

VERA INSTITUTE

LIBRARY

1206

---

---

**THE COMMUNITY PATROL OFFICER PROGRAM**

Community-oriented Policing in the New York City Police Department  
Interim Progress Report Number 2

---

---



**C.P.O.P.**

**C**OMMUNITY  
**P**ATROL **O**FFICER **P**ROGRAM

---

---

Michael J. Farrell

May, 1986

Vera Institute of Justice  
377 Broadway  
New York, N.Y. 10013



## ABSTRACT

In June, 1984, the New York City Police Department implemented a pilot Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP) in Brooklyn's 72nd Precinct. Based on the early results from the pilot, the Department began, in January, 1985, a careful expansion of CPOP, implementing it in additional precincts. By the end of that year, CPOP was operating in 31 of the City's 75 Precincts.

This report reviews the implementation and operation of CPOP in the first 21 Precincts to which it was expanded. (The last 10 Precincts, added to the program on November 3, 1985, are omitted from this review because of the relatively short time they have been operating.) The principal purpose of this report is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the CPOP concept and of its institutionalization, to date. To prepare this report, Vera and the Department's Office of Management Analysis and Planning reviewed CPOP operations in the 21 precincts. This review included an examination of each CPOP Unit's operating statistics, interviews with each unit's command and supervisory personnel, team meetings with the CPOs in each of the 21 Precincts, and interviews with the District Manager of each Community Planning Board in which a CPOP Unit is located.

In expanding CPOP beyond the 72nd Precinct pilot, the Police Department adopted an Expansion Implementation Plan which relies heavily on a replication of the pilot model in the expansion precincts. In addition, a CPOP training program, based on the experience gained in the pilot, was developed and implemented. As a result of these efforts, expansion has proceeded very smoothly. All of the 21 Precinct CPOP Units are operating in accordance with program design, and there is ample evidence that the initial goals of the program are being successfully met.

Personnel assigned as Community Patrol Officers in these CPOP Units have been extremely active, both in law enforcement efforts and in community service activities. In the higher activity commands, the level of enforcement activity (arrests and summonses) by CPOs rivals that of personnel assigned to Anti/Crime units. Unit Program Activities (e.g., Senior Citizen Escort Programs, Drug Awareness Workshops, Youth Sports Leagues, etc.), developed in each of the commands, have been directed at addressing a wide variety of crime prevention and service improvement needs, and have been warmly received by community residents.

A review of disciplinary and other records indicates that while the Department has granted the CPOs a greater degree of latitude in performing their duties than that given to officers assigned to normal patrol functions, this has not resulted in the creation of any substantial disciplinary or misconduct problems. Indeed, the data may suggest that the CPOs are subject to disciplinary actions and civilian complaints at a rate lower than that that experienced by officers assigned to normal patrol duties.

The Community Patrol Officer Program has generated overwhelming support both from precinct commanders and from community residents. District Managers of the Community Planning Boards served by the 21 CPOP Units are unanimous in their praise of Unit operations.

While this review of CPOP operations identified some problem areas, all of these result from the rapid pace of program expansion, and are the foreseeable start-up problems of an institutionalization. They are modest in comparison with the problems encountered in institutionalization of some other programs, and all of them can be successfully addressed by the Police Department in the next program year.

The conceptual and operational development of this program has advanced considerably during the past year. More has been accomplished in this brief period than would have been reasonably hoped for, given that CPOP is the Police Department's first large scale test of community-oriented policing concepts. While the initial success of CPOP must be credited to the Sergeants and Police Officers assigned to the Precinct CPOP Units, credit must be shared with the supervisory personnel assigned to the Chief of Patrol's Office and the Office of Management Analysis and Planning, who developed, implemented and coordinated the expansion effort.

## CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose of This Report . . . . .	3
I. Background . . . . .	7
A. Expansion Implementation Plan . . . . .	9
1. Precinct Selection and Initial Orientation . . . . .	9
2. Precinct Level Planning . . . . .	10
3. Selection of Community Patrol Officers . . . . .	11
4. Promoting Community Involvement . . . . .	11
5. CPOP Training . . . . .	11
B. Departmental Support for the Expansion . . . . .	13
1. Replication of the pilot model . . . . .	14
2. Command Support . . . . .	14
3. Clear Policy Communication . . . . .	14
4. Uniform Training . . . . .	14
5. Dissemination of Program Information . . . . .	15
6. Follow-up and Control . . . . .	15
II. Community Patrol Officer Program Operations . . . . .	16
A. Organization . . . . .	16
B. Logistics . . . . .	18
C. Conceptual Aspects of CPOP Operations . . . . .	21
1. Goal Orientation . . . . .	21
2. Flexibility . . . . .	22
3. Beat Responsibility and Accountability . . . . .	23
4. Community Involvement . . . . .	24
5. Unit Program Activities . . . . .	25
D. Dimensions of the CPO Role . . . . .	25
1. Planner . . . . .	25
2. Problem Solver . . . . .	26
3. Community Organizer . . . . .	26
4. Information Exchange Link . . . . .	27
E. Day-to-day Operations of CPOP Units . . . . .	28
1. Work Hours . . . . .	28
2. Beginning The Tour . . . . .	29
3. Routine CPO Patrol Operations . . . . .	30
4. Off Patrol and Administrative Time . . . . .	32
a. Off Street Time Incidental to Routine Patrol . . . . .	32
b. Scheduled Off Street Time . . . . .	32
c. Operational Activity at the Station House . . . . .	32
d. Administrative Time . . . . .	33
5. Unit Program Activities . . . . .	33

RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF CPOP OPERATIONS IN 21 COMMANDS . . .	35
III. Community Patrol Officer Activity Levels - Quantitative Measures . . . . .	36
A. Enforcement Activity -- Arrest and Summons . . . . .	41
B. Other-than-enforcement, and Community Service Activities . . . . .	43
1. Removal of Abandoned Vehicles . . . . .	43
2. Attendance at Community Meetings . . . . .	44
3. Recruitment of Block Watchers . . . . .	44
4. Security Surveys . . . . .	46
5. Community Organizing . . . . .	47
6. Unit Program Activities . . . . .	48
a. Drug Awareness Workshops -- 72nd Pct . . . . .	50
b. Community Awareness Program - 63rd Pct. . . . .	52
IV. Qualitative Assessment of CPOP Operations in the 21 Commands. . . . .	54
A. Implementation of the Program in the Expansion Pcts. . . . .	54
B. Command Support . . . . .	57
C. Program Expansion within the Twenty-one Pcts.. . . .	60
D. Personnel Concerns . . . . .	61
1. Role Development . . . . .	62
2. Burnout . . . . .	64
3. Personnel Turnover . . . . .	66
4. Disciplinary Actions . . . . .	70
5. Civilian Complaints . . . . .	72
6. Career Path . . . . .	74
7. Personnel Development . . . . .	76
8. Community Patrol Officer Frustrations . . . . .	78
a. Lack of a Clear Career Path for CPOs.. . . .	79
b. Lack of understanding on the part of other members of the service regarding the objectives of CPOP and the duties of CPOs. . . . .	79
c. Lack of Support from Other Department Units. . . . .	80
d. Undue Focus on Business Establishments . . . . .	81
e. Community Profile Records (Beat Books) . . . . .	82
f. Lack of Logistical Support . . . . .	82
g. Inability to Deal with Public Morals Violations . . . . .	82
h. Inability to Sense Accomplishment . . . . .	83
i. Lack of Community Support in Organizing Efforts . . . . .	83
j. Slow Or No Response from Other City Agencies . . . . .	84
E. Administrative and Managerial Matters . . . . .	84
1. Compliance with Operations Order 91 . . . . .	85
2. Unit Supervision . . . . .	87
3. Unit Equipment . . . . .	88
4. Community Profile Records (Beat Books) . . . . .	88
5. Beat Size . . . . .	89
F. Community Support . . . . .	91
G. Field Recommendations . . . . .	94

V. SUMMARY CONCLUSION . . . . .	95
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	97
A. Program Communication . . . . .	97
1. Creation of an Operations Manual for CPOP . . . . .	97
2. Creation of an Implementation Manual . . . . .	98
3. Dissemination of This Report . . . . .	98
4. Inclusion of information on CPOP in Department Training Programs . . . . .	98
B. Personnel Retention . . . . .	98
1. Inclusion of CPOs in the Department's Career Path . . . . .	98
2. Create a Minimum Period of Service in CPOP . . . . .	99
C. Improve Managerial Control . . . . .	99
1. Lieutenant Borough Coordinators . . . . .	100
2. Creation of a Community Interaction Development Team . . . . .	100
D. Operational Modifications . . . . .	101
1. Use of Scooters . . . . .	102
2. Structured Experimentation . . . . .	102
E. Improving Communication between CPOs . . . . .	102
F. Administrative Matters . . . . .	103
1. Monthly Supervisory Interviews . . . . .	103
2. Reporting Practices . . . . .	104
3. Community Profile Records (Beat Books) . . . . .	105
4. Specialized Training for CPOs . . . . .	106
5. Establishment of Direct Liaison between CPOP Units and Borough Narcotics and Public Morals Units . . . . .	106
6. Increase Support for the Crime Prevention Section . . . . .	107
G. Professional Development . . . . .	107

APPENDICIES

- APPENDIX A -- CPOP -- Monthly Activity 1985, by Precinct
- APPENDIX B -- CPOP Unit Program Activities
- APPENDIX C -- Samples of Letters of Support for CPOP  
Operations Received from Community Residents  
and Organizations
- APPENDIX D -- Police Department Publications:  
Operations Order 91 and 91-1, s.1985  
From the Commissioner's Desk, Vol II, No.4





## Introduction

In June 1984, the New York City Police Department, assisted by the Vera Institute of Justice, implemented a pilot Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP) in Brooklyn's 72nd Precinct. In January, 1985, the Police Department embarked on an expansion program which resulted in the program being implemented in thirty additional precincts between January 3rd and November 2nd, 1985. This rapid expansion of CPOP, coupled with the implementation of the TOPAC Program (foot and motorized Quality of Life Patrols), evinced a determination by the Department to mount a sustained effort to deal effectively with quality of life conditions and localized crime problems in the City of New York.

CPOP differs in many respects from the traditional modes of patrol and the various tactical deployment strategies, all of which have been utilized by the Department during the last several decades. Because of the innovative character of this program, there are both negative and positive consequences associated with the speed with which CPOP has been expanded. Pilot operations in the 72nd Precinct (June, 1984 - January, 1985) benefitted directly from the sustained attention of the program development team -- a degree of attention which could not be afforded to each of the expansion precincts. Consequently, the operational procedures which were developed for the pilot, which were largely experimental, and which were still evolving in January, 1985, have been institutionalized. While there are obviously some risks in proceeding this way, there were counterbalancing aspects of the expansion which substantially reduced the risk and may, in the long run, accelerate the pace at which these experi-

mental strategies are modified and refined to a point where they might be fully adopted as standard procedures. Although the rapid expansion diminished the ability of the program development team to monitor field operations and institute modifications where necessary, it did enlarge the number of command and supervisory personnel involved in program monitoring and operation, and it greatly increased the variety of conditions and situations addressed by CPOs. The input received from these command and supervisory personnel, observing CPOs at work under a wide variety of conditions, has greatly increased the Department's knowledge about what works and what does not work in CPO operations; this in turn has produced a number of program modifications.

On balance, it appears from consideration of the last twelve months of program operation, that the principal negative consequences of the rapid rate of expansion were:

- a. The program development team was not able to monitor initial operations in the expansion precincts. Program development is the responsibility of a Program Development Team (PDT) headed by a Lieutenant assigned to the Chief of Patrol's Office, which reviews and monitors program operations, develops and tests operational strategies, assists precincts in the implementation and operation of the program, organizes and administers the CPO training program, and makes recommendations to the Department's administration regarding program operations. The PDT is composed of a Lieutenant and a Sergeant from the Chief of Patrol's Office and a Lieutenant and a Sergeant from the Office of Management Analysis and Planning; it is assisted by Vera's Associate Director for Police Programs. Given the small size of the PDT staff, and the other duties imposed on the police personnel, its time was totally occupied by the substantial work involved in expanding the program to 30 precincts. As a result, its members were unable to make sufficient field visits to determine if the CPO was operating in full accordance with program design in each of the precincts.
- b. With the PDT's efforts devoted to program expansion, the continued development of innovative tactical strategies has been temporarily deferred in favor of firm adminis-

trative control of a uniform operation throughout the precincts. Because there was insufficient staff time to encourage or monitor the development of innovative strategies, the program has locked in at the state of development reached in the pilot precinct in January, 1985, after only six months of development. (Indeed, some new strategies being developed in the pilot precinct at the time the expansion began were not extended to the new precincts, because they could not be fully monitored across the city. They were discontinued in the pilot precinct to insure uniformity of operations.)

### **Purpose of This Report**

As no further expansion of the CPOP is anticipated in this fiscal year, the hiatus provides Vera and the Police Department the opportunity to review program operations thoroughly in each of the expansion precincts, and to renew the development of innovative CPOP strategies. To initiate this process, between mid-November and the end of January, Vera's program coordinator and OMAP's Vera Liaison Officer conducted a program review in each of the first twenty-one precincts in which the program was implemented. The last ten expansion precincts were omitted from this review because of the relatively short period in which they had been operating CPOP units.

One of the principal purposes for conducting the review was to determine the manner in which the institutionalization process effected CPOP operations in the expansion precincts. The development of the Community Patrol Officer Program parallels that of many other innovative programs developed within the Police Department and elsewhere: A pilot program is carefully designed and monitored. The early success of the pilot leads to early efforts to institutionalize it by expanding its base of operation. This transition from pilot project status to institutionalized is always the most critical point in the process of developing new

programs, and it is the point at which many programs fail. Pilot projects receive careful attention and nurturing and because of the attention paid them, often enjoy more flexibility than can be permitted in routine operations under normal supervisory control. Personnel involved in them are often highly motivated because of their participation in something new and different and, as a result, often perform at a level which is difficult to sustain over a long period of time. If the institutionalization process is itself carefully done, the process tests the ability of pilot procedures to work beyond the laboratory conditions under which they were developed.

Expansion of a new program in an agency such as the Police Department requires the curtailment of some of the flexibility which was encouraged during the pilot and introduces new stresses. It tests the ability of the agency to recruit personnel who are sufficiently motivated to undertake the new role under normal supervisory conditions. It tests the ability of the agency to effect change on a broad basis and to involve command and supervisory personnel who had no role in the creation of the innovation. It is the point at which many innovative programs fail simply because they cannot be sustained beyond the carefully controlled environment of the pilot. It is also a point, however, where many innovations fail merely because the effort to institutionalize them is not itself well designed to succeed.

The conceptual foundation for the Community Patrol Officer Program was based, in part, on a review of research on patrol deployment strategies which had been tried in New York City and elsewhere during the last twenty years. While this literature

review focused on identifying the positive or workable elements of previous experiments, with a view towards incorporating the best of them into a new program design, it was also concerned with identifying the reasons why previous experiments failed, in order to insure that the new program would stand the greatest chance of success, consistent with its own merits. We paid particular attention to experiments which could be grouped under the general heading of "Community Oriented Policing Strategies." Principal among these was the Neighborhood Police Team Concept, which was the subject of experimentation in New York City and elsewhere in the early 1970's. While the CPOP is in many ways dissimilar to the NPT, there are enough common program elements to make us particularly sensitive to factors which led to the demise of the NPT in all of the major cities in which it was tried.

The NPT arose during a period when the Federal Government was providing large amounts of money to fund police-related research. As a result, there were several credible studies conducted of NPT operations in major cities throughout the country. A review of these studies identifies the following as some of the major causes of the failure of the NPT to realize the goals for which it was established:

- a. In some jurisdictions, attempts to implement the NPT strategy failed because the concepts of team policing were either not fully understood, or not fully operationalized. As a result, the program was either not fully implemented, or failed to operate in accordance with original intent.
- b. In some instances, the geographic stability of the teams was not maintained, because dispatchers or dispatching procedures did not permit the teams to remain in their areas of assigned responsibility.

- c. The service element of the concept failed to operate in some areas, because some supervisors did not implement either the requisite team conferences or community conferences, or both.
- d. The team policing projects suffered everywhere from a lack of coordination, and from middle management interference.

As a result of these organizational impediments, Neighborhood Team Policing differed little from traditional policing as it was institutionalized. As one researcher summarized it:

"It was not long before the team members noticed that team policing hardly differed from the 'policing' they had done before. In most cases, the style of police work changed very little.... But it is impossible to say whether the organizational style of team policing failed to produce a new patrol style or whether the organizational style of team policing was not, in those cases, created at all."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the general purpose of this report is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the CPOP institutionalization effort to date, in the various commands responsible for CPOP operations. In addition, it serves as a record of (and means of disseminating) what has been learned, so far, about the adaptability of the basic CPOP model to a wider variety of conditions, personnel and management approaches then were present in the pilot precinct. These assessments are designed to solicit ideas for improvements from interested quarters within the Department, and to present the recommendations which seem to this writer to flow from what has been observed.

The operational review, which provided the basis for this report, consisted of the following activities:

-----

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence W. Sherman, Team Policing: Seven Case Studies, (Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1973), p.73.

- a. Relevant operating statistics for each of the commands were obtained and reviewed.
- b. Each unit was visited and unit records inspected.
- c. Each unit supervisor was interviewed in depth about unit operations.
- d. Each precinct commander was interviewed.
- e. Telephone interviews were conducted with the Community Board District Manager of each precinct in which a unit is operational.
- f. Team meetings were held with each CPOP Unit and the CPOs were invited to offer comments and recommendations on program operations.

#### I. Background

The Community Patrol Officer program was implemented as a Pilot Project in the 72nd Precinct in July 1984. The program resulted from a collaborative planning effort between members of the Police Department's Office of Management Analysis and Planning and staff of the Vera Institute of Justice; this planning effort was guided by research conducted by the Institute. The initial goals of the pilot program were to determine if police officers could adapt to a new style of policing, one which depended heavily on the individual officer's ability to work with community residents on the solution of crime and quality of life problems at the neighborhood level, and to determine if that style of policing was effective in dealing with crime, the perceptions of crime, the fear of crime, and the maintenance of order in local communities. The program was initially implemented as a one-year pilot project to be followed by a six to eight month period during which the Vera Research Department would conduct a full evaluation of its effectiveness.

