

**Proposal for
A New Direction for
The Minneapolis Police Department's
Community Crime Prevention/Safety for Everyone
(CCP/SAFE) Program**

**A Report to
The Public Safety and Regulatory Services Committee
Of the Minneapolis City Council**

October 17, 2001

I. Context for This Project

Since 1978, the city of Minneapolis has operated a specialized unit of city employees dedicated to community crime prevention. In 1991, this unit was transferred into the Police Department. Now called Community Crime Prevention/Safety For Everyone (CCP/SAFE), the unit has more than 60 field staff and a 2001 budget of \$4.4 million.

On a broader context, the Police Department has been in the midst of implementing a strategy – called CODEFOR – that decentralizes authority and accountability for results to the precinct level. Part of the CODEFOR strategy is to capture and analyze crime data at a precinct – and sometimes “lower” – level. In addition, CCP/SAFE teams are being decentralized so that they are both physically located in the precincts and under the direct control of the precinct commanders.

In recent years, city leaders have expressed concern about the direction of the CCP/SAFE program. The City Council included a footnote in the December 1999 budget resolution instructing the Police Department to “review CCP/SAFE, specifically to review the position of CCP Manager and address the middle management within CCP/SAFE.” In response, the Department requested that the city’s Management Analysis Division conduct a review of the CCP/SAFE program. Completed in October 2000, that review identified eight “issue areas.” These were:

- Need to clarify mission and program priorities
- Consistency versus flexibility in program delivery across teams and precincts
- Need to better define program performance measures
- Communication issues
- Community satisfaction issues
- Need to improve coordination with other departments
- Clarification of management structure, authority, and roles
- Staffing issues

In an effort to address some of these issues, in May 2001 the Police Department hired The Public Strategies Group (PSG), a management consulting firm located in St. Paul, to facilitate a process that would **achieve agreement among the Mayor, City Council, and Chief of Police regarding CCP/SAFE’s mission, goals, core strategies, and performance measures.**

II. Process

The process proposed by PSG and agreed to by the Police Department was driven by the guiding principle that Minneapolis residents – as the customers, or primary intended beneficiaries of CCP/SAFE – should be given the strongest voice in establishing the future direction of the program. The full process involved a number of steps.

First, PSG convened a project steering committee to help guide the implementation of the project. The steering committee included Council Members Joe Biernat, Jim Niland, and Paul Ostrow; Mayor's aide Ron Thaniel; Deputy Chiefs of Police Greg Hestness and Richard Schultz; and CCP/SAFE Managers John Baumann and Steve Sizer.

In May and June, PSG consultants gathered information related to CCP/SAFE and its future from key city government stakeholders and a cross section of city residents and business owners. PSG conducted one-on-one interviews with all city Council Members, the Mayor, the Chief of Police, two Deputy Chiefs, the City Coordinator, and the Police Department's Director of Internal Services (a former director of the CCP/SAFE program).

In addition, PSG facilitated a number of group interviews with the following categories of stakeholders: precinct commanders, police lieutenants, CCP/SAFE managers, supervisors, and front-line staff (officers and crime prevention specialists). PSG also conducted two group interviews with Minneapolis residents and business owners. Finally, PSG distributed short surveys to all members of the CCP/SAFE staff and to 800 block leaders throughout the city. The questions used in the interviews and surveys are included in the Appendix.

PSG synthesized the gathered data into themes to be used by a panel of citizens that was charged with making recommendations to Minneapolis city leaders regarding the future direction of the CCP/SAFE program. Each Council Member and the Mayor selected two individuals from their ward (citywide for the Mayor) to participate on the panel, for a total of 28 potential participants

Each invitee was asked to attend a series of three three-hour meetings (later expanded to four meetings) during July and August to consider all the information gathered and – along with their own experience and insight – use it to formulate recommendations on the future mission, goals, and strategies for the program. Of the 28 possible participants, 18 attended at least one meeting.

During the panel meetings, the citizens carefully analyzed the gathered information and began creating a draft of the recommendations. After the second panel meeting, an initial draft of recommended program mission and goals was circulated to the Mayor, City Council Members, and the Chief of Police for their comments and suggestions. At the third panel meeting, the citizens reviewed all feedback provided and made some adjustments to their original recommendations. They then developed high-level strategies that they believe should be pursued in order to achieve the recommended goals. The citizen panel concluded its work at the end of August.

