment complex, this store, this bus transportation area). Sometimes insights about how to resolve the problem or even why the problem is occurring can come from the very people who seem to be causing the offending behavior and the information can be used as leverage to get the property owner or the place manager to change how they manage the behavior in that place rather than just rely on calling the police.
- Suggesting officers do comparisons across places similarly situated. For instance, identifying apartment complexes in the same area, ones that follow the principles learned in landlord training and comparing them to those that don't; comparing the results of stores that secure their at-risk items to those that don't.
- Discussing in the Department whether officers can accept (for him or herself or for others in the Department) or recommend off duty paid details as a solution to an owner whose private

property has problems, since it may keep the owner from choosing more appropriate changes to his/her place management practices.

- Suggesting officers lengthen their assessment periods; in some they are only a month long before an officer stops his/her efforts on a project. A month or two is too short to judge if there is a sustained impact.
- Developing additional training so members can use situational crime prevention when responding to a problem. The POP Center contains a model POP college curriculum. In it is a section on situational crime prevention. The curriculum can be accessed at http://www.popcenter.org/learning/model_curriculum/. The curriculum is free and parts of it (or all of it) can be used. The CPD can change the curriculum to include Cincinnati-specific examples.

3. Resolving problems favorably with minimal displacement

We mentioned in our last report that the CPD is still in the early stages of problem-solving, and as such, officers engaging in it are not yet looking at minimizing displacement. To begin that process, the Community Relations Section may want to encourage officers to begin to document in the problem-solving tracking system the names of people engaged in problematic behavior at places experiencing problems so they will be able to determine if they resurface at different locations.

In a review of projects in the tracking system this quarter, none of the projects contain assessments of displacement. While it is easy to understand the concept, it is difficult to measure it, and so its absence is not surprising. While some displacement of crime and problems may occur, it is not always inevitable and it is not always in the full amount of the original problem. The model POP college curriculum also contains a teaching section on displacement (module ten). The curriculum can be accessed at http://www.popcenter.org/learning/model_curriculum/. This may be a resource the Police Relations staff can look to as they continue offering guidance and providing training in important aspects of problem-solving.

4. Utilizing POP Guides

When a member of CPD receives the appropriate approvals in his/her chain of command and opens a problem-solving project, the

member starts a problem-solving case in the Problem Solving Tracking System. After the member inputs basic information about the parameters of the problem, the Community Relations Section staff review it and provide the member with relevant problem solving information related to that type of problem. For instance, if the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing has published a guide on the topic, the Community Relations Section staff will note the name of the guide along with recommendations it contains for responses to the problem. So, if an officer opens a project involving crime at a motel, the Police Relations staff will share with the officer the recommendations for ways to respond from the POP guide on that subject.

The Community Relations Section consistently provides guidance to members about POP guides. Each POP guide typically contains a host of different responses for a given problem and the Police Relations staff chooses among them to identify the most appropriate, given the details of the problem being addressed. The Community Relations Section has done a good job of selecting appropriate responses, particularly in the last two quarters. There are many examples of tailored advice given. When the Community Relations Section first began providing advice, they realized they had to go back through all the old projects in the tracking system to make sure each received some guidance. They had a lot of projects to catch up with and so the guidance was not as timely as they would have liked. They have cleared up the backlog and it appears they quickly provide guidance once a case is open and preliminary analysis begins.

Where there is no POP guide for the type of problem a member has opened or additional information would be helpful, the Community Relations Section provides it to help the member turn around a problem. This might include information from civil law or about tenant's rights, or similar problem solving projects that are contained in the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing website. For instance, one member opened a project involving repeat domestic violence and the Community Relations Section recommended a successful problem-solving effort by two officers in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department.

It is less clear whether the information provided by the Community Relations Section is widely used. There are occasions where the CPD member clearly relies on the information and guidance the Community Relations Section provides, but there are many examples of efforts that ignore the most effective approaches favoring traditional responses that have already been tried with little success. The information the Community Relations Section provides is timelier now and so, perhaps, it is more likely to be adopted. This is something the Section keeps an eye on since it helps them identify training needs.

5. Collaborations with the Partnering Center, Community Groups and Other City and County Agencies in Problem-Solving Efforts

More and more, we see collaborations with other groups as part of problem-solving efforts. The CPD personnel often bring in other city agencies and sometimes county agencies to assist with projects. Officers seek help from agencies that handle code violations, tax arrears, inspections, community development, libraries, metro bus, animal control and traffic engineering. Some projects, such as CIRV and the Homicide Unit's baby fatality project, enlist a wide range of county entities as well.