Vera conducted an operational review (not a full evaluation) of the first five months of the pilots operation and delivered an interim report to the Department in December 1984. That report, the favorable community response to the program, and the positive perceptions of Police command personnel in the Patrol Borough, led the Department to begin a careful expansion of the program in January, 1985. In that month, CPO operations were initiated in seven more precincts, one in each of the Department's Patrol Boroughs (except Queens which, because it contains the largest number of precincts in the City, received two, and Brooklyn South which, because the pilot was still operating in the 72nd Precinct, did not receive any expansion precincts). Thus, by the end of January 1985, there was at least one CPOP precinct in each of the patrol boroughs and there were two in Patrol Borough Queens. The initial expansion precincts were: the 9th, 34th, 52nd, 81st, 102nd, 105th, and 120th.

The second expansion took place during March, 1985, when six additional precincts were added to the program. They were: the 13th, 25th, 43rd, 63rd, 88th, and 110th Precincts. One additional precinct was added to the program in April 1985, when the 7th Precinct was included to complete coverage of the territory within the Pressure Point I area. The next expansion occurred in June, 1985 when the 10th, 24th, 47th, 61st, 83rd, and 114th Precincts were added to the program. The final expansion, which was the last in 1985, took place at the end of October when ten additional CPOP Units were created in the 6th, 23rd, 41st, 49th, 70th, 78th, 79th, 84th, 109th, and 122nd Precincts. Thus, by the



end of 1985, CPOP was operational in 31 of the City's 75 Precincts.

#### A. Expansion Implementation Plan

Preceding the program's expansion, an implementation plan was developed which resulted in the creation of a Program Development Team comprised of representatives of the Chief of Patrol, the Office of Management Analysis and Planning, and the Vera Institute. The PDT was assigned the responsibility for the execution of the implementation plan. The specifics of this plan, which has been utilized in each expansion of the program, follow.

1. Precinct Selection and Initial Orientation. The Chief of Patrol requests each of the Patrol Borough Commanders to nominate a number of precincts within the borough, in priority order, for program implementation. Upon receipt, the nominations are reviewed by the Chief of Patrol and Chief of Department and are forwarded to the Police Commissioner with the Chiefs' recommendations. The Police Commissioner makes the final selection of precincts, and the PDT is notified. The PDT notifies the Commanding Officers of the selected precincts and forwards them copies of the 72nd Precinct Status Report to acquaint them with the general organization and operation of the program. Each precinct commander is also advised to recruit immediately a volunteer sergeant to head the CPOP Unit in his command. Two weeks following these notifications, a meeting is held at the Office of the Chief of Patrol attended by each Precinct's Commander, the selected sergeants, and the Commanders of the Patrol Zones in which the precincts are located. The meeting is presided over by the Chief of Patrol, and is conducted to accomplish the

following:

- Insure uniform implementation of the program in the various precincts and boroughs.
- Familiarize all concerned with the history and development of the program.
- Establish a timetable for program implementation.

2. Precinct Level Planning. At the conclusion of the Chief of Patrol's meeting, the sergeants from the new precincts are assigned to the PDT for a three day orientation. The first day is devoted to familiarizing the sergeants with their duties as principal planners of program implementation in their precincts, and each sergeant is provided with written guidelines to assist him during the planning period. In summary, the sergeants are responsible for assisting the precinct commander in accomplishing the following:

- Design CPO Beat Areas within the precinct.
- Identify and recruit volunteer officers for the program.
- Establish liaison with the local Community Planning Board.
- Establish and equip a unit office in the precinct.
- Develop the precinct phase of the CPO Training Program.

The second day of orientation is conducted at the 72nd Precinct, where the CPOP Supervisor in that command informs the new sergeants on the techniques developed there to operate the program, and reviews the various control devices which he has implemented to insure effective operations. On the third day of orientation, each new sergeant visits a second CPOP unit, operating within his borough of assignment, and reviews operations in that command. At the end of the orientation period, the sergeants

return to their commands to begin the precinct-based planning process.

### 3. Selection of Community Patrol Officers.

New CPOs are recruited by the precinct commanders and unit sergeants. All CPOs must be volunteers and are recruited on their agreement to work flexible tours as required by the temporal distribution of crime and order maintenance conditions within their beat areas. All new CPO personnel are subject to a central personnel index review.

4. Promoting Community Involvement. Prior to actual implementation, a meeting is held at the Vera Institute which is attended by the sergeants from the new precincts and the District Managers from their local Community Planning Boards. The purpose of the meeting is to inform the District Managers of the program's purpose, the manner in which it operates, and its relationship to the local Community Planning Boards. The District Manager from C.B. 7 in Brooklyn, who has worked with the program in the 72nd Precinct since its inception, attends and addresses the District Managers on how the program has operated within his board, and the manner in which the CPOP Unit and the Community Board cooperate in resolving local problems.

5. CPOP Training. A formal training program for new Community Police Officers was developed by the Vera Institute and is administered and coordinated by the Program Development Team. In essence, the training involves three elements: orientation, skill training, and resource utilization. In the orientation phase, the officers are instructed on their new duties as Community Patrol Officers, and are provided with suggestions about how these

duties can best be carried out. Then a two-day skill training course is conducted at the Police Department's Crime Prevention School, during which the CPOs are instructed on how to conduct residential premises security surveys. The resource utilization training phase is designed to impart to the officers information on the various programs and services offered by public and private agencies which can be utilized by them in dealing with problems arising on their beats.

The training program is conducted in three phases:

- Four days of training at a central location (The Police Academy or John Jay College).
- Three training exercises conducted at the precinct level.
- Two days of training administered by the Department's Crime Prevention Section

The four days of centralized training are conducted over a two week period during which training is interspersed with actual patrol. The first two days of training (which generally begin on a Monday) are primarily concerned with program orientation, and an exploration of the various tactics which may be utilized in addressing problems encountered on patrol. In addition to formal instruction, the trainees engage in group discussions with experienced CPOs from operating units. Also during the first two days, the new CPOs are addressed by both the Chief of Patrol and the Police Commissioner. At the completion of the first two days of training, the officers are returned to their commands, where actual CPOP patrol operations begin on the next day.

The second two days of centralized training are conducted during the following week, and involve a debriefing of the officers on their experiences during the first several days of

patrol, and a review of public and private agencies which may be utilized by the officers as problem-solving resources. Among the public and private agencies which participate in the training program by sending representatives to address the officers are:

The NYC Department of the Aging  
The Victim Services Agency  
Citizens Committee for NY  
The Manhattan Bowery Project  
The Boy Scouts of America  
The NYC Volunteer Corps  
The NYC Dept. of Housing Preservation & Development  
The Door

The precinct phase of the training program is conducted over a three week period following the centralized training. Approximately one training exercise is conducted each week, and includes:

- (a) A joint training session conducted by the Precinct CPOP Sergeant and the Community Board District Manager, during which the CPOs meet the representatives of the various City agencies which deal with the Board (e.g., Sanitation Dept., Human Resources, Neighborhood Stabilization, etc.) and establish the ground rules for a working relationship.
- (b) Institutional Visits. Each CPO visits two service providing agencies in order to determine the services offered, and to establish liaison with intake personnel.
- (c) Precinct Interactions: A full day of precinct training is devoted to a series of meetings between the members of the CPOP Unit and the members of the precinct staff with whom they will be expected to work closely. These include: the Community Affairs Officer, the Crime Prevention Officer, the Crime Analyst, The Anti-Crime Unit Supervisor, the Precinct Detective Unit Supervisor, and the Highway Safety Officer.

#### B. Departmental Support for the Expansion

Throughout the expansion of the program, the Police Department has taken a number of steps to avoid the pitfalls of institutionalization. These steps may be summarized as follows:

1. **Replication of the pilot model.** The expansion of the program has been based on a replication of the pilot model created in the 72nd Precinct. To encourage uniformity of operation throughout the City, all new unit supervisors are required to visit the 72nd Precinct, confer with the Sergeant assigned to that command, and observe program operations there.

2. **Command Support.** The program has received the enthusiastic and frequently articulated support of the highest ranking members of the Department. The Police Commissioner, the Chief of Department, and the Chief of Patrol often voice their complete support for the program, and have made this support known throughout the various levels of the command structure.

3. **Clear Policy Communication.** The Department has issued a comprehensive order, detailing the intent of the program, and the manner in which the Community Patrol Officers are to be deployed. (See Appendix) In the development of this order, the Department took great care to provide the new CPOs with the same degree of flexibility and accountability as exercised by the CPOs in the demonstration project. In addition, as indicated above, each expansion of the program is preceded by a conference chaired by the Chief of Patrol and attended by the Zone and Precinct Commanders of the expansion commands, at which the intent and operation of the program is discussed in detail.

4. **Uniform Training.** All new CPOP personnel attend a uniform training program, designed to orient new personnel in both the conceptual and practical operation of the program. A key part of this training program is the participation of experienced

Community Patrol Officers who discuss program operations in their unit with the new CPOs.

5. Dissemination of Program Information. Steps are taken to disseminate program information among the various CPOP units. Meetings of unit supervisors are held monthly by the Program Development Team, and each supervisor reports on the development of the program in his command. In addition, police officers assigned to the precinct units are kept abreast of program developments through the CPO Newsletter, which is distributed bi-monthly to all officers working in the program.

6. Follow-up and Control. The Department instituted a number of procedures designed to insure that the program is operating in accordance with program design. Each precinct is required to submit a monthly report providing quantitative and qualitative information on program operation. Every unit supervisor, Precinct Commander and Zone Commander involved is required to conduct monthly interviews of merchants and citizens within the community to determine the manner in which the CPOs are performing. Precinct Integrity Control Officers are required to conduct periodic inspections of unit operations and to coordinate their activities with personnel assigned to the Borough Field Internal Affairs Units.

## II. COMMUNITY PATROL OFFICER PROGRAM OPERATIONS

This interim review of CPOP operations in the first 21 Precincts surfaced many misconceptions about the design and operations of the Community Patrol Officer Program. Personnel directly involved, Unit Supervisors, Precinct Commanders, and the CPOs have a good understanding of the concept and its implementation. However, beyond them, and throughout the Department, there is a wide knowledge gap despite the Department's efforts to insure uniformity and to disseminate information on the program. The gap is found even within the precincts in which the program operates.

This knowledge gap about CPOP operations will be taken up again, in a later section of this report. At this point, it might be useful to set forth a comprehensive description of basic CPOP operations in each of the precincts in which the program has been implemented. The import of the observations made later in this report ought to be clearer, if they are set out against a full description of CPOP operations.

A. Organization. Each CPOP Unit is comprised of a supervising Sergeant, a CPO Coordinator, a number of CPO Beat Officers, two or three CPO Alternates, and a Police Administrative Aide. All personnel assigned to the unit, with the exception of the PAA, are volunteers recruited by the Precinct Commander.

The Sergeant functions as both Unit Supervisor and Team Leader. He is responsible, under the supervision of the Precinct Commander, for the day-to-day operation of the unit. He is responsible for the supervision of all administrative and operational functions of the unit, and the maintenance of liaison with the Community Planning Board in regard to CPOP operations.



The CPO Coordinator is a police officer who, in addition to acting as the sergeant's operator, is responsible for a number of non-clerical administrative functions of the unit. He may represent the Sergeant at various community meetings, act as unit liaison with public and private agencies, and perform a number of other duties of an administrative nature. In addition, he may become involved in unit field operations, substituting for other CPOs when necessary, or engaging in unit activities.

The CPO Beat Officers are police officers who are assigned to the CPO Beat Areas within the precinct. They perform a number of law enforcement, order maintenance, and community service activities.

CPO Alternates are police officers who have received the full range of CPO training. Anticipating some turnover in personnel, the Department authorizes each CPOP precinct to have two or three trained alternates available as replacements for personnel who leave the CPOP unit. In addition, the alternates fill in when CPOs are on vacation or protracted sick report.

The Police Administrative Aide performs clerical duties in support of unit operations. He or she prepares the unit's administrative roll calls, transcribes messages from the unit's telephone answering machine, maintains the unit's diary, copies precinct complaint reports to be furnished to the beat officers, and maintains the crime spot maps in each officer's beat book.

Each CPOP Precinct is divided into a number of CPO Beat Areas. In expanding the program beyond the Pilot phase, the Police Department initially replicated the organizational model established in the 72nd Precinct by authorizing the assignment of

one Sergeant, ten Police Officers and one PAA to each new CPOP Unit, thereby permitting the establishment of a maximum of nine Beat Areas. However, in nine of the thirty-one precincts operating a CPOP Unit, the size of the precinct permitted CPOP coverage of the entire precinct with fewer than nine beats (the number of CPO Beat Officers is reduced accordingly in these precincts). In fifteen of the 31 precincts, all of the territory within the precinct is covered by the CPO Beat Areas. In the remaining sixteen precincts, the nine CPO Beat Areas cover a portion of the precinct ranging from 25% in the 105th Precinct to approximately 90% in the 72nd Precinct.

Unlike traditional linear foot patrol posts, CPO Beat Areas are square or rectangular, and may range from twenty to forty square blocks in size. The size of a Beat Area is dependent upon a number of factors: population density, natural boundaries, neighborhood boundaries, the prevalence of commercial establishments, and most importantly, the number and type of crime and order maintenance conditions. The smallest Beat Areas are found in the Borough of Manhattan where CPO beats average between 14 and 18 square blocks. The largest beats are located in Queens and Brooklyn South, where CPO beats may average between 25 and 40 square blocks.

#### B. Logistics.

Each CPOP Unit is required to maintain a Unit Office within the Precinct Station House. The office provides a work site for the Sergeant and PAA, and an operational base for the CPOs. Unit offices in the thirty-one precincts range from a cubbyhole in the 9th Precinct to adequately sized offices in the ma-

majority of precincts. In most commands the Unit is the sole occupant of the office, while in the remainder they share the space with other precinct units. The office also provides secure storage for Unit equipment.

Each CPOP Unit is required to maintain a number of administrative records. Each is required to prepare a weekly administrative roll call, one copy of which is furnished to the Precinct Roll Call Unit for inclusion of the CPOs on the regular precinct roll calls. A second copy is forwarded weekly to the Investigation and Evaluation Unit of the Chief of Patrol's Office. The CPOP Unit is also required to maintain a Diary to record court appearances, vacations and days off, scheduled community meetings, etc. The CPOP unit maintains other records, including a confidential file of residential premises security surveys conducted by the CPOs.

Each CPOP Unit is provided with a 12-passenger marked Department van. The van is used for supervisory purposes by the sergeant, and to support unit operations. The van may be used to transport personnel to their Beat Areas, transport prisoners to the station house, engage in various enforcement activities, and conduct Unit community-oriented programs, such as senior citizen escorts.

Each unit is also provided with two direct telephone lines to facilitate citizen communication with the CPOs, and two telephone answering machines to record non-emergency messages when the Unit office is closed. At the onset of operations in each command, informational flyers, prepared by the Department, are distributed by the CPOs within their Beat Areas. These flyers de-

scribe the purpose and function of the Unit, identify the CPO assigned to the Beat, and encourage citizens to communicate directly with him or her in non-emergency matters by telephoning the unit directly.

The Department has also attempted to provide additional radios to support CPOP Unit operations. In some commands the CPOP Unit maintains its own radios, while in others they are merged with the rest of the command.

Each Community Patrol Officer assigned to a Beat Area is required to maintain a Community Profile Record (Beat Book). The Beat Books are divided into six sections:

1. A Beat Description Section, which includes a Beat map and a written description of the Beat Area.
2. A Patrol Objectives Section, which contains three records:
  - a. A Monthly Work Plan, which is a written agreement between the CPO and the Unit Supervisor, identifying the major patrol objectives to be pursued by the CPO during the month.
  - b. A Beat Conditions Log, which is a form on which the CPO records actions taken to deal with the major crime and order-maintenance conditions within his Beat Area, and the specific actions taken to deal with citizen's complaints as they come to his attention.
  - c. The CPOs Monthly Activity Report, which is maintained on a modified version of the Department's standard Police Officer Monthly Activity Report form.
3. A Crime Analysis Section, which includes crime incidence spot maps for the Beat Area.
4. A Beat Profile Section, which is designed in a manner to permit the CPO to systematically record information on residents, merchants, and civic organizations located within the Beat Area.
5. A Resource Section, which contains information

about the public and private agencies that may be utilized by the officer in dealing with problems encountered on the Beat.

6. A Miscellaneous Section, which may be used by the officer to maintain and preserve notes, reports, etc.

Each CPO Beat Officer is provided with a copy of every crime complaint recorded on his or her Beat Area. This is done on a daily basis, and is a responsibility of the PAA. The CPOs use this information in conducting crime analysis studies within their Beat Areas, and in scheduling visits to crime victims residing within their Beat Areas in order to determine if additional services are needed by the victim.

#### C. Conceptual Aspects of CPOP Operations

There are a number of key factors which differentiate CPOP Operations from those of normal patrol. These are:

1. **Goal Orientation.** CPOP Units attempt, whenever possible, to deal proactively with crime and order-maintenance conditions existing within the Beat Areas. The overriding goal of all CPOP operations is to effect permanent change, whether that change be measured by a reduction in crime, a reduction in the community's perceptions of crime, or an increase in the crime resistance of a community (fostered by the implementation of crime prevention techniques, or the elimination of specified order-maintenance conditions by, e.g., the removal of abandoned vehicles or the cleaning up of a debris strewn lot). To that end, individual CPOs are encouraged to plan their activities strategically, and to focus their efforts on specific tasks both of a short- and long-term nature. Many of the operating features of

the program are designed to foster the goal orientation of the unit.

2. **Flexibility.** CPO volunteers are recruited on their agreement to work flexible tours, the specific hours of which are negotiated between the CPO and the Unit Supervisor, in order to put the CPO in his Beat Area on the days and hours best suited to the CPO's evolving monthly work plan. As conditions in a Beat Area may change on a daily, monthly, or seasonal basis, CPOs are expected to adjust their hours accordingly. Similarly, while a CPO may be requested to change tour hours to accommodate a community group's request for his attendance at a meeting, the Department will also authorize programmatic overtime for the meeting should the tour change interfere with planned Unit activities.

Program flexibility also characterizes the manner in which CPOs are deployed. While the basic CPOP work unit is the individual CPO deployed in his assigned Beat Area, the Unit supervisor may direct different forms of deployment when necessary to deal with specific identifiable conditions. He may, for example, assign two or more CPOs to work together for all or a part of a tour to deal with a condition which is beyond the ability of one officer to handle. He may assign two or more CPOs (and on some occasions the entire Unit) to work in the van and conduct an enforcement sweep of a particular location. In some commands, where conditions require that most of the officers work some variation of day hours, he may assign two CPOs to the van during some evening tours and direct them to deal with the major conditions existing in several Beat Areas, thereby extending the im-

pact of CPOP throughout the day and throughout all of the Beat Areas. While this flexibility exists, it is exercised with care by the Unit supervisors and in accordance with the policies of individual precinct commanders.

