

Project Paper #21
1998 Citywide Beat Meeting Observation Methodology Report
by
Joel F. Knutson and Wesley G. Skogan

Introduction

Beat meetings are one of the cornerstones of Chicago's community policing program, dubbed CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy). The city has 25 police districts, and they in turn are divided into 279 small police beats. Teams of 8-10 officers from all watches are assigned to each beat, where they work under the supervision of a beat team sergeant. There they perform both their regular patrol duties and work with residents and city agencies to identify and solve neighborhood problems. CAPS features regular meetings between these officers and residents of the beats they serve. Beat team officers who are off-duty at the time are paid overtime to attend the meetings. These beat community meetings provide a venue for identifying and prioritizing local problems, through a dialog between police and residents that is informed by the regular distribution of crime and arrest information. Residents and police are also supposed to discuss solutions to the problems that are identified at the meetings, and divide the responsibility for specific problem solving efforts between police, residents and municipal service agencies. Beat meetings also provide a venue for giving and receiving reports on their successes. Most beats meet monthly, and — except in December — the city held between 225 and 268 beat meetings each month during 1998. Based on department records, 25 residents attended the average beat meeting during 1998, along with about seven police officers. During 1998, more than 67,000 residents attended beat meetings in their neighborhood.

During 1998, a team of field researchers from the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University attended 454 beat meetings throughout the city. They recorded what took place at each meeting on lengthy observation forms, and they distributed questionnaires to residents and police who were present. This Working Paper describes the project in detail, and includes as appendices all of the observation forms and survey questionnaires that were employed in the study. Further analyses of the data can be found in our 1999 report, *Community Policing in Chicago, Years Five-Six*, which is available on request from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016, Chicago IL 60606. The manager of the project was Joel F. Knutson. He was assisted during early stages of the study by Justine H. Lovig. Wesley G. Skogan is the Principal Investigator of Northwestern University's CAPS evaluation.

The Observers

Nineteen individuals participated as field observers during the course of the project. Four were Spanish-speaking. Most of the observers were graduate students at Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois-Chicago, and Loyola University of Chicago. A few community members also contributed to the project, along with two Northwestern undergraduates. Staff involvement in the project was affected by the academic calendar, and at any given time about ten observers were in the field while others were continually being recruited and trained. Each observer spent at least four months in the field conducting observations of beat meetings.

The observers were recruited through postings in academic departments at area universities, Internet bulletin board announcements, and personal contacts with observers and survey interviewers involved in other CAPS evaluation projects. Previous field experience or significant social science research skills was required. Recruitment and training began in the fall of 1997. Potential observers were screened through email or phone discussions, and were invited for formal interviews with the project staff.

Observers were only officially hired after they successfully completed field training. Hiring for the project was contingent upon successful completion of this trial period. The training began with a group session (since most observers were hired in waves) that introduced the observers to the project. The initial training session included an introduction to community policing as the new paradigm for Chicago's department, a discussion of what the CAPS evaluation was about and the crucial role field researchers had in the success of the project, and an introduction to the intricacies of field work and data collection. A number of safety protocols were introduced at training, and special attention was paid to maintaining the integrity of data and the confidentiality of survey respondents.

After the group sessions, observers attended three or four practice meetings in small groups, along with the project manager. At these meetings they were able to get a feel for the character of the meetings and how they vary across neighborhoods in Chicago. The project manager was also able to point out how the CAPS program provided underlying threads that connected all of the meetings, despite their apparent diversity. The observers also gained their first personal reference points for making comparative judgments about the conduct of meetings. At the practice sessions all of the trainees and the project manager completed an observation form. After each meeting, a group debriefing session took place. Each observer compared their answers to the observation form and notes made by the project manager. They discussed each point individually and talked about how they came to the observations they recorded. The debriefing sessions helped ensure that data was collected consistently, independent of individual researchers' experiences observing meetings in different beats. During the early stages of the project debriefing sessions were also helpful in further refining the

observation forms and study procedures. The joint training was particularly important for the parts of the observation form that required observers to make global judgments about the conduct of meetings. During the course of the project the observers were linked to one another and the project director by a private e-mail discussion group. This kept them abreast of progress on the project, changes in procedures, and clarifications of items on the observation and survey forms.

Among the observers, two conducted just two observations and then dropped out. Two more completed only four observations each. The remainder conducted between 10 and 65 observations, and the over-all average was 24 observations per staff member.