In addition, Community Councils throughout the City commonly identify priority problems, as do other types of neighborhood groups that are more loosely formed, as well as different downtown associations.

There is room for closer collaboration with the Partnering Center, and this is under discussion between the City Manager and the Center's board. The Partnering Center strongly partners with the Police with its CeaseFire initiative, as well as some problem-solving efforts, and with the annual CPOP dinner and summit. Much of the joint problem-solving training with the CPD that they offered to communities in the earlier years of the Collaborative Agreement no longer occurs. Recently, the Partnering Center has concentrated its efforts in 10 of Cincinnati's neighborhoods with crime prevention initiatives, and in two neighborhoods with its CeaseFire efforts. These latter efforts aim to lower the community tolerance level for gun violence.

The CPD has developed a strong partnership with the Urban League. The League frequently hosts or co-sponsors events with the CPD. During May and June, the Urban League (in collaboration with the CPD and United Way) hosted a series of community seminars to re-introduce the CPD to the community and to open dialogues on varied topics. The flier announcing the seminars asks, "Have a question about the Cincinnati Police Department's integrity, diversity, accountability, vigilance or professionalism?" and outlines weekly seminar topics.

- May 14th seminar topics:
 - Meet your District 1 Commander
 - Organizational overview of CPD
 - How to access CPD

- May 21st seminar topics:

- Meet your District 2 Commander
- Use of force
- Racial profiling
- June 4th seminar topics:
 - Meet your District 5 Commander
 - Asset forfeiture
 - Personal safety
- June 11th seminar topics:
 - Meet your District 3 Commander
 - Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)
 - Problem solving
- June 18th seminar topics:
 - Meet your District 4 Commander
 - Cincinnati Problem Oriented Policing (CPOP) and other crime reduction initiatives (including CIRV and CeaseFire)
 - Community and CPD working better together

These seminars have been well-received. Opportunities for dialogue and discussion are always helpful.

6. Quantity of Problem-Solving

During this Transition Year, the CPD agreed to open five new problem solving projects per District per month as a means of ratcheting up the level of problem-solving in the organization. This outcome measure was flexible however; if the volume of projects at any given time sacrificed quality, the Patrol Bureau Commander, Lt. Colonel Whalen, could adjust the number of new projects.

The Parties settled on five new District problem-solving projects monthly for several reasons. Plaintiffs felt that taking on five problem solving projects monthly would have a significant impact in Cincinnati's neighborhoods. It would also mean that a significant number of CPD members would be involved in problem-solving, advancing the cultural shift in the organization that was called for in the Collaborative Agreement. As noted in the CPD's problem solving manual, "[i]n order for problem solving to become CPD's principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder, *every* officer of *every* rank is expected to engage either directly or in a support role in problem solving initiatives. This approach is no longer the responsibility of a single unit within the police

department.” Initially, the CPD believed that the level of five new problem-solving projects per District per month was doable.

In the first months of the Transition Year, the CPD also set an expectation that a problem-solving project would be opened and closed within a 30-day period. This 30-day deadline was unrealistic. At the outset, the CPD believed it could only handle new projects if the ones it had opened in the prior month were closed by month’s end. However, repeat, chronic problems are only rarely resolved quickly. While work on a project might be intermittent, it may still take quite a long time to complete, particularly if follow-up is done to assess impact. The CPD now agrees this to be the case but is concerned that the quality of the projects may suffer if too many are open at the same time. Given this concern, the CPD has adjusted the outcome measure of opening five projects per District per month.

During the last six months, the number of projects opened has rested with the District and Unit Commander. We believe once the Collaborative Agreement ends, the CPD can develop an improved system for ensuring that Districts and Units produce quality projects, while expanding the number of CPD personnel engaged in problem-solving. The CPD will want to find a balance that advances the cultural shift required. Currently, the PSTS documents approximately 130 different projects; however, as we noted last quarter only about 20 to 30 of these are actually active (this does not include those that the Police Review Section continues to monitor).