3. **Beat Responsibility and Accountability.** Each Community Patrol Officer is responsible for identifying and dealing with conditions on his Beat Area and is accountable to his unit supervisor and precinct commander for doing so. He is responsible for communicating with residents and merchants in his or her Beat Area to determine their perceptions and priorities about crime and order-maintenance problems in the neighborhood, and he or she is responsible for formulating and executing plans to deal with these conditions. Where the identified problems may best be resolved by police enforcement actions, he is required to initiate such actions if he is capable of doing so. Where the conditions are such that direct enforcement action by the CPO would not be effective (e.g. activities in inside locations which require investigative follow-up), he is responsible for conferring with the Unit Supervisor and suggesting methods of dealing with these conditions. The strategies which result from such consultations may involve the use of other CPOP resources, the Sergeant's requesting assistance from other precinct units, or the referral of intelligence information to appropriate Department units. Where the identified problems deal with matters that require the assistance of other public or private agencies, the CPO is expected either to make an appropriate referral, or when necessary, to initiate contact with the appropriate agency himself and coordinate the interagency response. The CPO is also expected to assess the

need in his or her Beat Area for the development of program activities to address crime, order maintenance or social conditions within the Beat Area, and to work with the Unit Supervisor on the development of such programs.

Many of the operating procedures of the CPOP have been designed to foster this beat accountability and to provide the CPOs with sufficient authority and time to carry out their duties.

Among the strategies designed to foster beat accountability are:

- CPOs are permanently assigned to Beat Areas to provide them the opportunity to become knowledgeable about the conditions and problems there, and to permit the community to identify with one specific police officer as its day-to-day link with the Police Department. Continuity of assignment also permits the CPO to develop long range strategies to deal with persistent conditions and to make commitments to area residents regarding both routine beat coverage and attendance at special events.
- CPOs are excluded from other routine precinct assignments except in emergencies.
- CPOs are not carried on the 911 queue, although they are required by their supervisors to respond to radio runs within their Beat Areas whenever possible.
- CPOs are required to attend community meetings within their Beat Areas, and to advise the command supervisory staff of problems raised by residents, as well as dealing directly with such problems.
- To insure that the CPOs are knowledgeable about problems within their Beat Areas, they are provided with copies of all complaint reports on crimes committed within their beats; are required to maintain beat-based crime spot maps; and are required to compile community profiles.
- The CPOs are provided with sufficient administrative time to perform their clerical duties and to work on the solution of community problems (follow-up the agency referrals they have made, etc.).

4. Community Involvement. CPOP attempts to involve the community in joint efforts with the Police Department to improve



the quality of life at the neighborhood level. Beat officers are encouraged to maintain communication with citizens and merchants in the Beat Areas, and to continuously solicit their participation in the establishment of beat and unit priorities. They are assigned the responsibility of assisting communities to organize block and tenant associations and to engage in crime prevention strategies. With these efforts, and without having ceded any of its authority to the community, the Department has implemented a strategy which permits citizens to feel that they have some control over their environment.

5. Unit Program Activities. Each CPO Unit has the responsibility of designing and implementing program activities that build good police-community relations, address crime and order maintenance problems, enhance crime prevention efforts, and address social problems at the neighborhood level. In responding to this mandate, CPOP Units have undertaken a wide variety of programs, some of which involve the active participation of one or two CPOs, and others which involve all members of the unit. (This aspect of CPOP operations will be treated in depth in a later section of this report.)

#### D. Dimensions of the CPO Role

Community Patrol Officers are responsible for performing a wide variety of duties. Operations Order No. 91, s.1985, lists 16 separate duties of the CPO. Conceptually, the CPO role has four principal dimensions:

1. Planner. The first important responsibility of the CPO is to identify the principal crime and order maintenance problems confronting the people within his Beat Area. Toward this

end, he is expected to examine relevant statistical materials, record his own observations as he patrols his beat, and solicit and secure input from residents, merchants and their employees, and service delivery agents in the community. The problems identified are then prioritized and analyzed and corrective strategies designed. These strategies are reviewed with the Unit Supervisor, and are incorporated into the CPOs Monthly Work Plan, which forms the focus of the officer's patrol for the coming month.

2. **Problem Solver.** CPOs are encouraged to see themselves as problem solvers for the community. This begins with the planning dimension of the role described above, and proceeds to the implementation of the action strategies. In the implementation phase, the officer is encouraged to see himself or herself as accessing and attempting to guide four types of resources that can be directed against Beat Area problems. They are: the CPO acting as a law enforcement officer; other police resources on the precinct and borough levels which can be brought to bear through the CPO Sergeant and the Precinct Commander; other public and private service agencies operating, or available to operate in the Beat Area; and individual citizens living in, or citizen organizations operating in that community. The strategies developed by the CPO can call for the application of any or all of these resources. The CPO's success in resolving the problems identified will turn, in large part, on his or her success in marshalling them and in coordinating their application.

3. **Community Organizer.** Community resources cannot be brought to bear on crime and quality of life problems in a neigh-

borhood unless the resources exist and are both willing and able to play their roles in resolving the problems. Increasing the consciousness of the community about its problems, involving community people and organizations in developing strategies to address the problems, motivating the people to help in implementing the strategies, and coordinating their action so that they may contribute maximally to the solution are all aspects of the community organizing dimension of the CPO role. The CPOs are encouraged to identify potential resources and, where they are not adequate, to help in organizing and motivating the citizenry.

4. Information Exchange Link. The CPO, through his or her links to the community, is in a position to provide the Department with information about problem conditions and locations, active criminals, developing gangs, illicit networks for trafficking in drugs and stolen property, information about the citizenry's fears, and insights into the citizenry's perceptions of police tactics. In turn, the CPO can provide the citizenry with information pertinent to its fears and problems, technical information and advice for preventing crimes and reducing the vulnerability of particular groups of citizens, information about the police view of conditions in the neighborhood and strategies for addressing them, and information about police operations in the community. This information exchange dimension of the CPO role is expected to result in arrests which might not occur otherwise, greater cooperation between the police and citizens in addressing the crime and order maintenance problems in the community, and a heightened sense in the citizenry that the police

are a concerned and powerful resource for improving the quality of life in the community.

#### E. Day-to-day Operations of CPOP Units

The conceptual aspects of the CPOP operation and the several dimensions of the CPO's role intersect to define a series of routine operations which are carried out on a daily basis in each CPOP Unit. Following is a brief description of the manner in which the CPOP Units operate.

1. **Work Hours.** All of the personnel assigned to the CPO Units work a five-day week. In all but three of the units, all of the members work the same days and have the same days off, which provides for close supervisory control by the Unit Supervisors. In 19 of the 31 precincts, the units work Monday through Friday; in 9 units, the work week is Tuesday through Saturday. In the remaining three precincts, local conditions require 7 day unit coverage, and some number of CPOs in each have different days off. In those commands, the normal precinct supervisory staff supervises the CPOs on those days when the Unit Supervisor is off.

The specific hours of beat coverage are negotiated between the CPOs and the Unit Supervisor, and are scheduled to permit the officers to address the problems existing within their Beat Areas. As a result, members of the Unit may begin their tours at different times throughout the day. However, to reduce interference with normal precinct operations, many Unit Supervisors limit the beginning times of tours to specific hours, e.g.: 0800 hrs., 1000 hrs., 1200 hrs., 1500 hrs., 1600 hrs.

All CPO personnel are carried on the Precinct's roll calls, and when they are performing tours which coincide with regular precinct tours, stand roll call with the outgoing platoon. When working other than standard tours, the CPOs stand roll call with the Unit Supervisor, or in his absence, report directly to the Precinct Desk Officer.

## 2. Beginning the Tour

The first member of the Unit to begin the day is generally the PAA who is required to perform a number of administrative functions prior to the arrival of the CPOs. He or she is responsible for transcribing all messages off the Unit's telephone answering machine and preparing individual message slips for the CPOs. The PAA is also required to review the precinct complaint reports for the preceding 24 hours (after weekends, 72 hours) and obtain copies of those arising from crimes committed within the CPOP Beat Areas.

Upon reporting for duty, individual CPOs will stand roll call and will then request to be entered in the Interrupted Patrol Log so that they may perform their daily initial administrative duties in the station house. These include: reviewing their telephone messages and possibly returning phone calls; reviewing complaint reports, and possibly telephoning complainants to schedule follow-up visits; reviewing the crime spot maps in their Beat Books. In addition, they may, when these activities are scheduled or agreed to by the Unit Supervisor: make entries in their Beat Books; telephone other public or private agencies in an effort to deal with problems encountered on their beats; work on Unit program activities; confer with members of the

Precinct PDU, Anti-Crime or RIP Units on crimes committed within the Beat Areas, etc., or confer with other members of the precinct staff about problems and conditions within the Beat Areas. In the norm, CPOs will spend between fifteen and thirty minutes working on administrative matters prior to actually beginning the day's patrol.

3. Routine CPO Patrol Operations. CPOs perform a wide variety of tasks while on patrol. In any given day, a CPO may perform several of the following activities:

- Perform a high visibility foot patrol, covering all or a portion of his/her Beat Area.

- Confer with merchants and residents by visiting their places of business or residences to determine their perceptions of problems in the area. CPOs document all off-street time with appropriate entries in their memorandum books; when there is to be unscheduled off-patrol time of more than a short period, they are to notify the CPO Office and the Precinct Desk Officer in advance.

- Monitor the police radio and respond to calls for service within the Beat Area whenever feasible. Where the nature of the call permits one man response, the CPO will advise Communications that he is responding. On two-man assignments, the CPO responds as a back-up for the RMP Unit.

- Visit crime victims who reside or work within the Beat Area and determine if follow-up service or referral is appropriate.

- Solicit information on criminal activities from merchants and residents, act on such information when appropriate, or make referral to the appropriate Department Unit.

- Where appropriate, deal with minor violations of law and order-maintenance conditions by obtaining compliance through non-enforcement techniques such as conferral and requests for cooperation.

- Where appropriate, take enforcement actions such as arrest and summons to deal with law violations.

- Take other appropriate actions to deal with crime and order-maintenance problems within the Beat Area, such as high visibility patrol in the vicinity of crime-prone locations, etc.

- Team up with other CPOs, either on foot or in the Unit van to engage in enforcement actions or unit program activities.

- Confer with other members of the service on patrol and coordinate enforcement activities with them.

- Visit schools within the Beat Area and confer with the principals regarding conditions.

- Visit Senior Citizen centers and confer with administrators as to problems encountered by the senior citizens.

- Visit Houses of Worship in the area and confer with their administrators.

- Conduct residential premises security surveys either as a follow-up action on a complaint report, or on a proactive basis by scheduling such inspections with neighborhood residents. (Diary entry required on scheduled surveys.)

- Deliver safety and crime prevention lectures at school assemblies, Senior Citizen Centers, and before other civic groups.

- Attend scheduled meetings of civic organizations within the Beat Area as requested. (Diary entry on scheduled meetings.)

- Cause the removal of abandoned vehicles from the Beat Area either by rotation tow or sanitation.

- Confer with representatives of public and private service providing agencies to secure services needed in the area or by a resident.

- Attempt to arrange placements for drug or alcohol abusers who requests assistance.

- Conduct security checks on public busses passing through the Beat Area.

- Visit and sign the memo book of School Crossing Guards assigned to school crossings within the Beat Area.

- Participate, as directed by the Unit Supervisor, in Unit Program Activities such as: Senior Citizen Escorts or Safe Corridor Shopping Programs; Child Safe Haven or Child Safe programs; Youth Sports Leagues; Merchant Awareness Programs; Child Fingerprint Programs; Drug Awareness Programs; etc. (Diary and roll call entries where appropriate)

- In the absence of community organizations, seek to identify interested citizens and encourage the formation of block associations, tenant organizations, tenant patrols, etc. and coordinate such activities with the Precinct Community Affairs officer.

- Attempt to recruit block watchers and auxiliary policemen, coordinating such activities with the Community Affairs and Crime Prevention Officers.

- Perform other duties as directed by the Unit Supervisor or Precinct Commander.

#### 4. Off-Patrol and Administrative Time

A number of the duties performed by CPOs, as outlined above, require that the officer go to the precinct station house to perform required functions or otherwise not be engaged in visible patrol. In all instances it is required that the CPO's time be properly accounted for and that command and supervisory staff be aware of his or her general movements. In summary, the situations which result in off-patrol or administrative time, and the control devices used to account for this time, are as follows:

##### a. Off-Street Time Incidental to Routine Patrol.

Contact visits (merchants, schools, Senior Citizen Centers, etc.) conducted during normal foot patrol operations result in the CPO frequently being off-street for brief periods of time. CPOs are required to make Activity Log entries to account for such time. In addition, if it appears that the visit will require more than a short period, the officer is required to first notify the CPO Base and the Precinct Desk Officer.

##### b. Scheduled Off-Street Time.

Some CPO activities (attendance at civic meetings, delivering safety lectures, conducting scheduled security surveys, etc.) may be planned and scheduled in advance. In such instances, the event is recorded in the Unit Diary and placed on the appropriate roll call as a post change. CPOs also record such activities in their Activity Logs.

##### c. Operational Activity at the Station House.

Some activities require that the CPO go to the Precinct station



house to complete department records. These include rotation tow of abandoned vehicles, vouchering of property, arrest processing, etc. For these occasions, CPOs make Activity Log entries and are entered in the Interrupted Patrol Log by the Precinct Desk Officer.

d. **Administrative Time.** The principal activity which results in administrative time at the Precinct station house is the maintenance of the CPO's Community Profile Record (Beat Book.) It is estimated that between one and two hours weekly are required for the proper maintenance of this record. Other activities which may require administrative time in the station house are: contacting public or private agencies to address problems in the Beat Area; working on the planning and coordination of unit program activities; planning sessions with the CPOP Unit Supervisor (e.g., to negotiate the next monthly work plan); team meetings or training sessions. For these occasions, officers make Activity Log entries and are entered in the Interrupted Patrol Log by the Precinct Desk Officer.

#### 5. Unit Program Activities.

Each CPOP Unit engages in a variety of what are termed Unit Program Activities. Such activities, which may involve one or two CPOs or all members of the Unit, arise as a result of an effort on the part of the Unit to address crime and order maintenance problems or social welfare needs in the community. Such programs are specifically directed at promoting improved police-community relations, increasing the crime resistance of a community through crime prevention efforts, and reducing the vulnerability of victim prone populations. As a result, many of these efforts deal

with the polar ends of the the population, the youths and the senior citizens. Many of these program activities have been designed by the individual CPOP Units while others are the Unit's adaptation of an existing program. In either event, the Unit's Program Activities are an integral part of unit operations, and have done much to enhance the image of the Department throughout the City. Appendix B to this report (under separate cover) contains a list and brief descriptions of CPOP Unit Program Activities in the 21 Precincts to date.

## RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF CPOP OPERATIONS IN 21 COMMANDS

Representatives of the Vera Institute of Justice and the Office of Management Analysis and Planning conducted this review of CPOP operations in the first 21 precincts between mid-November, 1985, and the end of January, 1986. Precincts included in this review (and the period of time the CPOP Unit had been operational through December 1985) are as follows:

## 12 Months of Operation:

9th Precinct	72nd Precinct	105th Precinct
34th Precinct	81st Precinct	120th Precinct
52nd Precinct	102nd Precinct	

## 9 Months of Operation:

13th Precinct	43rd Precinct	88th Precinct
25th Precinct	63rd Precinct	110th Precinct

## 8 Months of Operation: 7th Precinct

## 6 Months of Operation:

10th Precinct	47th Precinct	83rd Precinct
24th Precinct	61st Precinct	114th Precinct

The scope of operations in these commands during 1985 may be summarized as follows:

- There were a total of 194 months of CPOP operation in the 21 Precincts
- There are 21 Sergeants, 206 CPO Police Officers and 19 Police Administrative Aides assigned to CPOP operations in these precincts. The Police Officer personnel account for approximately 6.5% of all police officers assigned to these commands.
- Of the 206 Police Officers, 21 are assigned as Unit Coordinators, and 185 are assigned as CPO Beat Officers.
- There are a total of 179 Beat Areas in the 21 Precincts. In 9 of the precincts, the beat areas cover all of the territory within the precinct, while in the remaining 12 only a portion is covered. Each beat is covered by one permanently assigned CPO with the exception of 6 beats (three in each of two precincts located within the Pressure Point I area) in which 2 CPOs are assigned to provide two-tour coverage.

- During the year, the 179 beat areas were covered for a total of 1,729 man-months of CPO patrol.

### III. Community Patrol Officer Activity Levels - Quantitative Measures

The Tables which follow summarize some of the quantitative measures of CPO activity in the 21 Precincts during the year 1985. They are:

Table 1, CPOP Unit Activity for All Months of Operation in 1985, presents the yearly total on each activity for which statistics are routinely maintained. (The monthly activity level for each individual precinct may be found in the Precinct Activity Tables included in the Appendix.)<sup>1</sup>

Table 2, Average Monthly Individual CPO Activity for All Months of Operation in 1985, presents data on the average monthly activity of individual CPOs during the year 1985 by precinct.

The data contained in these tables are not presented for comparison purposes. Activity levels vary widely among commands just as crime and order-maintenance conditions vary in the different precincts. What is an appropriate level of enforcement activity in one precinct may be inappropriate or not possible in another. Similarly, the opportunity to engage in a wide variety

-----

<sup>1</sup>Each CPO Unit maintains its own activity statistics on a monthly and cumulative basis, and submits these in a monthly report to the Chief of Patrol's Office, where staff prepare a consolidated monthly report. As all of these operations are performed manually, there is an opportunity for clerical error. In addition, precinct Units occasionally revise statistics and telephone changes to the Chief's Office, which does not result in the publication of amended reports. Table 1, and the Individual Precinct Tables contained in the Appendix were prepared by consolidating the monthly reports prepared by the Chief of Patrol's Office and sending each Unit Supervisor a draft table on which to enter corrections. The corrected copies were then consolidated into the tables presented in this report.

of community service activities may be substantially greater in some commands than others. Whether or not an individual unit's activity levels reflect an appropriate response to the conditions existing in a command is better determined by the judgements of the Unit Supervisor, the Precinct Commander, and the residents of that community.

These statistics are valuable, however, for several reasons. The cumulative city-wide totals provide some measure of CPOP's activity directed at crime and order-maintenance problems and the involvement of CPOs in crime prevention and community relations activities. They also provide some insight into the manner in which the program has been implemented in the commands by describing the balance between enforcement and community service activities in each of the precincts. While this is only a partial picture which must be augmented by a review of other issues, (e.g., unit program activities, command and citizen perception) it is a logical point at which to begin looking at what CPOP is all about.