III. Recommendations of the Citizen Panel

The citizen panel was charged to produce recommendations to Minneapolis city leaders regarding the future direction of the CCP/SAFE program. Specifically, the panel was asked to make recommendations on the following:

- Mission: A short statement of the program's purpose
- Goals: A set of results on which the program is to focus that will advance its mission
- Core Strategies: A set of services and approaches that the program should use in order to produce the goals and advance the mission

Below is the final set of recommendations from the citizen panel. In addition, the project steering committee has added some additional guidance and/or options for the Public Safety and Regulatory Services Committee to consider. These are presented in *italics*.

Mission

The purpose of the CCP/SAFE program should be to:

Enhance safety and livability in Minneapolis

[Option: Enhance safety and livability in Minneapolis through police-community partnerships]

Goals and Performance Measures

The CCP/SAFE program should focus on achievement of all of the following results. These goals are not listed in any particular order; each is critical to enhancing safety and livability in Minneapolis. Beneath each goal are listed performance measures by which the city can assess the degree to which the goals are being achieved.

GOAL #1: Reduce Crime

- Change in rate of number of Part I/Part II crimes committed (those crimes targeted by SAFE teams)
- Rating by residents and business owners of their perception of safety in their neighborhood

GOAL #2: Increase Community Involvement and Capacity to Address Safety, Stability, and Livability Issues

- Rating by residents and business owners of their level of involvement in addressing safety and livability issues in their neighborhood
- Percentage of residents and business owners surveyed who indicate they regularly participate in their block club or similar type of community crime prevention activity
- Number of residents and business owners who participate in block-club meetings
- Number of residents and business owners who attend CCP/SAFE-sponsored training programs

GOAL #3: Increase CCP/SAFE and Police Department Responsiveness to Community Members and Community Needs

- Ratings by residents and business owners of the responsiveness of their CCP/SAFE team and the police department in general
- Percentage of CCP/SAFE Team Work Plan goals/tasks/initiatives completed

GOAL #4: Increase the Amount of Community-Oriented Policing Performed by Other Parts of the Police Department

- Percentage of residents and business owners who can identify by name an officer serving their neighborhood
- Number (percentage?) of “regular” officers receiving training on community policing techniques
- Number of officer-hours of community policing training delivered

GOAL #5: Increase the Continuity of CCP/SAFE Staff

- Percentage of CCP/SAFE districts served by the same person (at least one of the two members of the team) for more than 2 years
- Average tenure (in months) of intact two-person CCP/SAFE teams
- Rating by residents and business owners of the quality of “hand-off” whenever there is a change in personnel on their CCP/SAFE team

The panel recognizes that CCP/SAFE is not in a position to control whether all of these results are achieved. However, the panel wants CCP/SAFE to focus on influencing them in a positive direction, measuring whether they are being achieved, and finding people and organizations that can help impact these results.

Core Strategies

The CCP/SAFE program should pursue the following strategies in order to produce the goals listed above. Some of these strategies are new; others will be enhancements to existing CCP/SAFE work; and others may represent continuation of existing CCP/SAFE strategies. The strategies are organized below based on the goal that they most directly impact; of course, most of these strategies impact multiple goals. And, the citizen panel believes that all of these strategies collectively will advance the goal of reducing crime.

Strategies to Increase Community Involvement and Capacity

- **Customize CCP/SAFE’s community organizing approach to meet neighborhoods’ unique needs, assets, history, and culture.**
 - Neighborhoods need to establish their own vision and approach for getting residents and businesses positively engaged in addressing safety and livability issues – including if and how block clubs are used.
 - One element of the vision should be the kinds of capabilities/capacity that the neighborhood needs to achieve its vision. These might include conflict resolution, information sharing, fund raising, etc.
- **Assist neighborhoods in developing an action plan for increasing community involvement and capacity around safety and livability issues.**
 - The action plan would define the concrete steps that the neighborhood plans to pursue in the coming year to move forward on its vision. In some neighborhoods, the NRP process may have already generated an action plan that can be used.
 - The plan should also identify the individuals and organizations in the neighborhood that will be responsible for leading and participating in those efforts.
 - CCP/SAFE should identify and/or provide appropriate resources (i.e., training, Block Connections grants) to assist neighborhoods in the implementation of their action plans
- **Focus an outreach initiative to include, involve, and communicate with members of recent immigrant communities**
 - **CCP/SAFE should launch a coordinated effort among its teams to reach out to members of immigrant communities, many of which cross traditional neighborhood and even municipal boundaries. The purpose of this outreach and relationship building is to educate members of these communities regarding how CCP/SAFE and the rest of the police department can serve their community and how they can get involved in community crime prevention activities.**
 - **As part of this outreach effort, CCP/SAFE should identify recognized leaders of these communities, develop relationships with them, and attend their meetings, as appropriate**
 - **Since the communities cross neighborhood and municipal boundaries, CCP/SAFE teams will need to work together on this initiative, as well as to coordinate with agencies in other municipalities that serve these communities**
- **Create a record of neighborhood safety and livability “victories” and celebrate them.**