In a review of projects in the tracking system, we looked at projects developed by each District and Special Unit to try to see how extensive problem-solving is in the Department. We recognize that some projects involve many people, while others only involve one member of the CPD. We realize that some projects are more complex and will take a longer time to implement, while others are simpler and can be resolved quickly. We also recognize that not all open projects are in the same stage. For instance, most recently opened projects (May and June) have very little information in them.

The quality of the projects rather than the number of projects is a more meaningful measure of the Department’s problem-solving efforts. However, having few projects does tell us that penetration of problem-solving in the Department is low. The CPD may want to develop additional measures that help it ascertain penetration and use of problem-solving in the CPD. We did find that there is an additional value to counting the number of projects by District and Unit; it reveals the absence of some Special Units that should be participating in problem

solving. As such, it can serve as an alert to the CPD leadership to reiterate its message about broadened participation in problem-solving.

District 1

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are eight open projects in District 1. The breakdown by shift or assignment is:
 - First relief – two projects
 - Second relief – two projects
 - Third relief – two projects
 - Downtown Services – one project
 - Investigative Unit – one project

District 2

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are six open projects in District 2. The breakdown by shift or assignment is:
 - First relief – one project
 - Second relief – one project
 - Third relief – two projects
 - Violent Crimes – one project
 - Investigative Unit – one project

District 3

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are ten open projects in District 3. The breakdown by shift or assignment is:
 - First relief – four projects
 - Second relief – one project
 - Third relief – three projects
 - Violent Crimes – one project
 - Investigative Unit – one project

District 4

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are 14 open projects in District 4. The breakdown by shift or assignment is:
 - First relief – two projects

- Second relief – five project
- Third relief – three projects
- Violent Crimes – two projects
- Investigative Unit – two projects

District 5

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are 15 open projects in District 5. The breakdown by shift or assignment is:
 - First relief – five projects
 - Second relief – four project
 - Third relief – two projects
 - Violent Crimes – three project
 - Investigative Unit – one project

Other Units

- Combining the number of new projects opened since late March 2008 with the number of older projects that remain open shows there are eight open projects by “other units.” The breakdown by Special Unit is:
 - Homicide – one project
 - Youth Services – one project
 - Vice – two projects
 - Parks – one project
 - Vortex – three projects

7. Auditing of Problem Solving Efforts

The Community Relations Section developed some quality assurance and auditing mechanisms to guide their review of and provide feedback on problem-solving projects. While it is not ideal for the team that provides guidance on problem-solving to be the same team that audits problem-solving, the CPD adopted this approach to keep the process more collegial and less punitive, hoping that this is more likely to advance problem-solving in the Department. Another reason is that the Community Relations Section staff possesses the most knowledge about problem-solving in the Department and so they are suited to the task. The transition year extension agreement requires that the CPD develop and apply quality assurance and auditing mechanisms. It is hoped that these mechanisms will help ensure the institutionalization of problem solving.

The quality assurance and auditing systems the Community Relations Section developed are quite comprehensive. They collected and captured information about many aspects of each problem-solving project in the tracking system using several databases. Information collected includes:

- the date each project opened and closed
- the phase of the SARA model each project is in
- whether each specific question in the problem solving tracking system for each project is answered
- if there are any other gaps in the project
- whether projects are really problem-solving projects
- an auditing for quality of each element of the SARA model (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) for each project using a set of matrices they developed that contain multiple criteria
- the number of open, closed and inactive projects by district
- the last date that information is entered on the project,
- whether projects are prematurely closed because the CPD initially wanted projects closed within 30 days, regardless of outcome
- whether guidance from the Community Relations Section is used
- results of each assessment for each project
- assessments the Community Relations Section conduct of each problem-solving project 30 days post-closure, 60 days post-closure and 90 days post-closure by looking at calls for service and crime reports at each problem location.

It is important to recognize how seriously the Community Relations Section took their responsibility.³ However, the auditing function took up most of their time.

The group within the Community Relations Section is also tasked with becoming the Department's problem-solving experts, they also have to research problems, become familiar with and be able to relay information from the POP guides to police across all ranks, have knowledge of effective problem-solving projects developed elsewhere, keep abreast of new problem-solving initiatives in other parts of the country, work with CPD members across ranks to increase the use of problem-

³ Within the Community Relations Section, it is the Neighborhood Projects Unit that is responsible for auditing. To minimize confusion for this report, however, we refer to them as the Community Relations Section.

solving, develop and conduct problem-solving training, recommend ways to advance problem-solving in the Department and within the community, develop and teach about resources available in problem-solving crime reduction projects, and advise command staff if there are issues requiring their attention. We are not listing these responsibilities to suggest that the staff should be relieved of them. Rather, it became clear that the quality control reviews and the auditing had to be less onerous if it were to survive the end of the Collaborative Agreement transition year.