COMMUNITY PATROL OFFICER PROGRAM  
Unit Activity  
All Months of Operation in 1985

Precinct	Unit Activity												Total									
	7th	9th	10th	13th	24th	25th	34th	43rd	47th	52nd	61st	63rd		72nd	81st	83rd	88th	102nd	105th	110th	114th	120th
Activity	22	81	24	12	20	3	68	26	16	64	2	3	101	26	41	33	4	13	9	15	18	601
Felony	56	307	24	15	29	13	158	22	41	114	1	29	142	25	19	48	19	15	7	14	34	1132
Misdemeanor	9	72	0	12	106	9	199	262	86	410	6	69	453	4	140	120	3	91	59	51	6	2167
Violation	87	460	48	39	155	25	425	310	143	588	9	101	696	55	200	201	26	119	75	80	58	3900
Total Arrests	178	314	80	306	240	92	966	551	196	781	256	310	271	378	379	388	251	261	210	257	61	6726
Moving	6467	3376	799	2099	1384	1052	3851	1671	778	1373	345	1096	363	1378	714	788	1767	837	931	1015	375	32459
Parking	631	498	93	211	88	16	100	122	62	44	39	93	47	44	41	294	77	37	72	51	60	2720
Other	7276	4188	972	2616	1712	1160	4917	2344	1036	2198	640	1499	681	1800	1134	1470	2095	1135	1213	1323	496	41905
Total Summonses																						
Abandoned Veh.																						
Rotation Tow	10	66	10	19	62	8	65	43	45	45	46	82	65	69	40	17	98	44	58	12	5	909
Sanitation	24	210	1	4	141	18	111	146	107	103	96	80	124	235	92	32	221	88	56	194	68	2151
Total	34	276	11	23	203	26	176	189	152	148	142	162	189	304	132	49	319	132	114	206	73	3060
Other Activities																						
Intell. Repts.	17	109	64	9	122	21	72	125	30	120	18	10	47	203	523	111	17	62	15	16	47	1758
Block Watchers	0	24	3	0	0	0	316	96	2	157	0	1	219	159	15	56	81	21	2	50	131	1333
Security Surveys	27	99	1	33	3	7	58	41	11	21	26	22	31	16	0	0	14	7	72	3	161	653
Meetings Att.	64	170	31	62	69	34	145	112	77	143	77	117	302	264	34	139	160	184	98	58	143	2483
Block Assoc.	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	2	1	2	8	4	0	0	0	4	8	5	1	47

Table 2

AVERAGE MONTHLY INDIVIDUAL CPO ACTIVITY FOR ALL MONTHS OF OPERATION IN 1985

Activity	Precinct (No. of CPOs) Activity Level											
	7th.(11)	9th.(11)	10th.(5)	13th.(7)	24th.(9)	25th.(5)	34th.(9)	43rd.(9)	47th.(9)	52nd.(9)		
<u>Arrest</u>												
Felony	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Misdemeanor	0.6	2.3	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.5	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1
Violation	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.2	2.0	0.2	1.8	3.2	1.6	3.8	1.6	3.8
Total Arrests	1.0	3.5	1.6	0.6	2.9	0.5	3.9	3.8	2.6	5.4	2.6	5.4
<u>Summonses</u>												
Moving	2.0	2.4	2.7	4.9	4.4	1.7	8.9	6.8	3.6	7.2	3.6	7.2
Parking	73.5	25.6	26.6	33.3	25.6	19.5	35.7	20.6	14.4	12.7	14.4	12.7
Other	7.2	3.8	3.1	3.3	1.6	0.3	0.9	1.5	1.1	0.4	1.1	0.4
Total Summonses	82.7	31.7	32.4	41.5	31.7	21.5	45.5	28.9	19.2	20.4	19.2	20.4
<u>Abandoned Veh.</u>												
Rotation Tow	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.1	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4
Sanitation	0.3	1.6	0.0	0.1	2.6	0.3	1.0	1.8	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Total	0.4	2.1	0.4	0.4	3.8	0.5	1.6	2.3	2.8	1.4	2.8	1.4
<u>Other Activities</u>												
Intell. Repts.	0.2	0.8	2.1	0.1	2.3	0.4	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.1	0.6	1.1
Block Watchers	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.2	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5
Security Surv.	0.3	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Meetings Attended	0.7	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.3	0.6	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.3
Block Assoc formed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 2 (CONTINUED)

## AVERAGE MONTHLY INDIVIDUAL CPO ACTIVITY FOR ALL MONTHS OF OPERATION IN 1985

Activity	Precinct (No. of CPOs) Activity Level											
	61st.(9)	63rd.(9)	72nd.(9)	81st.(9)	83rd.(9)	88th.(9)	102nd.(9)	105th.(9)	110th.(9)	114th.(9)	120th.(9)	
<u>Arrest</u>												
Felony	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.2	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
Misdemeanor	0.0	0.4	1.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Violation	0.1	0.9	4.0	0.0	2.6	1.5	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.1
Total Arrests	0.2	1.2	6.1	0.5	3.7	2.5	0.2	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.5	0.5
<u>Summonses</u>												
Moving	4.7	3.8	2.4	3.5	7.0	4.8	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.6	4.8	0.6
Parking	6.4	13.5	3.2	12.8	13.2	9.7	16.4	7.8	11.5	11.5	18.8	3.5
Other	0.7	1.1	0.4	0.4	0.8	3.6	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.6
Total Summonses	11.9	18.5	6.0	16.7	21.0	18.1	19.4	10.5	15.0	15.0	24.5	4.6
<u>Abandoned Veh.</u>												
Rotation Tow	0.9	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.2	0.0
Sanitation	1.8	1.0	1.1	2.2	1.7	0.4	2.2	0.8	0.7	0.7	3.6	0.6
Total	2.6	2.0	1.7	2.8	2.4	0.6	3.0	1.2	1.4	1.4	3.8	0.7
<u>Other Activities</u>												
Intell. Repts.	0.3	0.1	0.4	1.9	9.7	1.4	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
Block Watchers	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.5	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.2
Security Surv.	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.9	0.1	1.5
Meetings Attended	1.4	1.4	2.6	2.4	0.6	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3
Block Assco formed	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0



#### A. Enforcement Activity -- Arrest and Summons

The Community Patrol Officer Program was not implemented as an enforcement-oriented effort. CPOs are not meant to be uniformed Anti/Crime officers whose primary function is to make arrests. However, law enforcement is one of the most important aspects of the CPOs' role, and the authority to make arrests and issue summonses is one of the CPOs most powerful weapons in dealing with crime and order maintenance problems at the neighborhood level. During the initial orientation phase of the CPO Training Program, it is made clear to the new CPOs that CPOP is not a public relations program; it is a program for working cops. In helping neighborhoods to rebuild and become safe havens for their residents, it is a primary function of the CPO to use his powers of arrest and summons to deal with violations of law and public order. The CPOs are advised that community response to the program and to their individual efforts will be based more upon their ability to make the neighborhoods safer than on the number of friendly gestures they make. The CPOs are told, in essence, that while communities desire friendly and caring police officers who are prepared to help them in a variety of ways, they first and foremost want effective police officers who will make their neighborhoods safe places in which to live. The following statistics suggest that the CPOs have accepted enforcement as one of the principle dimensions of their role.

During the year 1985, the 185 Community Patrol Officers assigned to beat areas effected a total of 3,900 arrests. Of these, 601 were for felonies, 1,132 were for misdemeanors, and 2,167 were for violations. In addition, the CPOs issued a total

of 41,905 summonses, of which 6,726 were for moving violations of the traffic laws, 32,459 for parking violations, and 2,720 were for ECB, Penal Law, and other violations.

The level of enforcement activity varies widely among the 21 precincts, and appears to be dependent upon the levels of crime and order-maintenance problems existing within the precincts. The Units with the highest levels of arrest and summons enforcement activity are:

The 72nd Precinct with 696 arrests (including 101 felonies), and 681 summonses for the 12 months of operation in 1985. Each CPO averaged 6.1 arrests per month, including 0.9 felony arrests, for the period.

The 52nd Precinct with 588 arrests (64 felonies) and 2,198 summonses for 9 months of operation. Each CPO averaged 5.4 arrests per month.

The 9th Precinct with 460 arrests (81 felonies) and 4,188 summonses for 12 months of operation. Each CPO averaged 3.5 arrests per month.

The 34th Precinct with 425 arrests (68 felonies) and 4,917 summonses for 12 months of operation. Each CPO averaged 3.9 arrests per month.

While it would be difficult to conduct a rigorous analysis of the individual arrest and summons incidents, there is a consensus among Unit Supervisors and Precinct Commanders that CPO enforcement activities are directed against specific problems and conditions within the beat areas and are not, in the main, the fortuitous result of random patrol. For example, the CPOs in the 34th Precinct had the second highest rate of summons issuance of the 21 Units, issuing 4,188 summonses during the 12 month period. Almost all of these summonses resulted from the Unit's efforts to curtail street level drug sales in the area by rigorously enforcing the traffic laws to deter buyers (particularly school aged

youths from New Jersey) from entering the area.

What is not documented in this report are the numerous enforcement actions which have resulted from information supplied by CPOs to other units of the Department. During the year, the CPOs in the 21 precinct submitted a total of 1,758 Intelligence Reports, many of which resulted in arrest actions by other Department Units. In addition, in almost every command CPOs have furnished information to PDUs, Anti-Crime Units and RIP Units which has resulted in the arrest of dangerous criminals. While such events are not officially recorded or documented beyond the occasional letter of commendation prepared by Detective Unit Commanders, verification of numerous incidents of this type has been obtained by interview with the PDU, Anti/Crime, and RIP Unit commanders in the various precincts.

#### B. Other-than-enforcement, and Community Service Activities

CPOs engage in a wide variety of activity that does not entail arrest and summons, including focused community service activities, not all of which result in the maintenance of easily retrievable statistics.<sup>2</sup> However, statistics are maintained on some of the more common and visible of these activities, and they provide some insight into the total range of CPO operations.

1. Removal of Abandoned Vehicles. During the year, the CPOs in the 21 Precincts have caused the removal of 3,060 abandoned vehicles from their beat areas. Rotation Tow was util-

-----  
<sup>2</sup>There are a wide variety of CPO activities which, while documented, do not result in the maintenance of ongoing monthly compilations. Routine operations such as responding to 911 calls, making agency referrals, doing complaint follow-ups, visiting merchants and community residents while on patrol, etc. are recorded in individual officers' Activity Logs and are not subject to monthly tabulation.

ized in the removal of 909 of these, while the Sanitation Department removed 2,151.

2. Attendance at Community Meetings. CPOs attend Precinct Community Council meetings, Parent Teacher Association Meetings, Church meetings, Block Association meetings, Civic Association meetings, etc. On many of these occasions the officer merely attends as a department representative and is available to discuss police-related problems as they arise. On other occasions, the meetings are arranged to have the officer meet with community residents and discuss specific community problems with them, or to discuss specific crime-prevention techniques.

During the year 1985, the 185 CPO beat officers attended a total of 2,483 community meetings. The frequency with which CPOs attend such meetings differs among the various precincts and is dependent upon the level of community organization existing within the precinct. While in the majority of precincts each CPO attends about 1 such meeting monthly, there are several commands in which each CPO attends 2 or 3 community meetings each month.

3. Recruitment of Block Watchers. CPOs throughout the precincts attempt to stimulate interest in the Department's Block Watcher Program as a means of increasing the crime resistance of the neighborhoods. They attempt to recruit block watchers while at community meetings, while conducting complaint follow-ups, and by circulating fliers. These activities are coordinated with those of the Precinct Community Affairs and Crime Prevention Officers who conduct the actual block watcher training. During the year, the CPOs assigned to the 21 precincts

recruited a total of 1,333 block watchers. In a similar manner they attempt to recruit residents for participation in the Department's Auxiliary Police program, although there are no statistics available on the results of their efforts in this area.

Participation in this phase of CPOP operations varies widely among the precincts. The opportunity to recruit block watchers is dependent upon a number of factors: citizen perceptions of crime conditions in the precinct; degree of existing community organization; stability of the residential population; and previous efforts to recruit block watchers in the precinct (in some CPOP commands, program implementation had been preceded by successful efforts to recruit large numbers of block watchers.) In five of the 21 precincts the CPOs have failed to recruit any block watchers. Feedback from the CPOs in those commands indicates that this phase of CPOP operations was never emphasized in those precincts. (Subsequent to the field visits, one of these five precincts instituted a concerted effort to recruit block watchers which culminated in a mass meeting at which over 40 residents were enrolled in the program. The number of residents who attended the meeting would probably have been higher except for the fact that it was scheduled for a day on which near blizzard conditions occurred.) By contrast, some commands have emphasized this phase of the operation and there are 5 CPOP Units which have succeeded in recruiting over 100 block watchers each. They are:

- 34th Precinct -- 316 block watchers
- 72nd Precinct -- 219 block watchers
- 81st Precinct -- 159 block watchers
- 52nd Precinct -- 157 block watchers

- 120th Precinct - 131 block watchers

4. Security Surveys. At the implementation of CPOP, there was a clear policy decision to limit CPO security surveys to residential premises inspections, and reserve security inspections of business premises for the precincts' Crime Prevention Officers. In addition, it was decided that sensitive residential surveys (i.e., those in which residents indicate that they possess unusually large assets, coin collections, jewelry, etc.) also be reserved for the Crime Prevention Officers. These decisions were made both in view of the superior training afforded Crime Prevention Officers, and because the basic mission of the CPOs to serve residents in the communities. The Crime Prevention Section organized its training program for CPOs to focus on residential premises security, and designed abbreviated inspection reports for their use. CPOs conduct residential premises security surveys either proactively by soliciting community participation at meetings, etc., or reactively while following up on complaint reports. While CPOs conduct the actual inspections, their reports are first reviewed by the Precinct's Crime Prevention Officer before they are forwarded to the residents. Again this acknowledges the superior training and expertise of the Crime Prevention Officers, and insures that the recommendations made by the CPOs are fully in accord with Department policies.

During the year, the CPOs in the 21 precincts conducted a total of 653 crime prevention security surveys of residential premises. Unit participation in this phase of operations varied widely throughout the precincts, but there were only two Units which did not conduct any surveys. The leading units in this ac-

tivity are the 120th CPOP Unit with 161 surveys and the 9th CPOP Unit with 99 surveys.

5. Community Organizing. Part of the rationale for the establishment of the CPOP is to enlist the assistance of community residents in dealing with crime and order maintenance problems in the neighborhoods. While individual citizens are invited to assist in these efforts by becoming block watchers, by increasing the security of their residences, and by utilizing other crime prevention techniques, organized citizen involvement through community organizations (Block Associations, Tenant Associations, Merchant Associations, etc.) holds the greatest potential for effecting positive change in the various neighborhoods, and for increasing the security of a beat to which a CPO is assigned.

CPOs are directed to work with organized groups on the development and implementation of crime-prevention strategies in their neighborhoods. Citizen participation activities, such as neighborhood and tenant security patrols, are encouraged. In addition, the CPOs are directed to attempt to assist in the creation of community organizations in those areas of their beats where they do not exist. This last function, community organizing, is one of the most difficult tasks attempted by the officers and, as later sections of this report will indicate, these difficulties are a source of some frustration for the CPO. Nevertheless, all of the units have attempted to foster community organization, and during the year 1985, the 21 CPOP Units were responsible for the organization of 47 Block Associations. (Counting the 22 Block Associations formed by the 72nd CPOP Unit

in 1984, CPOP operations have resulted in the creation of 69 Block Associations since the inception of the program.)

6. Unit Program Activities. While not subject to precise quantitative measurement, a brief description of the Unit Program Activities of the various CPOP Units should be included in this section both because of their importance to the total CPO Program and because of the amount of time invested in their operation. In many of these program efforts there is an intentional focus on the polar ends of the population, the youth and senior citizens. The reasons for this focus are the issues of victim vulnerability, crime prevention, and what may best be described as a strategy for increasing the CPOs' involvement with all elements of the community. Senior citizens and youths are among the most often victimized. Many of the Program Activities are designed to reduce this victimization both by direct intervention (reducing the opportunity for victimization through, e.g., Senior Citizen Escort programs, Child Safe Haven programs, etc.) and by fostering crime prevention actions on the part of these groups. Youth are very crime-prone, as well as being frequently victimized, and many of the CPOP Unit Program Activities attempt to reduce the participation of neighborhood youths in criminal activities through counseling, providing wholesome leisure activities, and assisting them to participate in educational or vocational programs. By focusing Program Activities on neighborhood youth and senior citizens, the CPO Units hope to advance their efforts to reach all of the residents in a community, as their



efforts become known and appreciated by the parents and elder siblings of the youth and the children of the seniors.<sup>3</sup>

Some CPO Unit program activities (Unit Programs) may simply involve the CPOs attempting to get community residents to participate in existing Department crime prevention programs such as the Block Watcher Program, Operation I.D., Auxiliary Police, etc. Others involve the design and implementation of programs geared to deal with crime or order maintenance problems in the neighborhoods. In a large number of precincts the CPOs operate Senior Citizen Escort Programs, transporting the seniors to shopping areas, banks, etc. In other precincts the CPOs sponsor Safe Corridor programs, providing the seniors with specific routes to take to shopping areas and patrolling these routes during specific hours. In all of the precincts the CPOP Units are involved in a variety of Program Activities dealing with neighborhood children and youths: child fingerprint programs, Safe Haven programs, safety lecture programs, sponsoring athletic leagues, bicycle registrations, etc.

The emergence of CPO Unit Program Activities is one of the most encouraging aspects of current CPO operations. These efforts not only demonstrate the imagination and willingness of the CPOs to become deeply involved in the everyday life of the community, but also demonstrate a recognition on their part that enforcement efforts alone are not sufficient to deal with the crime

-----

<sup>3</sup>While this approach is grounded in little more than theory, evidence is mounting that it is sound strategy. For example, in some precincts, CPO activities at the grade school level (e.g., child fingerprinting programs, safety lectures, etc.) has led to the involvement of CPOs in PTA organizations, which has led to the development of crime prevention efforts involving the parents.

and order maintenance problems facing the neighborhoods they patrol, and that long range efforts to reduce crime through citizen involvement must be undertaken.