Strategies to Increase CCP/SAFE and Police Department Responsiveness

- **Create neighborhood work plans for CCP/SAFE teams**
 - **Each CCP/SAFE team should collaborate with its assigned neighborhoods to create neighborhood work plans** that cover a given time frame (i.e., 6 months or 1 year).
 - The work plan would outline the following:
 - The high-priority results that the team is expected to produce
 - The key activities that the team will perform to produce those results
 - The resource commitments that the community, other parts of the precinct, **other functions within the department and within CCP/SAFE itself (such as the family services function)**, and other parts of city government will make in support of those activities
 - The resource commitments that the team must make to support other Police Department activities
 - Each CCP/SAFE team would convene a group of neighborhood advisors to clarify the expectations and priorities for that team for next 6-12 months. The type of participants will likely vary across the city; possible examples include:
 - **Block Club leaders**
 - **Precinct Advisory Council members**
 - **Neighborhood organizations**
 - **Rental property owners associations**
 - **Other business and community leaders, including leaders of immigrant communities**
 - **The relevant City Council Member(s)**

Part of the process should also include testing the work plan for alignment with the priorities of the relevant sector and/or precinct.

- Each CCP/SAFE team – along with their supervisor – would report back regularly to the group of neighborhood advisors regarding its progress on the work plan and get feedback on its performance. The team would adjust its work plan (in collaboration with the advisory group) based on this feedback as well as other developments in the neighborhood.
 - The work plan would become the vehicle by which CCP/SAFE teams are integrated into the Department’s CODEFOR process. The teams would periodically report on their progress against their work plan goals during CODEFOR meetings.
- **Share useful, timely information with neighborhoods**
 - Each CCP/SAFE team should determine the key information needs for the neighborhood(s) that it serves and focus on delivering this information in a timely and understandable manner.
 - The types of information that neighborhoods might request include:
 - Crime statistics and education about how to interpret them
 - Crime-prevention toolkits, including seasonal safety-oriented reminders
 - Inventory of safety and livability resources available to residents and businesses, including how-to guides on accessing other police and city services
 - Lists of individuals and businesses in the communities that want to be identified as potential participants in safety and livability activities
 - A calendar of neighborhood events and activities
 - Information should not be restricted to only data about the immediate neighborhood. Residents often want to “see the whole picture” of what is happening in their precinct and/or adjoining neighborhoods
 - The mechanisms through which information is shared should also be customized based on the neighborhood. CCP/SAFE should use multiple communication channels if necessary in order to meet the access needs of residents and businesses, including:
 - Websites
 - E-mail