We met with this team. We believe the revised audit process they developed will reduce the time they will need to spend on auditing, but it preserves the most important aspects, which will give the CPD information about the quality and consistency of problem-solving in the Department. Under the revised auditing system, the Community Relations Section will audit every third project, not every one, and by consolidating forms and narrowing the information they collect they will save time. They have already made good use of the information they learned from the first sets of audits (identifying areas where improvement in training, procedures, processes are needed) and we believe they will do so under the new auditing process as well. The two auditing forms that supplant all the others are attached in the Appendix.

C. Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV)

The CPD continues its work with Professors David Kennedy, Robin Engel and John Eck in implementing a highly focused violence reduction project around actively violent groups of individuals. Analysis has suggested that a large share of the City's gun violence is driven by disagreements and retribution among small groups of chronic offenders.⁴ A partnership of law enforcement entities identified the key actors who generate violence in Cincinnati, the groups in which they are enmeshed, and the relationship between these groups.⁵ The CIRV combines this targeted approach with a community-based partnership among multiple law enforcement agencies, social service providers, and neighborhood leaders. A clear message is communicated to violent street groups – the violence must stop. The identified individuals have been: (1) offered an alternative to a life of violence on the street; and (2) told about the legitimate levers that the police and other agencies will use to ensure

⁴ Analysis of the 83 homicides from June 2006 to June 2007 showed that approximately 74% of homicides involved a victim and/or an offender known by law enforcement to be associated with a violent street group. *Implementation of the Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV): Year 1 Report*, April 14, 2008, University of Cincinnati Policing Institute.

⁵ The intelligence gathering resulted in an estimate of 800-1000 individuals associated with 69 known violent street groups of varying levels of violence. Of this estimate, 748 individuals associated with those groups have been identified by name.

that their violence stops if they refuse the offer of help. This message is communicated in various ways – through call-in sessions with probationers and parolees, direct contact through street workers, police, probation and parole officers, and through community outreach and media outlets. For individuals who seek assistance, employment and social service agencies and street-level advocates have developed a “life-change system” to help move these individuals to an employment-based lifestyle.

The initiative has also sought the support of the families of these individuals, as well as faith and other community leaders, to persuade them to make a more productive and responsible choice. The first two call-in sessions of the CIRV project were held on July 31, 2007. Two call-in sessions were held on October 3, 2007, and two additional call-in sessions were held on February 28, 2008. and June 26, 2008. Monitor Team members attended a number of these call-ins.

The Monitor Team has been greatly impressed with how well the sessions were organized, the hard work and commitment of all of the stakeholders, and the level of coordination among the stakeholders. The message is being delivered with true conviction, both in terms of the need to stop the violence, but also the extent to which all the stakeholders – community leaders, social service providers, and law enforcement – are interested in seeing the young men succeed in moving beyond “the life” in the streets.

CIRV is a complex, multi-agency, and community project of the sort that the CA supports. So far, the six call-in sessions involved 173 individuals (74 individuals attended more than one session) and 50 of the 69 groups identified in Cincinnati (38 of 43 high-violence groups, 11 of 19 medium-violence groups, and 1 of 7 low-violence groups). Also, since the first call-in session, over 272 individuals have contacted CIRV for services. See Appendix 2 CIRV Service Team Update, June 30, 2008 for detailed CIRV results.

While it is still relatively early to assess the impact that the CIRV has had on gun violence and homicide in Cincinnati, the coordinators of CIRV believe that CIRV has played a role in the downward trend in homicides in Cincinnati since the October call-in sessions (the CIRV team believes that at least two direct messages to street groups are necessary before behavior on the street is altered). The yearly 2007 homicide total was substantially lower than the previous two years, and much of that reduction can be attributed to reductions in homicide in the final quarter of 2007. In addition, the reduction in homicide has continued into 2008. Moreover, reduction in “group member involved”

homicides from October 2007 through March 2008 appear to be a significant reason for the decrease.