Observation Materials

The observation forms were based on instruments that have been developed over a six-year time span. During 1993-94 members of the evaluation team attended 143 beat meetings in five police districts, and made open-ended notes on what took place there. During 1995 these notes were used to develop an observation form that was used to record events at 165 beat meetings in 13 police districts. During 1997, 78 observations were conducted at meetings in 15 beats that were selected for careful scrutiny. The 1998 observation form was finalized in February, just before the field work began, and included last-minute modifications based on the first round of observer training. The observation form — which is included in this report as Appendix A — consists of 89 individual items, plus a dense form for recording the nature of the issues that are discussed during the course of a meeting. The “problems and issues” page of the form offered a place to record the topics that were discussed during the meetings. It distinguished issues that elicit serious or time-consuming discussion from those that are mentioned in more casual fashion.

The survey distributed to residents attending the meetings was developed during the fall of 1997 by project staff members. Surveys had also been distributed during the round of beat meeting observations conducted in 1995. The observers contacted district neighborhood relations offices (and in some cases the civilian beat meeting facilitators) in advance of each meeting to ensure that they would be on the meeting’s agenda. We hoped to distribute the questionnaires to participants in the middle of meetings, when attendance and audience attention might be at their peaks. However, a primary goal of the project was to not interfere with the flow of meetings and thereby alter the meeting’s atmosphere. So observers were flexible in their schedule, occasionally distributing surveys at the beginning or end of sessions. At the appointed time the observers arose to explain who they were and briefly described the purposes and goals of the evaluation. Then they described the survey and distributed the questionnaires. The questionnaires were necessarily short, so they would not take up much time, and they were designed and worded to be as accessible as possible to a wide audience. Questionnaires were available in both English and Spanish. Observers were instructed to assist any respondent who

could not read the form, apart from the rest of the meeting's participants to avoid a breach of confidentiality. To collect the questionnaires the observers passed out large envelopes prominently marked as containing confidential survey materials or placed the envelopes at the front and rear of the meeting room so that respondents could deposit them upon completion. Police officers were given somewhat longer questionnaires while residents completed theirs.

The observers kept no formal records of refusals, non-completions or survey completion rates beyond informal reports made to the project manager. Beat meetings have a fluid character. Residents and police officers come late and leave early, and they often stand and stretch or mill around in the back, and conduct personal business out of the room. As a result, the simple question of *how many* are in attendance is a problematic one. Observers would generally recount meeting participants when they could in order to gauge survey response, but they were very busy during the meetings. Because the questionnaires were anonymous, it was not possible to determine who did not complete one. Also, while observers handled inquiries from officers or residents on any number of issues regarding the questionnaire, in no case were potential respondents pressured into completing a questionnaire if they did not desire to do so. We feared that more intrusive efforts to monitor who had completed them would appear to be a violation of this principle.

Difficulties in observing and surveying the police officers who were present illustrates the fluid character of the meetings and data gathering. An entire page of the observation form was devoted to capturing information on police officers, including their race, gender and assignment. However, many officers attend the meetings in plain clothes, either because they have a tactical assignment or are attending off their regular shift. Not only do they flow in and out of meetings, they often are not introduced. Thus the observers had to question uniformed officers who were present to determine who was who, and why they were there.

The resident survey gathered information on several key topics: *who* was attending the meetings, *why* they were attending the meetings, *what* were the problems or issues they deemed as problematic in their neighborhoods, and *how* they related with police in the beat. The police survey asked many similar questions, and also gathered police input on matters specific to their role in CAPS and their perceptions of how the program is progressing. Officers attending meetings in multiple beats were as a consequence asked to complete multiple copies of the questionnaire; this was particularly true for officers assigned to the districts' neighborhood relations units. Therefore, questions on the police survey specifically asked officers to consider the issues in reference only to the beat where they were attending the meeting that day. Copies of all of these survey instruments are included as appendices to this report.

The timetable for the project was driven by the calendar. Because one purpose of the observation study was to question meeting participants, we needed to conduct it during the warmer months when more people attend.¹ Thirty beats were observed during January-March 1998; 131 were observed during April-June; 208 during July-September; 86 during October-November; and 2 in December.

Relations With The Public

Due to the nature of the evaluation, a fundamental aspect of the project is maintaining our credibility and trust with residents of Chicago and the Chicago Police Department. To this end, the observers were trained to answer general questions about the CAPS evaluation, their observations, and the surveys. Detailed questions or requests for additional information were to be handled directly by the project manager. Problems in the field and coordination with the management of the police department were also handled directly by the project manager. Because our findings relate to the city as a whole, residents and police alike were encouraged to join the mailing list for CAPS evaluation reports that are published by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. However, because the data collection period spanned almost all of 1998, casual inquiries like “how are we doing?” were common. The observers were instructed not to provide on the spot assessments to anyone about individual beats or the overall conduct of the program, nor were they to speak with the media on behalf of the project or to report on any of the work that they were doing for us. All of these inquiries were to be handled by the project manager and principal investigator. Residents or officers were especially encouraged to provide feedback on the CAPS and our observation study to the project manager. Their comments, letters, and phone calls were greatly appreciated, and led to one major change in the content of the participant survey.