While the Appendix to this report presents detailed information on the Unit Programs underway in the 21 precincts, two will be outlined here as examples of the manner in which program activities have been designed to address perceived needs.

a. Drug Awareness Workshops -- 72nd Precinct

Since the inception of the program in the 72nd Precinct, the CPOs have devoted much of their efforts to dealing with street-level narcotic trafficking within the Beat Areas. Their initial efforts focused on enforcement, and resulted in a large number of arrests. As a result of these activities, there is a perceivable difference in the level of street narcotics trafficking in the area. For example, when the program began, 61st Street between Fourth and Fifth Avenues was generally regarded as one of the prime retail drug locations in the City. Street sales were very evident and there was a constant procession of cars passing through the block for the purpose of buying drugs. The decent citizens who lived on the block existed in fear of the drug dealers and, when the program began, were afraid to be seen talking to the Beat Officer. The unit focused a great deal of energy and attention on this block and, in addition to coverage by the Beat Officer, made it the target of frequent pass-bys by the CPOP van. Various enforcement strategies were designed and implemented, including always covering the Beat Area either by the assigned CPO, by one of the alternates, or, if necessary, by reassigning one of the other CPOs in the absence of the assigned officer. When per-

sonnel were available, the Beat was frequently covered on two tours. This concentrated CPO activity resulted in a large number of high visibility arrests being made on the block. After several weeks of this sustained attention, the decent citizens on the block began to have confidence in the CPOs and began to flood the Unit with intelligence information on narcotic activities. Some of this intelligence (that regarding street sales) resulted in additional arrests by the CPOs, other information (regarding inside sales) resulted in the submission of a number of intelligence reports to the Borough Narcotics Unit. As a result of this sustained attention, street sales on 61st Street have been substantially reduced, if not completely eliminated. In some instances dealers have relocated, in others they have moved indoors. The change in the block is very evident to any informed observer, and street traffic is now limited to residents and their children.

In addition to the high level of enforcement, the CPOs attempted to deal with the drug problem in a number of other ways. They identified and began working with a number of drug programs in the area, and succeeded in securing placements for over 40 addicts in residential drug treatment programs.

Despite the success they have had in dealing with the drug problem in the area, the CPOs recognized the magnitude of the problem and the substantial high risk which it continued to present to the children and youth in the community. As a result, they formulated plans to initiate a Drug Awareness Program in the Precinct. To insure that each of the officers was qualified to conduct drug awareness workshops with neighborhood children, and

was prepared to discuss both the physiological and psychological effects of drug usage, the Unit contacted the Assistant Director of Training of the Police Academy, and arranged for all of the CPOs to attend a two-day Drug Awareness training session at the Police Academy during the month of November, 1985. The Unit then approached the Precinct Community Council which arranged for financial backing for the program. The Council succeeded in obtaining a donation from a local merchant to purchase T-shirts for every youth who attended a workshop. The T-shirts bear the international symbol for not doing something (a circle with a diagonal line through it) superimposed over drug paraphernalia, and the legend "Say No To Drugs -- 72nd Precinct Community Patrol Officer Program" on them.

Initial program efforts focused on those areas within the precinct which evince the highest levels of drug usage. Small drug awareness workshops are conducted by CPOs for neighborhood youth, focusing on two age groups, 7 to 12, and 12 to 17. The workshops are held at the neighborhood level, in a home, a church, or other community facility. The first workshop was delivered on January 30th, 1986, and 2 more have followed. Through February, 1986, a total of 41 neighborhood children have attended.

**b. Community Awareness Program -- 63rd Precinct**

During the early months of operation of CPOP in the 63rd Precinct, the CPOs became aware that leaders and residents of the community suffered from a lack of knowledge about the nature and extent of crime and order-maintenance problems in the area. This lack of knowledge resulted in citizen apathy and a general mis-

understanding of the Police Department's concern with these problems and what it was doing about them. As a result, the Unit developed a Community Awareness Program as an effort to promote citizen awareness of the nature and extent of conditions in the area, to promote citizen involvement in dealing with these conditions, and to increase the level of citizen awareness about Department efforts to improve the quality of life in the area.

Two or three times each month, a small group of between 8 and 10 citizens (community leaders, elected officials, school officials, residents, etc.) are taken in the CPOP van for a tour of the precinct. These persons are shown various locations where youth congregate in menacing ways, drug-prone locations, and sites of other disorderly conditions within the precinct. The CPOs explain the conditions at each location and what efforts are being made by the Department to deal with them. The tour lasts between one and two hours and is followed by a meeting at the station house during which the conditions reviewed are discussed and the citizens are invited to suggest means by which the precinct could better deal with the problems and means by which the citizens themselves could assist in addressing them.

This program has been very well received both by the local citizenry and by the representatives of other service agencies operating within the precinct. For example, all of the drug counselors from Local School District 22 have participated, and report that this first hand view of the drug prone locations and the areas where the youth congregate, and the conditions at those locations, has been extremely helpful to them in performing their duties.

#### IV. Qualitative Assessment of CPOP Operations in the 21 Commands

In addition to a review of available operational data, our qualitative assessment of CPOP operations in the 21 precincts relies heavily on interviews conducted with a wide variety of persons and on other information received. Among those interviewed were: all CPOP Unit Supervisors, all CPOP Precinct Commanders, all Community Planning Board District Managers, approximately 90% of all of the CPOs in the 21 Precincts, and the representative of the Citizen's Committee who has conducted Community Organizing Training workshops in each of the Units. Other sources of information were: feedback provided by other members of the Program Development Team who had visited the CPOP Units and observed operations; reports of the Ethical Awareness workshops conducted for CPOs; information submitted by the Units for publication in the CPO Newsletter; records of the Civilian Complaint Review Board; and letters of commendation received by the Department and the Precincts.

##### A. Implementation of the Program in the Expansion Precincts

In general, the implementation of the program in the expansion precincts has been successfully accomplished. In all of the precincts the Units have been established and are working in general accord with program design. However, it should be noted that within that design, there is a great latitude for local adaptation to meet the needs of the individual precincts. CPOP operations differ from command to command, and it is this flexibility which permits command personnel to obtain maximum utilization from the personnel assigned to the program.

The process of program development at the unit level, in terms of the speed with which the CPOs begin to perform non-traditional or community-oriented functions, has been directly influenced by the time of year at which the program was implemented in the unit. Those precincts which implemented the program in the winter or spring months had the opportunity to begin to develop a base of community support for their activities before the onset of the inhospitable street conditions so prevalent during the summer months. On the other hand, the CPOs in precincts which implemented the program at the beginning of the summer were forced to devote their initial energies to dealing with the street conditions before they could begin the task of building a firm base of community support. Neither developmental pattern appears to be preferable with respect to gaining community support for the program. Communities in which the program was begun during the summer were found to be just as supportive of it as those in which the program was implemented during the winter or spring.

There also appears to be a relationship between the level of crime and order-maintenance conditions existing within a precinct and the speed with which CPOP Unit begins to develop a rounded program of enforcement and community service. In general, it appears that the greater the challenge to the officers, the greater their response. CPOP Units implemented in commands which experience a high level of crime and order-maintenance conditions generally respond to those conditions not only with high levels of enforcement activity, but also with a determined effort to foster crime-prevention activities by community residents, and with the implementation of a variety of Unit program activities designed

to address community needs. On the other hand, CPOP Units implemented in relatively more stable communities with lower levels of crime and order maintenance conditions not only engage in significantly lower levels of enforcement activity, but in some instances appear to be limited in the number and type of non-traditional strategies implemented by the unit. This seems to be more a function of opportunity than a function of desire on the part of the CPOs. CPOP units implemented in the more stable low-crime precincts have less opportunity to engage in the development of creative strategies than those in high-crime areas. Stable communities are marked by high levels of community organization, and the availability of a wide variety of public and private social services. As a result, the need for CPOs to become involved in these areas is limited. Nevertheless, the CPOP Units in these precincts (meeting, as they do, the perceived needs of the residents) have been as well received by the community as the units in the high-crime areas.

There is a clear parallel between the manner in which the pilot program developed in the 72nd Precinct and its development in the expansion precincts. Initial operations tend to focus on the identification of street conditions and the initiation of enforcement and other strategies to deal with them. Once this is well underway, the CPOs begin to focus on identifying program and service needs in the area and developing unit program activities and other strategies to address them. It is only at this point that the officers begin to explore means of involving the community residents in crime prevention activities. Despite the similarity in the developmental pattern, it should be noted that



each succeeding group of expansion precincts has benefitted directly by the experience gained in the precincts which have preceded them. There has been a concerted effort by the Program Development Team to foster an exchange of information and experience between the various CPOP precincts, and this effort has resulted in accelerating the pace of development within the newer precincts.

**B. Command Support.**

The most important factor in the development of a good CPOP Unit is the level of support the unit gets from the Precinct's Commanding Officer. The strength of support from the commander appears to be based, as one might suspect, on his perceptions of the degree to which CPOP is likely to meet the needs of the precinct. In the vast majority of commands into which the program has been expanded it appears that the Precinct Commanders perceive that quality-of-life issues are of equal importance with crime conditions. As a result, and because these commanders view CPOP operations as directed at quality-of-life problems as well as embodying traditional enforcement values, they tend to give CPOP the support it needs. These commanding officers also tend to view CPOP as a long-term strategy for dealing with crime problems through the implementation of crime prevention strategies and the involvement of community residents in the development of such strategies. There are a few commands, however, in which it appears that the precinct commanders' perceptions are that crime is an overwhelming problem, that traditional enforcement action is the indicated response, and that CPOP operations are to viewed

more in terms of immediate impact on crime rather than in terms of a longer-range crime reduction strategy.

In interviews conducted with the Commanding Officers of the twenty-one Precincts, sixteen commanders indicated unequivocal support for the program. These commanders cited a variety of reasons for this level of support, among which were:

1. CPO operations deal with a wide variety of problems existing in the precinct. The personnel engage in crime enforcement activities as well as dealing with quality of live problems.
2. Community feedback is extremely positive.
3. The units have made the commanding officers' job easier by dealing directly with the issues of concern to the precincts' residents. All of the commanders interviewed indicated that they received substantially fewer complaints from the community as a direct result of CPOP operations. As one commander summarized this: "I am no longer on the defensive at community meetings because the CPOs are out there dealing effectively with the problems which cause citizen dissatisfaction." Another stated: "Instead of working for an hour trying to dope out the answer for a community problem, I can delegate it to the CPOP Unit and I know that it's taken care of." A third commander stated: "The CPOs function like Community Affairs Officers who have the ability to handle the problems they discover instead of merely bringing them back to the Commanding Officer."
4. Several of the commanders indicated that the CPOs had effectively dealt with long-term conditions which had defied previous precinct corrective efforts.
5. Several of the precinct commanders cited the intelligence gathering capability of the CPOs as a definite plus which has resulted in the solution of serious crimes.
6. One commanding officer summarized his opinion of the program by stating: "Any precinct commander who doesn't like this program is out of his skull." Another stated: "This is the best program that I have ever witnessed in the Department with respect to positive community response."

The Commanding Officers of the remaining five precincts also evinced support for the program, but each voiced some reservations. These may be summarized as follows:

1. One commander of a high-crime precinct indicated that while he believed that the program was effective in his command, he felt that the results were not as evident as those experienced in other precincts. He indicated that he feared that the existence of the program raised the expectations of the public to a level which could not be satisfied because of the extent of the conditions within the precinct.
2. A second commander indicated that while he believed that the program was effective in addressing the needs of the residents of the community, it limited the Commanding Officer's prerogatives in the deployment of his personnel.
3. The remaining three commanders indicated that while the program was very effective in dealing with the quality of life conditions in the precinct and satisfying the community in that regard, crime was the most important problem within the precinct and the CPOP unit was not directly reducing crime.

The majority of the twenty-one precinct commanders evince their support of the program in a number of tangible ways which contribute directly to the effectiveness of the program in their commands. Among these manifestations of support are the following:

1. Many of the commanders have issued clear policy guidelines within their commands as to the manner in which unit operations are to be conducted. They have disseminated this information through written memoranda or through command supervisory conferences to reduce middle-management interference with program operations. In these commands there is a clear presumption that CPOP personnel and equipment (primarily the CPO van) are to be used only for CPOP operations unless a significant emergency exists.
2. The majority of commanders have placed CPO alternate personnel in TOPAC or non-chart assignments in order to make them available to fill in for absent CPOs. In several commands, the Precinct Commander has made the alternates full-time members of the Unit, to be deployed on a daily basis in support of Unit operations. As a result, in those commands when all personnel are present for duty,

the Unit Supervisor is able to provide two tour coverage on some Beat Areas, or utilize the alternate personnel for enforcement or community service activities.

3. The majority of commanders have made immediate replacement personnel available to the Unit when CPOs or CPO alternates have left.
4. The majority of the commanders encourage high visibility for CPOP operations by insuring that the Unit Supervisor, and in some instances individual CPOs, attend important community meetings, e.g., Precinct Community Council, Community Planning Board, etc.
5. The majority of the precinct commanders maintain frequent if not daily contact with Unit operations. In some precincts the Commanding Officer deals primarily through the Unit Supervisor while in some others the COs indicate that they frequently debrief individual CPOs to find out what is going on in the various Beat Areas. One commanding officer indicated that he visits the CPO office on a daily basis and reviews operations with the CPOs present at that time.
6. Many of the commanders have demonstrated their satisfaction with the efforts of individual CPOs by giving them desirable precinct assignments such as Anti-Crime, Community Affairs, and Crime Prevention.

#### C. Program Expansion within the Twenty-one Precincts

Initial program operations within each command are the result of the Department's strategy of replicating the pilot model. As a result, each command begins with a maximum of 9 Beat Areas which, as previously indicated, may cover all of the territory within a precinct, or a portion of it. Beyond initial operations, precinct commanders are encouraged to plan the further development of CPOP after they have had the opportunity to become familiar with it and to evaluate its effectiveness. As a result, during the past year, several precinct commanders have redrawn the boundary lines of Beat Areas either to increase the size of the beat, or to provide for a more equal distribution of workload among the several beats. In addition, the Commanding Officer of

the 72nd Precinct implemented a 10th Beat Area to increase the level of CPOP coverage within that command.

During the interviews, each of the Precinct Commanders was asked if he intended any modifications to program operations in the near future. Several indicated that they were formulating plans to increase the number of Beat Areas, and several others indicated that they were conducting studies of the Beat Area boundaries to determine the feasibility of enlarging some. (Subsequently, two of these Precinct Commanders did in fact increase the number of Beat Areas within their precincts. The 52nd Precinct increased the number of Beat Areas from 9 to 11, while the 114th Precinct increased the number of Beat Areas from 9 to 10.)

In addition, several precinct commanders indicated that, while they would like to increase the number of Beat Areas within their commands, they did not have sufficient personnel to do so. For example, the Commanding Officer, 105th Precinct, indicated that he believed that CPOP was an extremely effective operation within the command and that, because the Beat Areas only cover approximately twenty-five percent of the precinct's territory, he would like to increase the number of Beats. However, he stated that he did not have a sufficient number of personnel assigned to the command to do so at this time.

#### D. Personnel Concerns

Throughout the development of the Community Patrol Officer Program, questions have been raised, by Department managers and by Vera staff, about various personnel issues. During the review, we tried to obtain information relevant to these issues.

1. Role Development. A threshold question is the ability of police officers to adapt to the new role of Community Patrol Officer. While the role builds on the basic training and skills of a police officer, its effective performance requires that the individual officers develop a whole new range of skills and attitudes, many of which they had never associated with the role of police officer. While each dimension of the CPO role requires the development of new skills on the part of the officers, the one which presents the most direct conflict with their previous police experience is that of "planner." CPOs are required to do a great deal of planning. They must survey their Beat Areas and identify the principal crime and order maintenance problems of greatest concern to the community; prioritize their efforts in dealing with these problems; determine the most appropriate times for their patrols; identify service needs in the community, and assist in the development of unit activities directed at meeting these needs, etc. To many of the officers entering the program, this was the first time in their police careers that they had been called on to participate in the planning and decision making process. Police officers assigned to standard patrol duties (e.g., radio motor patrol, foot patrol, etc.) are not required to plan, but to respond as directed by their supervisors and by the central communications unit and to perform their duties in accordance with the Department's regulations. As a result, throughout the CPOP training program, the areas which seemed most problematic for the new CPOs were those associated with the planning dimension.

There is growing evidence that the police officers assigned to the program have adapted well to this part of the CPO role. A review of the quantifiable data presented in an earlier section of this report demonstrates that, while the CPOs have continued to utilize enforcement tactics to deal with many of the problems encountered in the neighborhoods, they have also become involved in a wide variety of community oriented policing activities. There is also some evidence that they have accepted the planning dimension of the role, and are developing in this area.

During the operational review, we examined the monthly work plan of every CPO for each month of operation. This was an encouraging exercise as it demonstrated that a large number of the officers were showing significant improvement in the manner in which they identified and analyzed problems, and were becoming more creative in the development of strategies to address them. In general, their early attempts at problem identification and proposing strategies to deal with them reflected an exclusively enforcement orientation; at first, they were limiting their proposed strategies to those actions which they could take as individuals. However, as they gained experience in the program and began to explore other means of dealing with the problems they identified, their proposed strategies began to include participation by citizens and other agencies in coordinated efforts.

For example, in some Beat Areas, CPOs identified burglary as one of their principal crime problems, and also identified it as a priority issue to be dealt with during the month. In designing strategies to deal with this problem during the early months of program operation, many of the CPOs would propose enforcement

oriented strategies such as: perform high visibility patrol in area; work with Anti-Crime unit on burglary reduction; work evening (or day) hours to deter burglaries; etc. As the months passed, these same officer began to identify compound strategies to deal with the problem, such as: Increase patrol visibility in area, and inform residents of problem, and solicit security surveys of residents, and recruit block watchers in area, and (in some cases) form tenants security patrol. In essence, with the passage of time and the gaining of experience, many of the CPOs demonstrate an appreciation of their limitations in effecting change through acting alone, and a recognition that there is a role for citizen participation in crime-reduction and order-maintenance efforts.

There is also some evidence that the CPOs are developing in other aspects of the new role. During the CPOP training program, almost all of the CPOs voiced concern about their ability to address community groups and to represent the Department on such occasions. All of the sergeants interviewed report that not only have all of their officers overcome their initial fears in this area, but also they have become rather accomplished performers who will speak before any group.

## 2. Burnout

As many studies have indicated, policing is a stressful occupation. CPOs are subject to all of the stress faced by other members of the force on patrol, with the possible exception of the stress engendered by continually responding to calls for service. And CPOs face other stressors not encountered in normal patrol operations. Undertaking a new role with new dimensions is



in itself a significant source of stress. In addition, many of the new duties associated with the CPO role may, in some instances, produce stress: Speaking at public meetings, attempting to help a resident solve a problem which involves coordinating actions with other public or private agencies, committing to resolution of a longstanding problem or condition, becoming involved with residents as people rather than as potential perps -- any of these may stress a CPO. CPOP is a high visibility assignment; in accepting the role, the officer loses much of the anonymity enjoyed by officers assigned to RMP cars on rotating tours. Part of his job is to become known in the community and his success depends to a large degree on his ability to gain the trust of the residents. But probably the greatest potential source of stress for a CPO is his acceptance of continuing personal responsibility for the people and conditions within his Beat Area.