D. Systems in Place to Ensure that Problem Solving is the Principal Strategy for Addressing Crime and Safety Problems After the Transition Year is Completed

During this Transition Year, the goal was to help the CPD ratchet up the pace of adoption of problem-solving and to implement systems and improvements to ensure institutionalization of problem-solving as the principal crime fighting approach of the CPD.

The Collaborative Agreement and the transition year extension agreement identified those systems and improvements. We list some of them below:

- new job descriptions that include CPOP as a job function
- an updated personnel evaluation system that incorporates problem-solving knowledge and participation in it as rated elements
- use of a repeat databases to identify chronic locations, chronic victims, and chronic arrestees for problem-solving projects
- a problem solving tracking system
- a new RMS system and records management support that supports problem-solving (in progress)
- training for all employees in problem-solving
- FTO must now train and teach problem-solving to trainees
- new police recruits will learn about problem solving in the Academy so they will know how to do it when they graduate
- community members trained in problem solving
- dialogues between the police and different groups
- an annual CPOP award
- adoption of new CPD policies to support and require problem-solving
- an auditing and quality control system to evaluate problem-solving

These changes have now been made. These systems and improvements are important in signaling to an organization that things are shifting and these changes help support the shift to a CPOP agency. What has become evident during the course of the different agreements (the MOA, the Collaborative Agreement, the Transition Year Extension Agreement) is the power police leadership has in choosing to adopt

change and setting the pace for it. The improvements made will support the shift to CPOP, but the leadership in the police department must adopt and drive it. We believe the City, its residents, and members of the CPD are ready for this to happen.

III. EVALUATION PROTOCOL AND BIAS-FREE POLICING

A. Evaluation Protocol and the Rand Report

1. Rand Findings

In December 2007, RAND issued its third evaluation report on community-police relations in Cincinnati. Like its 2005 and 2006 Reports, the 2007 Report found that “blacks continue to bear a disproportionate share of the impact of policing in Cincinnati.” 2007 Rand Report, p. xv.

Rand’s review of traffic stops found no evidence of a department-wide pattern of racial bias in the decision to stop. When looking at what happens after the stop, black residents in Cincinnati are searched at a higher rate than nonblacks in Cincinnati and they are stopped for longer periods of time. Rand determined that much of these differences can be attributed to factors such as the location and time of the stop, the reason for the stop, and whether the driver in the traffic stop had a valid driver’s license.

As in the previous two Rand reports, the 2007 report includes a review of over 300 randomly sampled video recordings of Cincinnati traffic stops. In reviewing stops of black drivers by white and black officers, and stops of white drivers by white and black officers, Rand’s findings suggest that black and white officers are policing differently. Rand found a consistent pattern that white officers are more likely to look into cars in an effort to obtain probable cause, require identification from passengers, and stop cars for equipment and registration violations. This suggests “that white officers are using more proactive police tactics in their traffic stops, using the traffic stop as a means to investigate possible drugs, weapons or warrants” (p. 58).

2. Response to Rand Findings

In our last Report, we stated that it is now up to the Cincinnati community to “fully and fairly” put these findings to use, as called for by the CA. We further noted, even if the many ongoing CPOP projects that employ more targeted and precise police tactics prove successful in reducing crime and improving police-community relations, the goals of

the CA will not be met unless the CPD is also able to address the daily interactions between police officers and African American residents.

For the third year in a row, the Friends of the Collaborative conducted a Forum on the RAND Report-Police Community Relations in Cincinnati. The February 5, 2008 forum featured an overview of the 2007 RAND Report by Greg Ridgeway, Acting Director of RAND's Safety and Justice Programs, and a panel discussion on traffic stops featuring Chief Thomas Streicher, ACLU Attorney Al Gerhardstein, the Monitor and several police officers. The forum did not result in concrete steps to examine the traffic stop issues raised in the RAND Reports.

City Manager Milton Dohoney has recently convened several meetings where the traffic stop issues identified by RAND have been examined. These meetings are attended by Chief Streicher, members of the CPD command staff, and community members. These dialogues provide an excellent opportunity for progress on this important issue.

RAND will issue its final comprehensive report on police-community relations in Cincinnati at the end of 2008, followed by a small report in 2009 that just analyzes and summarizes 2008 traffic stop data.

B. Collaborative Agreement Communications Plan

The CA calls for an ongoing community dialogue and interaction between the CPD and numerous stakeholders, such as youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other city residents. The Evaluation Protocol section of the CA also calls on the Parties to use the data from the evaluation to improve police-community relations and assess whether any actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results.