- Automated telephone dialers
 - Community center postings
 - Neighborhood newspapers
 - **Block Club distribution**
- CCP/SAFE must also strive to deliver information to residents in languages other than English whenever appropriate
- **Link neighborhoods with other parts of the police department and appropriate city, county, and state agencies**
 - The role of CCP/SAFE will likely vary from case-to-case; CCP/SAFE should be explicit in advance about which role that it will play.
 - Conveyor of information to neighborhood about how to interact with the relevant agencies by providing the correct contact person, the information that will be required, and the process to expect.
 - Facilitator of interaction between neighborhood and relevant agencies around a particular issue
 - Advocate on behalf of the neighborhood with the relevant agencies, especially in cases where language or other conditions create significant barriers to effective interaction
 - CCP/SAFE should create and distribute “protocols” regarding the role it plays in responding to certain “routine” requests from citizens
- **Develop centralized resources to strengthen and standardize the city’s enforcement of laws related to rental licensing and public nuisance (“problem properties”)**
 - CCP/SAFE teams should continue to be the initial point of contact for neighborhoods to file complaints; the teams should gather the information, make an initial assessment of the situation, and, if appropriate, initiate the first notification to the property owner.
 - As part of their efforts to resolve the situation, the CCP/SAFE team should request a face-to-face meeting with the property owner at which CCP/SAFE clarifies the expectations of the property owner to correct the presenting problems and provides the owner with training and/or links to outside resources.
 - If the property owner does not fulfill his/her obligations to correct the problem, the CCP/SAFE team will refer the case to a centralized team that will handle disposition of the case from that moment forward **This team could either be comprised of CCP/SAFE staff experienced in handling these types of cases, or it could be a function assigned to an already existing team, such as the Problem Properties Task Force. This latter option would involve rechartering the task force in order to give it accountability for outcomes of cases, rather than coordination.**
 - **That team would** be responsible for the following:
 - Documenting the facts of the case (beyond what the original CCP/SAFE team has already done), including taking “impact statements” from effected neighborhood residents and gathering information from other city and county agencies
 - Based on the information gathered, determining whether and how the city should proceed on the case
 - Completing and assembling the required paperwork, etc. to bring the case either to the Rental Licensing Board or the County Attorney’s office
 - Providing both the CCP/SAFE team and interested parties from the neighborhood with regular updates on the status of the case.
 - The centralized team would be expected to establish a priority list of the cases so that CCP/SAFE teams and neighborhood residents could have some sense of how quickly the cases would be handled. In addition, the

teams should create service standards regarding how frequently they will report back to the CCP/SAFE team on the status of the case.

- ***OPTION: Maintain responsibility for resolution of “problem properties” with the local CCP/SAFE team and create a standardized process for how such cases are handled throughout the city***
 - *CCP/SAFE will create a city-wide process that promotes consistency regarding how rental licensing and public nuisance statutes are enforced*
 - *CCP/SAFE will develop a common handbook, forms, and tracking system to support this process*

Strategies to Increase Community-Oriented Policing in the Police Department

The citizen panel placed a very high priority on this goal; however, it recognized that CCP/SAFE has limited resources to impact the rest of the police department. While they would like to see more done to increase community policing practices in the rest of the department, these are the strategies that they believe are reasonable to expect CCP/SAFE to pursue.

- **Integrate Other Officers from the Precinct into CCP/SAFE Activities**
 - Other officers in the department should attend CCP/SAFE community meetings in their sectors/precincts
 - Other officers should **work** with CCP/SAFE teams in order to meet community members and build trust

- **Integrate CCP/SAFE “Curriculum” into Regular Police Training**
 - The department should require other officers to attend some form of training related to CCP/SAFE activities and methods, much as they are currently required to attend CRT training.
 - CCP/SAFE and the department should seek out grant funds to support activities and programs specifically designed to introduce community policing techniques into the rest of the department

Strategies to Increase Continuity of CCP/SAFE Staff

- **Make the SAFE Officer Position the Best Job in the Department**
 - Give CCP/SAFE officers the same or better benefits (i.e., flexible shifts) as other officer positions
 - Create meaningful recognition for CCP/SAFE teams' accomplishments across the whole department
 - Create an explicit expectation for CCP/SAFE officers to make the program more visible in other parts of the department (as well as other city, county, and state agencies) and reward/recognize those that do it
 - Be sure that the job descriptions for both officer and civilian CCP/SAFE positions accurately reflect the skills, knowledge, and abilities required to deliver on these strategies
- **Make Learning a Cornerstone of the CCP/SAFE Program**
 - Teams should regularly share and debrief cases and other experiences with other teams. This could be face-to-face or through some kind of electronic discussion group or database.
 - Create a database "promising practices" for enhancing community safety and livability. Make it accessible not only to CCP/SAFE teams but also residents and business owners.
 - Use the department's CODEFOR meetings as an opportunity to learn from CCP/SAFE activities
 - Invest in training and development of CCP/SAFE staff and key community partners (i.e., block leaders, PAC members, business owners, etc.) regarding how to apply innovative tools and techniques for enhancing safety and livability in the city
 - Make the "hand-offs" that occur when there is a change in CCP/SAFE staff as seamless as possible. Both the incoming and outgoing employee have an obligation to transfer information about the team's neighborhood work plan, existing cases and issues, and important neighborhood dynamics and trends. To the maximum extent possible, the outgoing team member should introduce the new team member to key individuals in the neighborhood.