Given these features of the assignment, it is reasonable to anticipate that some officers assigned to CPOP operations will burn out, and it would be beneficial both to the Department and to the individual officers to try to determine when and why this occurs.

There is still very little information available to guide us in addressing this problem. CPOP has been operating in a meaningful way for only a little over one year, and there is very little evidence of burnout among the officers at this point. We looked at some of the factors which might be indicators of burnout (unit morale, personnel turnover, disciplinary actions, civilian com-

plaints, sick and accident reports, etc.) and found little to indicate the emergence of significant problems.

### 3. Personnel Turnover

All of the personnel assigned to the CPOP are volunteers and, as such, may return to normal patrol duties merely by making a request to do so. In addition, it was expected that some personnel initially selected for the program would not prove suitable after they were given the opportunity to perform. As a result, some turnover in personnel was anticipated when the program was designed, and the identification and training of alternates was implemented to insure the availability of trained personnel to replace CPOs who, for one reason or another, left the program.

Personnel turnover could also result from other causes. In some instances it might reflect burnout -- the inability of an officer to adjust to the various stressors associated with the CPO role, resulting in his or her desire to return to the more traditional and comfortable role associated with normal patrol operations. But turnover might also be associated with other dissatisfactions by the officers with the CPO role or the CPOP structure.

To begin to address these issues, we gathered information on the turnover rates in each of the 21 precincts. This information is presented in Table 3, following.

Table 3  
Personnel Turnover During 1985

By Command:

<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>
7th	1	43rd	2	83rd	3
9th	4	47th	1	88th	1
10th	2	52nd	2	102nd	2
13th	7	61st	2	105th	5
24th	1	63rd	2	110th	5
25th	2	72nd	8	114th	3
34th	6	81st	4	120th	1

Total 64

Reasons for Turnover:

- 15 -- Transferred to other Commands (e.g., Applicant Investigations, OCCB, PMD, IAD, Aviation, MISD)
- 15 -- Received other Precinct Assignments (e.g., Anti-Crime, Community Affairs, SNEU)
- 16 -- Voluntarily returned to chart
- 8 -- Replaced by Unit Supervisor
- 5 -- Promoted to Sergeant
- 3 -- Resigned or Retired
- 2 -- Extended Sick Report or Modified Assignment

A review of the data in Table 3 discloses the following:

- a. Sixty-four police officers left the program out of the 206 police officer positions, for a turnover rate of 31%. (It should be noted however, that the 8 Police Officers who left the program in the 72nd Precinct had all served for at least one year. If the 72nd Precinct is removed from the calculations, 56 officers left the program out of 196 PO positions, for a turnover rate of 28.5% during the first year of operation.)
- b. Of the 64 officers who left the program, 35 (or 55%) left for reasons of perceived or actual career advancement. Five were promoted, 15 received desirable assignments in other department units, and 15 received desirable precinct assignments.
- c. Five of the officers left through retirement or resignation or because of extended sick report or modified assignment.
- d. Only 24 officers left the program because they were either dissatisfied with the CPO role and preferred normal patrol assignments (16), or because they failed to perform in accordance with

the standards set by unit supervisors (8). Thus the turnover rate for reasons which could be associated with burnout or dissatisfaction was only 11.7% during the year.

The low rate of personnel turnover resulting from supervisory dissatisfaction with performance (3.9%) reflects very favorably on the selection processes implemented by the precinct commanders and supervising sergeants. The rate of turnover of 14.6% for career advancement purposes (not including promotion) reflects the high quality of personnel selected for the program. Additionally, it reflects the opportunity the program has presented to many young police officers to demonstrate their abilities and receive the recognition due their efforts.

While this last issue -- turnover resulting from upward career moves -- may be regarded as a positive aspect of program operations, it also discloses one of the more serious problem areas found in the review of program operations: the perception on the part of the majority of CPOs that the program is out of the main stream of Department operations, and that participation in CPOP holds no clear career advantage for the officer. While transfer to a specialized department unit, (e.g., Aviation Bureau, OCCB, PMD, IAD, MISD) may clearly be perceived as a positive career move on the part of a police officer, offering as it does the opportunity for advancement to detective assignments or the pursuit of a specialized career path, it is less clear that CPOP personnel who opted for other precinct assignments (Anti-Crime, SNEU, Community Affairs) really made more than a lateral move.

Sergeant Philip Massina, OMAP conducted exit interviews of all of the personnel who left the program to accept other desirable precinct assignments. He found that the vast majority

of officers interviewed stated that they left CPOP only because they perceived it to be in their best career interest to do so. Some stated that they had submitted requests for transfer to OCCB and were notified that they did not meet career path because they had not spent the required period of time in an investigative assignment. Others indicated that, while they had not made such requests, they believed that they could not advance to investigative assignments because CPOP did not meet career path requirements for doing so. (All of those interviewed stated that they found CPOP a more rewarding assignment than their current one, and had left it reluctantly.) Similar negative perceptions about the career opportunities associated with participation in CPOP were voiced by the majority of CPOs during the CPOP Unit rap sessions held as part of the operational review, and will be discussed in a later section of this report.

While some level of turnover of personnel may be anticipated, and may indeed be healthy, high rates of turnover may be detrimental to program operations. The Department makes a substantial investment in the training of CPOs, and high rates of turnover increase these costs. In addition, high rates of turnover at the unit level may negatively affect unit operations for a variety of reasons and may give erroneous signals, to the residents of the communities, that this is just another police "public-relations" program. In reviewing operations in the twenty-one commands, there was only one precinct, the 13th, in which an unusually high rate of turnover (88%) appears to have negatively affected the development of the program, because it occurred over such a short period of time. On the other hand, the

80% turnover rate in the 72nd Precinct did not visibly affect efficient operations because it occurred after the completion of the first year, and was conducted in an orderly fashion over a number of months.

#### 4. Disciplinary Actions

The CPOs are given a wider range of duties than patrol officers in conventional modes of deployment, and they are given the wider scope of authority necessary to perform them. This fact, coupled with the relatively large size of CPO Beat Areas, raises potential hazards. Because CPOs enjoy a greater degree of freedom to pursue program objectives, a greater opportunity for misuse or abuse of authority exists. This potential for problems arises from the intentional trade-off of some degree of control in return for the accomplishment of a variety of desired objectives.

The Police Department has taken many steps in both the design and implementation of CPOP to minimize the potential hazards associated with the program's operation. Among these are:

- a. Careful selection of supervisory and operational personnel.
- b. Full integration of the program at the precinct level, involving the direct participation of all supervisory personnel in the command.
- c. Implementation of a schedule which requires Zone, Precinct and Unit commanders to conduct interviews of informed citizens to determine their perceptions of program operation and any problems resulting therefrom.
- d. Introduction of a reporting system which requires precinct and unit commanders to account for the activities of the CPOP personnel.
- e. Assignment of specific program review responsibilities to the precinct integrity control officers.
- f. Imposition of review responsibilities on other investigative units of the Department (e.g., the Field Internal

Affairs Units, and the Investigation and Evaluation Section of the Chief of Patrol's Office.)

- g. Introduction of an Ethical Awareness Program specifically geared to the hazards faced by CPOs.

In addition to these steps, many elements of CPOP operations were designed not only to foster the accomplishment of the objectives of the program, but also with a view to reducing its potential hazards. Some examples are: The large Beat Areas, while a concern with respect to supervisory aspects, contribute to the integrity of the program by insuring that each officer has a sufficient volume of work to occupy him daily. The high visibility of the individual CPOs, fostered both by the publicity attendant at program inception and by the permanent assignment of each officer to a particular beat, significantly reduces the anonymity associated with standard patrol operations. (Thus if a CPO were to engage in misconduct, it would be more difficult for him to do so without detection and identification by the area residents.)

Nevertheless, the potential for misconduct exists in CPOP, and the Department must guard against it. Of the several indicators of potential problems, this review focused on data about disciplinary actions maintained at the command level, and on Civilian Complaints filed with the Civilian Complaint Review Board. Data on disciplinary actions is presented in Table 4, which follows, while the data on Civilian Complaints will be reviewed in the next section.

A review of the data in Table 4 discloses that, of the 16 disciplinary actions taken against CPOs in the 21 Precincts during the year 1985, 13 resulted in command disciplines, 2 were unfounded by the Precinct Commander, and only 1 resulted in Charges

being preferred against the officer. More importantly, there is nothing in the causes of these disciplinary actions which is unique to the Community Patrol Officer Program. All of these infractions of Department regulations are of types which may be committed by any member of the Department, regardless of assignment.

Table 4

Community Patrol Officer Program  
Disciplinary Actions -- 1985

By Command:

<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>
7th	1	43rd	0	83rd	2
9th	3	47th	0	88th	2
10th	0	52nd	2	102nd	1
13th	0	61st	1	105th	1
24th	0	63rd	0	110th	0
25th	0	72nd	1	114th	0
34th	2	81st	0	120th	0

Total 16

Causes of Disciplinary Actions:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Cause</u>
6	Off Post - 4 Command Disciplines, 2 Unfounded
1	Fail to Appear at Training Session (Charges)
1	Fail to Appear at Traffic Court (CD)
1	Fail to Return Radio (CD)
1	Late for Rollcall (CD)
1	Haircut (CD)
1	Fail to Sign Out (CD)
1	Smoking in uniform (CD)
1	Improper use of Dept Vehicle (CD & replaced)
1	Open Locker (CD)
1	Reason Unknown (CD)

**5. Civilian Complaints**

Data was obtained from the Civilian Complaint Review Board on the total number of civilian complaints filed against all members of each of the CPOP precincts for the period during which the program was operational during 1985. During the review, Precinct Commanders and Unit Supervisors were requested to review



command files and determine the number of civilian complaints filed against CPOs during the year. Although the possibility exists that there are civilian complaints against CPOs of which the Precinct Commanders have not been informed by the CCRB, the number indicated by the commanding officers was recorded and was used in the construction of Table 5, which follows.

Table 5  
Community Patrol Officer Program  
Civilian Complaints -- 1985

<u>Precinct</u>	<u>No. of Civilian Complaints Received by CCRB on Comd. from inception of CPOP through December 31, 1985</u>	<u>No. of CPO Civilian Comp. Known to Command</u>
7th Pct	16	5
9th Pct	79	2
10th Pct	26	0
13th Pct	45	0
24th Pct	28	1
25th Pct	34	0
34th Pct	83	2
43rd Pct	67	0
47th Pct	36	4
52nd Pct	96	1
61st Pct	28	0
63rd Pct	45	0
72nd Pct	105	8
81st Pct	52	0
83rd Pct	20	0
88th Pct	35	0
102nd Pct	42	0
105th Pct	46	2
110th Pct	40	0
114th Pct	26	0
120th Pct	63	0
Totals	1,012	25

A review of the data in Table 5 discloses that of 1,012 Civilian Complaints filed against police officers in CPOP precincts, only 25 or 2.5% were filed against CPOs, who constitute 6.5% of the police officer personnel assigned to these commands.

In providing this information, the precinct commanders noted that almost all of the CPO civilian complaints known to them arose out of enforcement actions.

To the extent that these data are reliable, they indicate that CPOs are drawing civilian complaints at a rate lower than that of other members of their commands -- despite the fact that in many of the precincts they are very active in enforcement, and in all of the precincts have very high visibility and a great deal of citizen contact. One plausible explanation for this is that communities are broadly supportive of CPOs' activities and are less likely to misunderstand what the individual officers are trying to accomplish. Another is that the CPOs have learned remarkably well, from their training and their day-to-day experience, how to accomplish their patrol assignments with a minimum of friction.

While this is encouraging, the Department should anticipate receiving larger numbers of civilian complaints against CPOs in some of the precincts. In at least two of the commands, the 105th and the 72nd, command personnel are aware of an organized effort on the part of local drug dealers to discourage CPO enforcement activities by filing civilian complaints against those officers who are effectively interfering with drug trafficking.

#### 6. Career Path

During the team rap sessions conducted as part of the operational review, all of the CPOs expressed concern regarding the absence of a clear career path for Community Patrol Officers. Several expressed the view that CPOP was a dead-end job and,

despite the fact that they perceive it as personally rewarding, they felt it did not further their careers.

Some of the younger officers expressed opinions which evinced a distorted view of career opportunities within the Department. But the majority, who realized that service in career path assignments (such as anti-crime) is no guarantee of advancement into other investigative assignments or the Detective Bureau, nevertheless felt that such assignments would at least qualify them for consideration for career advancement, while service in CPOP would not. Many of these officers have very realistic impressions of their personal worth and ability. They were selected, from among the volunteers for CPOP, because of their past performance and they have confidence in their ability to perform effectively in any assignment. However, they see themselves as falling behind their peers in meeting the Department's criteria for career advancement. They see personnel junior to themselves, and with no more impressive credentials than theirs, serving in Anti-Crime units and thus qualifying themselves for advancement, while they serve in CPOP and their careers stagnate.

These sentiments echoed those expressed by officers who had already left the program to accept career path assignments at the precinct level. One of the unfortunate consequences of these perceptions (which are based on fact) is that the program has rather quickly lost the services of some of its most capable and dedicated officers to assignments which, while important, do not tap nearly as much of the full potential of these personnel. In a programmatic sense, CPOP is weakened by continually losing its

best personnel (and, indeed, its role models) to other precinct assignments.

#### 7. Personnel Development

The duties of a Community Patrol Officer involve the utilization of a variety of knowledge and skills not normally associated with the police patrol role. Many of the non-traditional tasks we are asking CPOs to perform involve their participating in activities which are normally associated with other professions. For example, CPOs are directed to assist communities in organizing block, tenant or merchant associations as an effort to focus community resources on crime prevention activities. Community organizing is a recognizable profession, having its own literature, research base, and learnable skills. Persons entering the field are not only required to familiarize themselves with its literature and research, but are generally required to serve internships, a process which may take years to accomplish. While it is not the intention of the Department to convert police officers into professional community organizers, full realization of the potential of the program requires that the officers begin to develop skills in this area, and learn to utilize the services of skilled professionals to assist them.

Because they lack knowledge and skills in the non-traditional areas of involvement, it is generally very difficult for the CPOs to conceptualize roles for the community in areas which heretofore were viewed as being the sole responsibility of the police. For example, while many of the officers face substantial drug problems within their Beat Areas, it is difficult for them to conceive of a role which the community may play in drug enfor-

cement other than that of providing information to the officers on drug activities within the neighborhoods. Despite this, some CPOs have begun (at times on their own initiative, and at other times with outside assistance) to develop drug enforcement strategies which provide a more direct and meaningful role for community residents. Such developments are extremely encouraging not only because they demonstrate personal development on the part of those CPOs, but also because they serve to stimulate similar development among other officers and CPOP Units.

The sergeants assigned as CPOP Unit supervisors play an extremely important role in the development of the CPOs. Not only do they provide direct supervision of the officers' activities, but they provide the leadership necessary to encourage and stimulate program and individual development. However, because CPOP is the initial involvement of the Department with community-oriented policing strategies, none of the sergeants assigned to the CPOP units have previous experience with community-oriented policing and possess no greater knowledge in the non-traditional areas than do the CPOs. As a result, the sergeants must also develop the knowledge and skills as they proceed. Given what we have observed of the state of program development in the twenty-one precincts, we are encouraged that the sergeants are making progress along these lines. The program has benefitted from the selection of relatively young sergeants in most of the precincts. What they may lack in previous supervisory experience, they appear to make up for in enthusiasm and dedication.

## 8. Community Patrol Officer Frustrations

Unit morale, as gauged from comments made by the CPOs during the Unit rap sessions, appears very high in most of the precincts. The officers not only expressed general satisfaction with working in the program but were able to specify a number of reasons why they felt this way. Almost all of the officers indicated that they received a great deal of personal satisfaction from the activities they performed as CPOs. They stated that the ability to follow through on the various problems they encountered gave them a feeling of accomplishment which they did not experience in other forms of patrol. Many cited the ability to get to know the residents of their Beat Areas as a definite plus, which benefited them in dealing effectively with the problems they tackled. In every command, the officers indicated that their working relationships with the other police officers on patrol were excellent. Although many indicate that they were subject to a good deal of kidding by the other officers when the program first began, it was not long before the other officers began to appreciate that they are still working police officers, and began to support their efforts.

Despite this, many of the officers in many of the precincts cited various matters which they found to be the source of frustration to them. Some of the issues they raised are within the province of the Police Department, while others concern other agencies or community residents. In the following pages are sketched the frustrations identified by the CPOs. Remedial actions are discussed in a later section. Briefly, the frustrations cited were:

- a. Lack of a Clear Career Path for CPOs. See previous discussion of this issue.
- b. Lack of understanding on the part of other members of the service regarding the objectives of CPOP and the duties of the CPOs.

In many of the precincts the CPOs stated that there were few department members outside of the unit who really understood what the program was all about. They felt that this was particularly true of superior officers and that, as a result, they were frequently challenged by various supervisors as to why they were engaging in certain program activities. In at least one instance, this resulted in a Borough Patrol Supervisor initiating a command discipline against two CPOs which was subsequently unfounded by the Precinct Commander. More importantly, the officers indicated that, in the absence of the Unit Supervisor, other precinct supervisors frequently interfered with their ability to perform their duties. Cited as examples of such interference were the following:

- (1) The CPOs in a few commands stated that in the unit supervisor's absence they were frequently given assignments other than their CPO beats by the precinct desk officer. These ranged from RMP duty to being assigned to DOAs or EDPs in parts of the precinct other than their Beat Areas.
- (2) In several of the precincts the officers stated that, when the CPO Sergeant was not working, it was almost impossible for them to come into the Station House to work on a community referral or to do administrative work such as making entries in their Beat Books. They indicated that the desk officers used various tactics to accomplish this, ranging from harassment to outright refusal to grant them permission to "go administrative."
- (3) In a few of the precincts the CPOs stated that, in the absence of the unit supervisor, they were frequently unable to use the unit Van because it was being used for patrol in lieu of an RMP car.

c. Lack of Support from Other Department Units

In the majority of the precincts, the officers believe that they were not receiving any visible support from other Department Units. Most frequently cited in this regard were OCCB Narcotics, OCCB Public Morals, and the enforcement side of SPECDA. Many of the officers indicated that they had significant drug problems within their Beat Areas and, in addition to making street level arrests, had attempted to involve the community in the enforcement effort by soliciting information on drug activities from them. They stated that the citizens were cooperating and that many good sources of information had been developed, resulting in their receiving detailed information on drug activities in the areas. As much of the information received dealt with inside activities or street situations in which uniformed personnel would be ineffective, they had submitted either intelligence reports or 61s referring this information to the Narcotics Division (or to SPECDA when school locations were involved). It is the CPOs perception that there were no follow-ups to these reports, and that the conditions continue unabated. (CPOs in the 21 precincts submitted a total of 1,758 intelligence reports during 1985.)