The Parties have agreed that part of the efforts of the Transition Year will be a project to communicate the progress of the CA to stakeholder groups in the community, and to seek and respond to input from the community regarding their views on public safety, racial fairness, and police policies, practices and strategies. The communication initiative has obtained funding from Better Together Cincinnati and the Andrus Family Foundation to continue the communication effort. A diverse team of facilitators representing Friends organizations and community representatives has been convened to coordinate the community dialogue and input to the project.

Key "message elements" that have been developed by participants were outlined in our last report. The Parties hope to tell the story in an

engaging way, to communicate the impact of the Collaborative through individual examples and the voices of the Parties and members of the community, and to convey that various stakeholders and constituencies still have different perspectives(including folks whose interactions with the CPD have not all been good, especially youth). What is important in this effort is that the communication will not be one-sided.

The communication initiative will engage citizens and police in a continuing two-way dialogue that will provide opportunities to report the continuing reforms, acknowledge what's going well and where improvement is needed and to provide process transparency to shape future police-community relations in Cincinnati.

Appendix 1: Revised Problem-Solving Project Audit Forms

Audit Date: July 11, 2008

NPU officer: Werner

Last Audit Date: March 21, 2008

PSTS #		Inactive 30+ Days (from date of audit: include last entry date)	Lacks specifics in Analysis	Response started prior to adequate analysis	Primary Response is Arrest / Saturation	Project does not fit the definition of CPOP problem	Project closed prematurely (inadequate response and/or assessment)	No change since last audit	Other Issues
D6-2008-	000111	2/23/2008	x	x	x			x	
D6-2008-	000234				x	x			

PSTS #		NPU Response Used?	Closure Date	Type of Closure	Closures: IR - Inc Reduced; HR - Harm Reduced; EP - Problem Eliminated; PI - Problem Handling Improved; TP - Temp Closure	6 month Audit Results	12 month Audit Results
					Miscellaneous Info	Have Results been Sustained?	
D1-2007-	000011	Audit Only	11/1/07	EP			
D1-2007-	000015	Audit Only					
D1-2007-	000017	Audit Only	11/17/07	TP			
D1-2007-	000018	Yes	1/31/08	IR			
D1-2007-	000049	Audit Only	1/18/08	HR			
D2-2007-	000013	Audit Only	12/5/07	IR			
D2-2007-	000023	Audit Only	11/23/07	IR			
D2-2007-	000025	No	12/6/07	IR			
D2-2007-	000036	Yes					
D2-2007-	000061	Audit Only	1/13/08	IR			
D2-2007-	000073	Yes					
D2-2008-							

**Appendix 2: Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV)
Service Team Update
June 30, 2008**

There have been a total of 278 individuals who have contacted CIRV for services (45 in Wave 1¹, 135 in Wave 2, and 98 in Wave 3).

- 242 (87.1 %) of those individuals have been engaged into the program (32 in Wave 1¹, 114 in Wave 2, and 96 in Wave 3).
- 3 (1.1%) of the 278 were Non-CIRV Clients.
- The following tables are based on available data on individuals who completed the needs/services assessment and individual goal plans.

Table 1: Client Demographics at Intake Assessment

	Total (All Waves: N=242)		
	Valid N ²	n ³	Valid %
Average Age	242	29.4	
Male	242	233	(96.3)
Black	242	230	(95.0)
Single	151	132	(87.4)
Have Children	152	107	(70.4)
Average # of Children	107	2.5	
<HS Diploma at Intake	234	99	(42.3)
Unemployed at Intake	241	222	(92.1)
Felony Record at Intake	147	126	(85.1)
Attended a Call-in Session	242	38	(15.7)

CIRV-identified	242	44	(18.2)
Street Worker Identified	242	198	(81.8)

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present.

²Valid N refers to the number of valid cases existing for the given variable.

³n refers to the number of cases with the given attribute.

Table 2: Intake Services Provided to CIRV Clients

	Wave 1 (N=32) ¹		Wave 2 (N=114)		Wave 3 (N=96)		Wave 4 (N=)		Total (N=242)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Contacted by Street Worker within 2 days of Initial Contact	26	(81.3)	110	(96.5)	94	(97.9)			230	(95.0)
Assessment Scheduled within 5 days of Initial Contact	20	(62.5)	110	(96.5)	96	(100.0)			226	(93.4)
Assessment Completed within 10 days of Initial Contact	25	(78.1)	111	(97.4)	96	(100.0)			232	(95.9)
Assigned a Street Worker	30	(93.8)	111	(97.4)	89	(92.7)			230	(95.0)

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present.