RECOMMENDATION

This report, provided by Public Strategies Group, was designed to achieve agreement among the Mayor, City Council, and Chief of Police regarding CCPSAFE's mission, goals, core strategies, and performance measures. These stakeholders along with MPD staff and the Community informed this process. However, after being informed by the opinions of the other stakeholders, it was the Citizen Panel that generated the bulk of recommendations contained herein. We concluded that while all stakeholders clearly have an interest in CCPSAFE, it exists first and foremost to serve the Community.

We are substantially in agreement with the Citizen Panel with regard to the adoption and implementation of the report. There are however two areas where the Department differs somewhat with the recommendation of the Citizen Panel:

- 1) Mission. The Steering Committee and the Department recommend that the mission statement be revised to read, “**Enhance safety and liveability in Minneapolis through police community partnerships**”. We believe this more accurately reflects the nature of CCPSAFE. We ask that Council endorse this alternative.
- 2) Problem Properties. The Citizen Panel recommended that probably two central management teams be created to handle the rental licensing and public nuisance (Problem Properties) processes. Chief Olson and the Department acknowledge the need **to align consistency, authority, and accountability**, but believe there may be better alternative approaches. In a more austere budget climate we wish to avoid adding unnecessary expense and positions.

The Department believes a change in the charge of the Problem Properties Taskforce, from a resource collaborative, to a body that has both authority and accountability, would be one way of making better use of existing resources. SAFE staff have their thoughts as well about improving our approach. We recommend the Council direct the Department, as part of the implementation of this report, to develop a Problem Properties strategy delivers within the above principles.

We ask that City Council provide the Police Department direction to carry out the recommendations of the report. We would also ask that Council direct the Department to report back on progress in the adoption of the **recommendations by July 1, 2002.**

III. Appendix

General Questions Used in One-on-One and Group Interviews

- What do you consider to be the purpose of the CCP/SAFE program?
- How well do you believe CCP/SAFE is doing at accomplishing that purpose? What are the indicators you use to base this opinion on?
- What do you think CCP/SAFE does particularly well?
- Where do you think CCP/SAFE can improve?
- What services would you like to see from CCP/SAFE that are not currently performed today? What services do you think they should stop performing?
- How should the city measure the performance of the CCP/SAFE program?
- How should the goals and strategies of CCP/SAFE be aligned with CODEFOR and other city and police department strategies?
- Which elements/services of CCP/SAFE should be standardized across the city? Which should be customized at the neighborhood/ward/precinct level?

CCP/SAFE Staff Survey Questions

- In 10 words or less, what do you believe the primary purpose/mission of the CCP/SAFE program should be?
- What are the three (3) most important services/strategies that the CCP/SAFE program should provide to Minneapolis neighborhoods in order to achieve that mission? (These could be things currently being done or new things)
- What performance measures should be used to regularly assess whether the CCP/SAFE program is successful?
- Which CCP/SAFE services/strategies should be standardized across the city?
- Which CCP/SAFE services/strategies should be customized to particular neighborhoods or precincts?

Block Leader Survey Questions

- In 10 words or less, what do you believe the primary purpose/mission of the CCP/SAFE program should be?
- What are the three (3) most important services that the CCP/SAFE program should provide to Minneapolis neighborhoods in order to achieve that mission? (Note: these could be existing services or new services)
- How should the City measure whether the CCP/SAFE program is successful at achieving that mission?

Citizen Panel Invitees

Mary Ann Anglim
John Cevette
Patrick Ciernia
Bill Dane
Don Davis
Sheila Dingels
Eric Guida
Janice Hamilton
Al Kelly
Kathy Kittleson
Paul Kjornes
Mary Kay Krutchen
Ray Lewis
Beth Minehart
Mary Ellen Mueller
Lorraine Pittman
Maurice Prater
Michael Rainville
Tom Reid
Dick Saunders
Rachel Shield
Shirlee Stone
Joan Thom
Myrtle Vickla
Elizabeth Whitbeck
Pierre Willette