This was a particularly sensitive issue in several of the precincts with large scale narcotics problems. For example, the CPOs in the 52nd Precinct believe that lack of support from the enforcement side of SPECDA reduced their credibility with the community. The officers in that command have made a large number of narcotic arrests, and have encouraged community residents to believe that if they provide the Department with information on



narcotic activities, action will be taken. However, as time passes, and nothing seems to come of the information furnished, residents are questioning the officers sincerity. As a result, the officers perceive that the information flow from the community is slowing, making their job more difficult.

In another instance, an officer in the 114th Precinct discovered the existence of a pickpocket ring operating in a large shopping area within his beat on weekends. He succeeded in making one arrest, but was unable to do more because of his uniformed presence. Working through his Unit Supervisor and Precinct Commander, help was requested from the Special Frauds Squad of the Detective Bureau. However, because that unit does not work weekends, his efforts have been frustrated and the condition continues.

On the other hand, CPOs in several of the precincts were able to cite examples of assistance received from the Narcotics Division and from other specialized Department units.

#### d. Undue Focus on Business Establishments

Many of the officers indicated that they were being led to place an undue focus on the business establishments in their Beat Areas. They felt compelled to spend a lot of time in the business areas because it is there that the Zone and Precinct commanders go to conduct CPOP feedback interviews. They also felt pressure to focus on the business establishments because of the need to record information on them in their Beat Books, and to update the precinct Business Index File. Several of the officers indicated that, while they recognize that a viable business community is important to the stability of a precinct, there were other areas

within their beats with more significant problems to be dealt with.

**e. Community Profile Records (Beat Books)**

There is an almost universal dislike for the maintenance of Community Profile Records (Beat Books). Separating the management portion of the book (The Monthly Work Plans, Beat Conditions Log, Crime Analysis Section) from the Community Profile Section, the majority of officers stated that they could not see the virtue of maintaining the Community Profile Section. They stated that it was an unnecessary duplication of information which they possessed in various forms, primarily in memory. Their principal objection however, focused on their perception that supervisory personnel, including the Program Development Team, were evaluating their entire performance solely on the content of the Beat Books.

**f. Lack of Logistical Support**

Several of the officers stated that as the program has expanded to additional precincts, it has become more difficult to obtain films from the Department's Crime Prevention Section.

In several of the precincts (those with borrowed vans) the officers stated that the general disrepair of the van prevented them from using it in citizen participation programs such as Senior Citizen Escorts.

**g. Inability to deal with Public Morals Violations**

Officers in several of the commands indicated that their inability to deal effectively with the large number of policy locations within their beats was a constant source of frustration to them. They do not perceive that they are getting support from the

Public Morals Division in response to the intelligence reports they have submitted, and they recognize that they are quite limited in trying to deal by themselves with conditions in inside locations. But they remain frustrated by the very existence of such visible locations, which they feel must compromise their credibility with community residents.

**h. Inability to Sense Accomplishment**

Almost all of the officers assigned to the 34th Precinct CPOP Unit, and several CPOs assigned to high activity beats in other commands, experience frustration in gaining a sense of accomplishment for their efforts. Conditions on these Beat Areas are nearly overwhelming, and the officers are employing a wide range of strategies to deal with them, including a great deal of direct enforcement actions. They receive the full support of their commanding officers and the other personnel in the command. Despite this, they do not see any improvement in conditions -- hence, their sense of frustration. All of the officers offering comments of this nature appeared very sincere, and a review of unit records verified the amount of effort they are expending in attempting to deal effectively with the conditions on their beats.

**i. Lack of Community Support in Organizing Efforts**

Many of the CPOs have experienced frustration in their efforts to mobilize organized community support. They believe that, while the community does support their efforts, the residents are unwilling, for a variety of reasons, to organize and take on some of the responsibility for dealing with neighborhood conditions. The officers indicated that residents are willing to hold a meet-

ing and discuss issues when there is a problem to focus on. However, if the officer is successful in dealing with the problem, community apathy prevails and that's the end of the organization.

**j. Slow or No Response from other City Agencies**

While all of the officers can cite examples of good cooperation from other agencies, they also cite occasions when they are unable to obtain needed help, or unable to obtain it promptly. For example, the officers in the 88th CPOP undertook a program to clean up the vacant lots in the precinct. They succeeded in obtaining good support from the Department of Sanitation and many lots were cleared of garbage and other debris. However, they were unsuccessful in coordinating the actions of the agency responsible for erecting fences around city property, and as a result, many of the lots became debris strewn again before the fences were erected.

**E. Administrative and Managerial Matters**

This operational review also considered a number of administrative and managerial issues. As indicated in the introduction to this report, the rapid pace of program expansion has taxed the ability of the Program Development Team to monitor initial operations in each of the expansion precincts. It has also limited the Team's ability to insure that command level personnel in the Boroughs and Zones were fully informed as to both the conceptual and practical operation of the program. As a result, we could reasonably anticipate that the expansion effort would not be problem-free. In addition, and as reviewed earlier, the very process of institutionalization of a program which contains so many elements that differ from standard patrol practices in the

Department is almost guaranteed to result in the development of administrative and operational discrepancies in some of the commands.

#### 1. Compliance with Operations Order 91

There is a high rate of compliance with the provisions of Operations Order 91 which govern program operation in the various commands. CPOP Units are maintaining required records and operations are being conducted in accordance with program design. The regular patrol supervisors assigned to the precincts are providing functional supervision over the CPOs while on patrol, and are signing the officers' memorandum books to indicate this.

During the past three months, we have had the opportunity to discuss CPOP operations with a wide variety of Department personnel at both the Precinct and the Zone level. These discussions disclose that while most are familiar with the general organization and structure of the program, they are not conversant with the details of its operation. As a result, many misconceptions exist as to the purpose of the program, and the actual duties of the officers assigned to it. This is not a surprising finding. Although the Department has taken a number of steps to insure that information on the program has been disseminated throughout the chain of command, the complexity of the operation and the degree of flexibility necessary to insure the most effective adaptation of the program within each individual precinct are matters which are not easily translated into standard written order format. In a very real sense, while there are many superior officers who have an understanding of the program, only those directly associated with its operation fully understand it.

Even within the precincts in which the program operates, there is a lack of complete understanding on the part of many of the sergeants and lieutenants. While they accept the responsibility of providing functional supervision to the officers while on patrol, they tend to view CPOP as the province of the sergeant assigned as Unit Supervisor, just as they view Anti-Crime as being the province of the sergeant assigned as its supervisor. Given their very substantial responsibilities with respect to the supervision of the remainder of the precinct's forces, this is not an unreasonable position, nor is it necessarily an undesirable one. What is undesirable, however, is the occasional interference with CPOP operations resulting from the uninformed actions of a precinct supervisor.

During the unit inspections, we reviewed the monthly activity reports of every CPO for each month of program operation. From this review we discovered that in some commands, CPOs are being periodically pulled from CPOP duties and given normal precinct assignments (RMP duty, DOAs, EDPs, etc.). We reviewed this matter with the unit supervisors and precinct commanders and learned that in most instances, this resulted from either a lack of knowledge on the part of the supervisor concerned, or a misinterpretation of the "emergency" provision of Operations Order 91, which permits CPOs to be given routine patrol assignments under unscheduled emergency conditions. This problem has been dealt with in a number of ways by the various commanding officers. In some precincts, the commanding officers have issued explicit written orders regarding CPO usage. In others, the commanders devote portions of their supervisory staff meetings to

discussing the CPOP operation. Permanent resolution of the problem has been complicated by the large number of promotions and transfers which have taken place during the past year, forcing unit supervisors and precinct commanders to continually inform and instruct new supervisory personnel.

A review of unit records and interviews with unit supervisors, precinct commanders, and CPOs discloses that this is not a significant problem in the majority of precincts, but has been in a few.

## 2. Unit Supervision

In several of the precincts, the CPOP unit supervisors have been assigned additional duties, primarily that of TOPAC supervision. Interviews with these sergeants indicate that this does not appear to detract from their ability to effectively supervise CPOP operations, and may in actuality enhance operations. These sergeants indicate that having direct supervision over the TOPAC unit enables them to coordinate the activities of the CPOs with those of the TOPAC personnel in dealing with precinct conditions.

Unit supervisors are, for the most part, rarely assigned to other duties at this time. However, during those months in 1985 when there was no sergeants' promotion list and the Department experienced a great shortage of sergeants, the CPOP supervisors were routinely assigned to general patrol supervision or desk duty. While this practice may have slowed program development in some commands, it does not appear to have had a lasting negative impact. At present, the only borough in which CPOP Unit Supervisors are periodically assigned other patrol assignments is Patrol Borough Manhattan South.

### 3. Unit Equipment

The Police Department has made a substantial investment in the equipment necessary to support CPOP operations. Office space has been allocated in each precinct station house, and in most instances is adequate. In several commands however, physical plant limitations have resulted in the CPOP unit being assigned insufficient space to support unit operations.

One of the most critical items of equipment is the unit van, which is used for supervisory purposes and to support unit operations in a variety of ways. The rapid rate of program expansion has outpaced the Department's ability to supply new vans to each of the CPOP units. As a result, six of the thirty-one operating precincts have vans which were borrowed from the Patrol Boroughs concerned. Several of these borrowed vans are in such disrepair that they cannot be used to support citizen involvement programs, such as Senior Citizen Escorts.

Although the CPOP van is reserved for CPOP use in the majority of commands, in a few it is also used for general patrol purposes when there is a shortage of RMP cars. While this is problematic for a number of reasons, it is particularly so when it results in the van being unavailable for CPOP operations.

### 4. Community Profile Records (Beat Books)

All of the Beat Books in the twenty-one precincts were thoroughly inspected. In general, the inspection disclosed a number of apparent problems with beat book maintenance.

a. While the Monthly Work Plan section of the books are being maintained in accordance with design, and indeed provide evidence of both personal and program maturation in some in-



stances, the Beat Condition Logs are being misinterpreted and misused in some commands. These logs were designed to reflect a CPO's activity in response to two kinds of stimulus: activity directed at dealing with specific citizen complaints, and activity directed at dealing with major or long-term conditions within the Beat Areas. The most common error found in maintaining these logs was that they were being used as substitutes for memorandum books, thereby causing unnecessary work for the officers, and diminishing the value of the record.

b. The Community Profile Section of the Beat Book was poorly maintained in most books, in most precincts. There were only a few instances found in which the amount of work done by the officer reflected the number of months that the program had been in operation in the command. In essence, it appears that the officers' dislike for the clerical duties involved in beat book maintenance have resulted in their not really trying to maintain them. The overall poor quality of the community profile section in many of the commands also indicates that this matter has not received necessary supervisory attention. The most notable exception to this general observation was the 34th Precinct where, despite the high level of activity recorded by the officers both with respect to enforcement and community service, the community profile sections of their beat books reflected a level of work commensurate with the period of time in which the program had been operational.

#### 5. Beat Size

One of the issues of great concern in the design, implementation and expansion of CPOP is the size of the CPO Beat Areas.

Beat design in the expansion precincts was based on the limited experience gained in the pilot project. As a result, only limited guidance about beat design was provided to the supervising sergeants and precinct commanders. In general, they were told to consider the following factors in designing their beats:

- a. the beats should be large enough to insure that the officer has a sufficient variety of conditions and problems to occupy his time;
- b. natural and community boundaries should be taken into consideration;
- c. Beat size should be more dependent on the number and type of street conditions encountered than on population density;
- d. where possible, the beat should include one or more schools;
- e. where the beats do not, taken together, cover the entire precinct, consideration should be given to designing them in a manner which would permit their expansion if experience should prove this feasible and desirable; and
- f. If there was a question as to how large an area could be effectively patrolled by an individual officer, it was preferable to initially make the beat(s) smaller and then, if experience indicated, expand them.

Because conditions vary among the twenty-one precincts, beat sizes vary. The smallest Beat Areas are found in the borough of Manhattan, where beats average between 14 and 18 square blocks. The largest beats are found in Queens and Brooklyn South where beats average between 25 and 40 square blocks. In general, most CPO Beat Areas are fairly large, particularly so when compared to the linear posts assigned traditional foot patrol officers. In reviewing CPOP operations, beat size was discussed with the unit supervisors, precinct commanders, and CPOs. These discussions disclosed the following:

- a. There are only 2 precincts in which a total of 3 beats are considered to be too large to be effectively patrolled by the CPOs assigned.
- b. Despite the large size of some of the Beat Areas, the CPOs appear to be able to handle the problems within them in an effective manner.
- c. There is only one precinct, the 34th, in which beat size appears to negatively effect CPO performance. While the beats in that command are, by program standards, relatively small, the high volume of crime and order maintenance conditions within 5 of the 9 Beat Areas over tax the abilities of the officers to make a lasting impact on these conditions.
- d. The CPOs in two of the higher crime precincts indicate that while their beats are not too large, it would have facilitated program operations for them to have begun with smaller beats and expand to their current size as they gained experience.
- e. Of the 179 Beat Areas in the 21 precincts, there have only been a total of 5 boundary changes based on operational experience.

#### F. Community Support

There are several ways to gauge the manner in which the various communities have received the Community Patrol Officer Program. They are: direct feedback received by precinct commanders from community residents, communications received by the Department, and feedback received from Community Planning Board District Managers.

During this operational review, each of the precinct commanders was asked to summarize his perceptions of community response to the program. All of the commanders indicated that community feedback has been extremely positive. They indicated that, based upon comments offered at community meetings and the precinct community council meetings, the community was very aware of the existence of the program and the work being done by the CPOs. All of the commanders indicated that they had not received

any negative feedback on the program from community residents or organizations.

At this point, the Department has received numerous communications from individual citizens and community organizations praising the work performed by CPOs. The exact number of such communications is unknown, but the Office of Management Analysis and Planning has collected approximately 500 which were received directly by precinct CPOP units. Some additional number has been received at Police Headquarters.

Telephone interviews were conducted with all of the District Managers of the Community Planning Boards covering the twenty-one precincts. Each was asked to state his or her opinion of the program, his or her perceptions of community response to the program, and any specific information which he or she felt would assist the Police Department in improving CPOP operations. Without exception, each District Manager stated that the program was highly successful within his or her Community Board boundaries. Some of the terms used to express this support were:

- "This is an enormously successful program. The officers are both visible and available to the residents."
- "The program works very well in this precinct. The officers are very responsive to community complaints, and have addressed many street problems."
- "This is the greatest thing that ever happened. The people can shop in their neighborhoods once again."
- "The program is a great resource for the district cabinet, and has put the Board in greater contact with community residents."
- "We are very delighted with the program, it is one of the best things that the Police Department has done in a long time. We have never been as pleased with anything that the Police have done as this."
- "The CPOs have stabilized our commercial area which is

currently in transition."

Each of the District Managers indicated that close working relationships had been established between the CPOP Unit and the Community Board. Each indicated that the precinct commander made periodic reports to the board on CPOP activities, and that they were pleased with the results obtained. Many cited specific ways in which CPOP operations had helped in the community. Some of these were:

- "The officers have dealt with a variety of youth related problems in the area."
- "Because they are out there, they are able to see some of the needed services which we cannot see. As a result, we were able to modify our budget requests to bring these services to the community."
- "The officers provide instant response to problems we refer to them and effectively deal with these issues."

Each of the District Managers stated that they had received nothing but praise for the program from community residents. Most offered the observation that they had yet to hear anything negative about CPOP.

Each of the District Managers indicated that they had been briefed on the program before it was implemented in their boards and had been consulted with on the design of the Beat Areas. They stated that they had met with each of the officers and had assisted in the training at the precinct level. Several commented on the good working relationship with the CPOs. One District Manager commented that she had encouraged them to deal directly with the service agencies, sanitation, social services, etc., and felt that this was the most efficient way to deal with the problems in the area. Several of the District Managers indicated that the program did not cover all of the territory within their Board

area, and stated that they had communicated with the Department asking it to increase CPOP coverage so that the entire area would be included. (Either by the inclusion of new Beat Areas within those precincts in which the program does not cover all of the precinct's territory, or by implementing the program in those precincts covered by the Board in which it does not exist.)

Only one District Manager offered any negative comments about current CPOP operations. She indicated that while she thought that the program was excellent, the officers are assigned duties (such as community organizing), which should not be given to police officers; she indicated that community organizing is the function of the Community Board and that she had insisted that the officers not contact the service agencies directly but go through the board instead. (The Commanding Officer and CPOP Unit Supervisor of the precinct concerned have established a good working relationship with this District Manager.)

#### G. Field Recommendations

Each of the Unit Supervisors and Precinct Commanders, and all of the CPOs were asked to suggest ways in which the program could be improved. Several recommendations were offered.

1. Many of the CPOs in various precincts suggested that a system be established which would permit CPOs from different precincts to get together and discuss mutual problems and the solutions utilized in various precincts. They indicated that the only opportunity they have had to date to do so was at the Department's Ethical Awareness Workshops, and that the format of that workshop did not afford them the opportunity to discuss issues in depth.
2. Many of the CPOs were joined by their sergeants in asking that they be included in many of the Department's specialized training programs. Specifically mentioned were the Auto Crime School and the Latent Fingerprint Training Program.

3. The CPOs in several precincts suggested that specific OCCB Narcotic and PM Modules be designated to work with each of the CPOP units.
4. A large number of CPOs, CPOP Sergeants, and Precinct Commanders suggested that CPOs be authorized to periodically utilize scooters when they were available. They indicated that because many of the beats were so large, and in many instances far removed from the precinct station house, they believed that scooters would improve CPOP operations by enabling the officers to more quickly travel between the various problem areas within their beats.

All of the unit supervisors and precinct commanders who joined in this last suggestion indicated that they did not believe that the use of scooters would diminish citizen contact by the CPOs. They believed that the CPOs not only had established a good base of community support but also realized that the maintenance of this support was essential for effective operations. As a result, they believed that the CPOs would not use the scooters to insulate themselves from the public, but would instead use them in a manner which facilitated operations, and improved service delivery.