Table 3: Assessment Completed: Services Requested and Provided to CIRV Clients

	Wave 1 (N=32) ¹		Wave 2 (N=114)		Wave 3 (N=96)		Wave 4 (N=)		Total (N=242)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Requested employment services ²	32	(100.00)	111	(97.4)	95	(99.0)			238	(98.3)
Requested education assistance ³	23	(71.9)	65	(57.0)	37	(38.5)			125	(51.7)
Attended support group	13	(40.6)	43	(37.7)	30	(31.3)			86	(35.5)

Substance abuse treatment	3	(9.4)	4	(3.5)	2	(2.1)	9	(3.7)
Anger management	3	(9.4)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	3	(1.2)
Housing assistance requested	13	(40.6)	5	(4.4)	1	(1.0)	19	(7.9)
Counseling	1	(3.1)	1	(0.9)	0	(0.0)	2	(0.8)
Parenting assistance	5	(15.6)	38	(33.3)	14	(14.6)	57	(23.6)
Transportation assistance	12	(37.5)	32	(28.1)	16	(16.7)	60	(24.8)
Mental health treatment	1	(3.1)	2	(1.8)	1	(1.0)	4	(1.7)
Health care assistance	2	(6.3)	3	(2.6)	0	(0.0)	5	(2.1)
Credit recovery assistance	2	(6.3)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	2	(0.8)

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present; ²See Table 4 for a detailed description of the employment services; ³See Table 5 for a detailed description of the requested education assistance.

Table 4: Employment Services by Current Disposition

	Wave 1 (N=32)¹		Wave 2 (N=111)		Wave 3 (N=95)		Wave 4 (N=)		Total (N=238)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Assigned Job Readiness	27	(84.4)	104	(93.7)	52	(54.7)			183	(76.9)
Started Job Readiness	22	(68.8)	74	(66.7)	50	(52.6)			146	(61.3)
Completed Job Readiness	16	(50.0)	49	(44.1)	33	(34.7)			98	(41.2)
Began Job Search	16	(50.0)	50	(45.0)	33	(34.7)			99	(41.6)
Obtained Employed	14	(43.8)	35	(30.7)	15	(15.6)			64	(26.4)

Retained Employment	7	(21.9)	28	(24.6)	11	(11.5)	46	(19.3)
---------------------	---	--------	----	--------	----	--------	----	--------

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present.

Table 5: Requested Education Assistance by Type

	Wave 1 (N=23) ¹		Wave 2 (N=65)		Wave 3 (N=37)		Wave 4 (N=)		Total (N=125)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
High School	0	(0.0)	1	(1.5)	0	(0.0)			1	(0.8)
GED	14	(60.9)	49	(75.4)	33	(89.2)			96	(76.8)
Vocational Training	5	(21.7)	6	(9.2)	3	(8.1)			14	(11.2)
College	4	(17.4)	9	(13.8)	1	(2.7)			14	(11.2)

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present.

Table 6: Client Status by Type for Assessed Individuals

	Wave 1 (N=32) ¹		Wave 2 (N=114)		Wave 3 (N=96)		Wave 4 (N=)		Total (N=242)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Active in Services	16	(50.0)	70	(61.4)	88	(91.7)			174	(71.9)
Currently Incarcerated	7	(21.9)	15	(13.2)	2	(2.1)			24	(9.9)
Unable to Locate	0	(0.0)	6	(5.3)	1	(1.0)			7	(2.9)
Decided Not to Participate	5	(15.6)	8	(7.0)	0	(0.0)			13	(5.4)

Client Deceased	1	(3.1)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	1	(0.4)
Client Moved	0	(0.0)	1	(0.9)	2	(2.1)	3	(1.2)
Inactive (Unknown/Other)	3	(9.4)	14	(12.3)	3	(3.1)	20	(8.3)

¹Wave 1: 7/31/2007 to 10/2/2007; Wave 2: 10/3/2007 to 2/27/08; Wave 3: 2/28/08 to 6/25/08; Wave 4: 6/26/08 to Present. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

DELIB:2991082.1\121694-00001