#### V. SUMMARY CONCLUSION

Initial expansion of the Community Patrol Officer Program, from one to twenty-one precincts, has been effected with remarkable success. Each of the expansion precincts is operating in general accord with program design, and there is ample evidence that the initial goals of the program are being successfully met.

Personnel assigned as Community Patrol Officers in these commands have been extremely active, with respect to both law enforcement activities and community services. Unit program activities, developed in each of the commands, have been directed at addressing a wide variety of crime prevention and service improvement needs, and have been warmly received by community residents.

A review of disciplinary and other records indicates that while the Department has granted the officers assigned as CPOs a greater degree of latitude in performing their duties than that given to officers assigned to normal patrol functions, this has not resulted in the creation of any substantial disciplinary or misconduct problems. Indeed, the data may suggest that the CPOs are subject to disciplinary actions and civilian complaints at a rate lower than that experienced by members assigned to normal patrol duties.

The program has generated overwhelming support both by precinct commanders and community residents.

All of the problems identified during the review of operations stem from the rapid pace of program expansion, and the foreseeable consequences of institutionalization. By comparison with the problems developed in the institutionalization of some other programs, they are almost inconsequential, and all may be successfully addressed by the Police Department.

The conceptual and operational development of this program has advanced considerably during the past year. Given that this is the Department's first large scale involvement in community-oriented policing, more has been accomplished in this brief period of time than would have been reasonably hoped for. Despite this, it should be recognized that this is just the beginning. At this stage of its development, the Community Patrol Officer Program is far from achieving its full potential, and the Department is likely to want to continue its efforts to build upon what has been learned and to continue the development of this worthwhile effort.



## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the operational review of the twenty-one CPOP commands, the following recommendations are offered.

### A. Program Communication

As indicated in the report, the publication of operational orders does not effectively inform Department personnel about the total scope and complexity of CPOP operations. Even within the commands in which the program operates, many precinct supervisors have a quite imperfect understanding of the duties and responsibilities of CPOs and of the flexibility necessary for effective CPOP operations. This problem has been compounded by the large number of promotions and transfers, which has detracted from continuity of supervisory assignments in most commands. As a result, almost every precinct has experienced some level of middle management interference with program operations, from supervisors who are not directly involved in CPOP supervision and not familiar with this program's design and imperatives. To address these problems, we recommend the following:

#### 1. Creation of an Operations Manual for CPOP

A CPOP Operations Manual should be written and distributed to all supervisory personnel in CPOP Zones and Precincts. This manual would incorporate the program description presented in this report, and would detail the specific duties of personnel assigned to the the various supervisory levels regarding program operation. The manual would be written in narrative form and would run between 15 and 20 pages. In addition to improving information flow among Department members, the manual would also be available for the Department to use in responding to requests for information on CPOP received from other jurisdictions. If this recommendation is approved, Vera would undertake the writing of an initial draft.

## 2. Creation of an Implementation Manual for CPOP

If approved, Vera will undertake the writing of an Implementation Manual for new CPOP precincts. The manual would incorporate the material currently used in orienting the new CPOP supervisors, and would be available for future program expansions.

## 3. Dissemination of This Report

It is recommended that copies of this report be provided to all Borough, Zone, and Precinct Commanders, Zone Aides, and CPOP Supervisors, assigned to commands in which CPOP currently operates.

## 4. Inclusion of information on CPOP in Department Training Programs.

To promote a greater department-wide understanding of CPOP, it is recommended that information on CPOP be included in the recruit training program, and in the promotional courses given to new sergeants and lieutenants. The information should include details on both the conceptual and practical operation of the program.

### B. Personnel Retention

One of the more serious problems to be faced in the further development of the Community Patrol Officer Program is the rate of turnover of CPO personnel. As indicated in the report, the program has lost many of its most experienced officers to other department assignments, a factor which slows the rate at which the program may be expected to develop in any given command. Among the steps which might be taken to slow the turnover rate and retain qualified personnel for longer periods of time are:

#### 1. Inclusion of CPOs in the Department's Career Path.

It is strongly recommended that police officers serving as Community Patrol Officers be given equivalent career path credit with personnel serving in Anti-Crime units. There would appear to be ample justification for equating both types of service, among which are:

- Personnel assigned to CPOP receive extensive additional training.

- The CPOs are extremely active in enforcement actions and, in many higher activity commands, they rival the enforcement productivity levels of personnel assigned to Anti-Crime Units.
- CPOs are involved in many investigative efforts and have supplied information garnered through their community contacts to investigative units which has led to the arrest of a large number of felons
- The CPOs have assumed continuing responsibility for crime and order maintenance conditions within their beat areas, a factor which separates them from the vast majority of personnel assigned to the patrol function

While granting career path credit to CPOs would not guarantee their ultimate assignment to investigative positions (any more than service in Anti-Crime does) it would remove the incentive to transfer to Anti-Crime duty which now exists.

## 2. Create a Minimum Period of Service in CPOP

Precinct Commanders in the existing CPOP precincts and in those commands which are to be added to the program should recruit volunteers on the basis of a commitment to serve as a CPO for a minimum period of one year. This tactic has been adopted by several of the commanders of CPOP precincts and has resulted in improving the stability of the CPOP Units in their commands, and has not appeared to hamper the commanders' ability to attract qualified personnel. Precinct commanders should also be encouraged to resist the temptation to recruit the more experienced and higher performing CPOs to fill precinct assignments (Anti-Crime, Community Affairs, Crime Prevention, etc.) until such personnel have completed at least one year in the program.

## C. Improve Managerial Control

The Police Department has made a substantial investment of personnel and equipment in the Community Patrol Officer Program, and there is every indication that the initial goals of the program are being realized. However, as indicated in this report, the Department has only just begun to realize the potential of this patrol strategy. To continue and accelerate the orderly development of the program, it is recommended that the Department

increase its investment by assigning additional personnel to the program management function. Specifically:

1. Lieutenant Borough Coordinators

It is recommended that a Lieutenant be appointed as Borough CPOP Coordinator in each of the large Patrol Borough Commands, and that a member of the staff of the Staten Island Patrol Borough Command be designated coordinator in that borough. At the present time, there are 5 CPOP precincts in each of PBMS, PBBX, PBQ, PBBS and PBBN, 4 CPOP precincts in PBMN, and 2 CPOP precincts in PBSI. The Borough Coordinator would be responsible to the Borough Commander for coordinating the activities of each of the CPOP Units within the borough, working with the Program Development Team on the implementation and testing of innovative strategies within the borough CPOP Units, assisting in future expansion efforts, and conducting ongoing evaluation of CPOP operations.

2. Creation of a Community Interaction Development Team.

As indicated in the report, the most difficult obstacle to be overcome in the development of the individual CPOs is the transition from law enforcement officer to law enforcement officer/community resource mobilizer. Without exception, the police officers assigned to the CPOP Units have demonstrated their ability to identify community crime and order maintenance concerns and deal effectively with them. They have also demonstrated great imagination in the development of the various Unit Program Activities which have been implemented in each command in response to existing service and crime prevention needs. However, they have not, as a group, demonstrated an ability to mobilize community resources in significant crime prevention efforts, nor could one have reasonably expected them to do so in so brief a period of time. Although several of the CPOs in various precincts have begun to involve community residents in meaningful crime prevention activities, these are isolated cases and they are largely the result of outside agency assistance. The Department needs to develop an in-house capability of providing and sharing the knowledge and skills required to successfully organize community action programs. Until the Department itself can serve this vital function, progress in the community development area will continue to be slow.

It is therefore recommended that a Community Interaction Development Team, consisting of two experienced CPOs who have demonstrated ability in this area, be created as an in-house resource to assist CPOs throughout the city in more effectively mobilizing community resources in crime prevention efforts. These officers would perform this function in the following manner:

- They would conduct problem identification workshops in selected CPOP Units, in an effort to identify the most pressing problems faced by the majority of CPOs in each unit.
- They would work with other department units and private and public resource agencies to develop appropriate police/community action strategies to deal with the problems.
- They would identify key community leaders in each target precinct, and coordinate a problem identification/response development meeting between the CPOs and the community residents.
- They would assist both groups in developing strategies and formulating implementation plans.
- They would act as a resource to both the CPOP Unit and community groups during the implementation of action plans.
- They would review similar efforts in other CPOP Units with a view towards disseminating information on them throughout the program.

It is further recommended that at this stage of program development, the personnel assigned to this function be assigned to the Office of Management Analysis and Planning under the supervision of the Lieutenant assigned as Vera's Liaison Officer.

#### D. Operational Modifications

As explained in the report, the concentration on program expansion during the past year has resulted in curtailing tactical developmental activities. In essence, the operational format was locked-in at the end of the first six months of pilot operations. In consideration of what has been learned during the past year it is suggested that some modifications be approved at this time, and that others be considered for pilot trials in selected units.

## 1. Use of Scooters

It is recommended that the periodic use of scooters by CPOs be authorized. The program description contained in this report demonstrates that while the principal deployment tactic used in CPOP is one-man foot patrol, the program's success to date has been, in large measure, the result of a number of flexible deployment strategies. Almost all of the precinct commanders and unit supervisors have suggested that scooters be used, when available, as a means of increasing the CPOs ability to move between problem areas within the Beat Areas. We concur in that recommendation, with the following reservation: Because CPOP differs in so many ways from standard patrol, and indeed from traditional foot patrol, we believe it essential that new CPOs first be given the opportunity to learn the CPO role and make contact with neighborhood residents before they are permitted to use a scooter. Once the unit supervisor is satisfied that a CPO has accepted the role and is familiar with the residents and conditions within his Beat Area, he should then be authorized to use a scooter. In no case should scooters be authorized for new precincts or new personnel in existing units for a minimum of four months of operational experience, and then only if the unit supervisor and precinct commander are satisfied that the use of scooters would enhance program operations.

## 2. Structured Experimentation

There are a number of operational innovations which have been suggested by field and staff personnel and which should be tested during the coming year. We will submit specific proposals on these for Department consideration during the coming months.

### E. Improving Communication between CPOs

Because there is no established body of knowledge to draw upon, individual CPOs conceive of CPOP as they have experienced it in their commands. While the central training program and the replication of the pilot model provide for a high degree of uniformity in operation among the CPOP units, there are a variety of differences in the approaches used to deal with the same problems in various precincts. We believe that exposing CPOs to the operational nuances would be beneficial and enhance program development. Although the CPO Newsletter does provide information

on some of the various strategies used, it cannot begin to substitute for first hand exposure. We therefore recommend implementing a rotational system in which each CPO would work one tour every six months with a different CPOP unit, and he or she would go on patrol with an experienced member of the host unit.

In addition, we recommend modification of the initial CPOP training program to include three tours on patrol with experienced CPOs in the established precincts. These on-job training days would be scheduled between the first and second week of the CPO centralized training program.

#### F. Administrative Matters

##### 1. Monthly Supervisory Interviews

During the initial stages of program expansion, the Department implemented a program requiring Zone and Precinct Commanders and CPOP Unit Supervisors to conduct a number of monthly interviews of beat area merchants and residents to determine the public's perception of the program and the performance of the individual beat officers. This interview program was designed to serve several purposes including: to act as a counter-corruption measure, and to determine the level of public acceptance of the program. We recommend that this interview schedule be eliminated after CPOP has been in operation for four months in any command. This recommendation is made for the following reasons:

- After the first few months of operation, the interview requirement appears to have a negative impact on program operations by focusing the efforts of the CPOs on the business community. Of necessity, Zone and Precinct Commanders focus on the business community when conducting their CPOP interviews. As a result, the CPOs tend to spend more time in the business areas of their beats than conditions

may warrant, because they feel that "they had better be known in those stores when the boss comes around."

- Moreover, since the initial implementation, the Department has instituted a number of control devices to insure that the program is operating in accordance with program design, and to reduce the potential for misconduct by CPOs. These additional safeguards minimize the need for the interview schedule.
- The interview schedule has become a burden on many precinct and zone commanders, particularly in those zones which contain more than 1 CPOP unit. For example, Zone 2 currently contains 4 CPOP Units which results in the Zone Commander having to conduct over thirty CPOP interviews each month.
- Precinct and Zone Commanders have a number of other less intrusive means available to determine public perceptions of the program, including the large number of monthly community meetings attended by each commander.

## 2. Reporting Practices

During the operational review, several of the CPOP sergeants indicated that they believe the current format of the monthly activity reports submitted to the Office of the Chief of Patrol for evaluation of program operations is counter-productive in some respects. Specifically these sergeants believe that too much emphasis is placed on the quantitative material reported in tabular format, and that, as a result, the more interesting and informative quantitative and qualitative material presented in narrative form tends to be overlooked. In addition, there were several items of information which we sought during the operational review which were difficult to obtain because they were not included in the monthly report format.

It is recommended that a committee of CPOP supervisors be formed to work with the Program Development Team on the design of a new monthly reporting format. It is anticipated that such a



format would include more information on program operations than the one in current use. Upon design completion, the new format would be submitted to the Chief of Patrol for his consideration.

This committee would also review the records currently maintained by CPOP units with a view towards identifying information gaps, and standardizing record keeping procedures throughout the various units.

### 3. Community Profile Records (Beat Books)

Although many of the CPOs objected to maintaining community profile records (specifically the community profile section), it is recommended that they be continued. It is not surprising that the majority of CPOs have not found this record to be of great value to them, as most have not yet had much experience utilizing the information to develop a community action program. On the other hand, supervisory personnel recognize the importance of these records, because the Beat Books contain information that is valuable to new CPOs who are assuming responsibility for Beat Areas.

During this operational review, several minor deficiencies were noted in the various forms Vera constructed for use in maintaining the beat books. Additionally, there seemed to be a widespread misunderstanding of the purpose and format of the Beat Conditions Log. Vera will redesign the forms and rewrite the Beat Book instruction manual. This redesign will not result in causing any transfer of information from old forms to new ones, and will not increase the amount of time required for maintaining these records.

#### 4. Specialized Training for CPOs

During the course of this review, many of the CPOs requested permission to attend some of the specialized training courses offered by the Department, particularly the Auto Crime School. (In addition, in at least one instance, the members of a CPOP unit identified a specific training need and arranged to attend a specialized training program at the Police Academy. [72nd CPOP Unit -- Narcotics Awareness Course]) It is recommended that the Commanding Officer, Police Academy, assign personnel to review CPOP operations and confer with CPOs and their Unit Supervisors to determine the specific specialized training needs of the CPOs, and the ability of the Department to provide such training.

#### 5. Establishment of Direct Liaison between CPOP Units and Borough Narcotics and Public Morals Units

The widespread belief among CPOs that they do not receive adequate support from OCCB Narcotics and Public Morals Units may be as much a matter of perception as reality. This matter has been discussed with the Chief of Organized Crime Control and members of his staff, and it is recommended that direct liaison be established between the individual CPOP Unit Supervisors and the Sergeant supervisors of the OCCB Narcotics and PM modules assigned to the CPOP precincts. This ought to permit the development of a feedback system through which CPOs would be advised of the action taken on 61s and Intelligence Reports submitted by them. It is suggested that this be kicked-off in each borough by a meeting between the CPOP supervisors and the Borough Narcotics and Public Morals Commanders and their relevant module supervisors.

With respect to the CPOs' perceptions that they do not receive adequate support from the enforcement side of the SPECDA program, the Chief of Patrol's Office convened a meeting of all CPOP Unit Supervisors and the relevant supervisory personnel from OCCB Narcotics, at which the total scope of the SPECDA enforcement effort was explained and the proper notification procedures reviewed. This should result in improved coordination in the future.

#### 6. Increase Support for the Crime Prevention Section

The expansion of CPOP has placed burdens on the Department's Crime Prevention Section both for training and for providing crime prevention materials to the CPOP Units. It is recommended that consideration be given to increasing the budget and manpower allocations of the Crime Prevention Section in order for that unit to fully serve the increase in the Department's need for training and materials arising from the development and expansion of CPOP.

#### G. Professional Development

During the past year, there have been a number of discussions among personnel closely connected with the operation of the Community Patrol Officer Program about the challenge of maintaining quality control in program operations during a period of rapid program expansion. Among those participating in these discussions were representatives of the Chief of Patrol, the Office of Management Analysis and Planning, the Police Academy, the Citizens Committee for New York, and the Vera Institute. As a result of these discussions, we have focused on a number of key

issues we believe are critical to long-term program success. The majority of these issues have training implications:

1. The need to identify operational and policy dilemmas, formulate solutions, and develop new and specific skills for CPOP officers.
2. The need to develop the best method for identifying, selecting, and developing CPOP supervisors.
3. The need to examine command level administrative skills for managing CPOP within a precinct structure.
4. The need to develop a greater understanding in command personnel at all levels, from Precinct through Borough, of the theoretical basis for CPOP goals and strategies.

Although these discussions have not progressed to the point where we could make strong recommendations, they have led to the following set of preliminary suggestions:

1. That a two-day CPOP conference be held to describe operational and policy dilemmas, suggest strategies and solutions, and identifying specific training and development needs.

This conference might involve approximately sixty-two CPOs (2 from each CPOP precinct), and the 31 CPOP supervisors; it could be held at one of the City University campuses. A pre-conference survey could be used to identify vital issues around which workshops could be formed. The two days might conclude with workshop leaders making a presentation of their findings and recommendations to the Police Commissioner and other ranking Department managers.

2. That a specific CPOP supervisor profile be developed, describing a number of character dimensions that would assist precinct commanders in their selection of CPOP supervisors.
3. That a three day CPOP supervisors course be developed for both in-service and newly assigned CPOP supervisors.

These items might be developed by a number of selected CPOP supervisors working in a conference setting such as that described above, or in a separate session.

4. That a one day seminar be developed for CPOP precinct commanders, for both in-service and new CPOP precincts. The topics to be considered would include: supervisor and officer selection, program theory, program administration, and program evaluation.

This one day seminar would be specific to precinct commanders currently administering or scheduled to administer CPOP units. The development and delivery of this training might be aided by precinct commanders who are currently administering the program most effectively. This training could be developed over the course of several meetings among the selected commanders.

5. That a half day executive level seminar be developed for operational commanders from the precinct through the borough levels for discussion and enlargement of CPOP theory.

This final suggestion could result in a series of dialogues. The first might be between the Police Commissioner and his Borough Commanders, with representatives of the Chief of Department, the Chief of Patrol, the Office of Management Analysis and Planning, and the Vera Institute as resources. Subsequent dialogues, modeled after the first, but without the Police Commissioner, could continue by Borough for Zone and Precinct Commanders affected by CPOP.

To continue the development of these suggestions, it is recommended that a CPOP Conference/Training Task Force be created with membership to include representatives of the Chief of Department, Chief of Patrol, Office of Management Analysis and Planning, Police Academy, and the Vera Institute.