The Data

Between February and December 1998, observers recorded data at 454 beat meetings. Our goal, which was not fully realized, was to conduct observations in each of the city’s 270 (of 279) residential beats. Beats were scheduled for observation in two ways. One set of 83 beats were involved in an evaluation of a community mobilization effort sponsored by the City of Chicago. The anticipated target beats for this program and a set of matched control beats were observed several times during 1998. The remaining 187 beats were to be observed just once.

¹ We did not need to use the observations to estimate meeting attendance; for that we have several years of monthly data gathered from police department records. We therefore did not conduct the observations or distribute participant surveys to represent months of the year, and could focus on collecting data during high-attendance seasons. The correlation between observer counts of meeting attendance and police records for the same meeting was +.93

However, several factors led to the completion of multiple observations of beats in the single-observation sample. If attendance was unusually low at a meeting (for example, if it were scheduled during a Chicago Bulls' championship game), observers revisited the beat at another time. On a few occasions observers arrived to discover that no one had showed up for a scheduled meeting; they revisited those beats as well. In some cases observers were dropped from the agenda of a meeting that they had attended in order to distribute questionnaires, due to the press of business. They revisited those beats too. Because they completed an observation form on each occasion, multiple observations were made of meetings at 45 beats in the single-observation sample. An additional complication was that some beats held meetings jointly with other beats during the study period. Where that was the case, the data were allocated between them and the data file was amended to include separate records for each of the participating beats for that meeting. This added five additional cases, so in the end, the data file includes information on 459 observations conducted in 256 beats.

For analytic purposes we were primarily interested in characterizing beats rather than meetings, especially because of the widely varying number of observations conducted at each site. Our analysis strategy was to use all 459 observations to make beat-level estimates of the observational variables of interest. For this purpose, each observation was given a weight which was the inverse of the number of times the beat was observed. So, for example, if a beat was observed twice, the weight for each observation was 0.5. (The three meetings which were canceled because no one showed up were given a weight of zero, essentially dropping them from the analysis.). This procedure equalized the effective number of observations for each of the 256 beats that were observed, at a value of 1. Next, the weighted observational variables were aggregated to the beat level. The resulting set of data on 256 beats thus draws upon all 456 complete-meeting observations. If instead averages were calculated for all variables for each set of multiply-observed beats, the results would be the same.

Over the course of the study, a total of 5,293 resident surveys were completed at the meetings. Resident surveys were administered in only one beat in District 01 (the central business district). Otherwise, the district range of participants was 127-398, and the average (excluding District 01) was 219. An average of 21 participants were questioned per beat in the 253 beats where questionnaires were successfully distributed; the range was 1-96.

A total of 1,050 officers were surveyed at the meetings, but 30 of them provided very incomplete data. Only three officers were surveyed in District 01; otherwise the range was 14-72 per district, and the average 44. Officers were surveyed in 222 beats, and the beat average was 4.7 officers.

All of the observation forms and questionnaires were reviewed and edited by project staff prior to data entry. The project manager examined all of the observation

forms and noted missing data and discrepancies in the data. Internal consistency checks were made to ensure that related counts added up correctly and that skip patterns were used logically. The observation forms were then completed or corrected by the project manager, based if necessary on conversations with the observers. In addition to the forms, the observers submitted text files recording a written description and analysis of each meeting; these comments could be used to supplement the observation forms, and helped fill in missing information.

Attachments:

- Appendix A: Meeting Observation Form
- Appendix B: Participant Questionnaire (English)
- Appendix C: Participant Questionnaire (Spanish)
- Appendix D: Police Officer Questionnaire

Appendix A: Meeting Observation Form

CAPS BEAT MEETING OBSERVATIONS 1998

**DO not leave any answers blank.
Use pencils only please.**

Q1. _____ Interviewer IDENTIFY #

Q2. _____ District (2 digits 01-25)

Q3. _____ Beat (last 2 digits)

Q4. _____ Month (2 digits)

Q5. _____ Day (2 digits)

Q6. _____ Year (2 digits)

Q7. Circle Location Code

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|----|----------------------------|
| 1 | Police station | 7 | hospital |
| 2 | Park district building | 8 | public housing facility |
| 3 | Library | 9 | private housing facility |
| 4 | Church | 10 | restaurant |
| 5 | School | 11 | other not-for-profit space |
| 6 | Bank | 12 | other commercial space |
| 13 | Other government building | 14 | Other _____(specify) |

Q8. _____ Time meeting began (*hhmm*: military 00:00-24:00)
 hh mm

Count participants 30 minutes after the meeting begins

Q9. _____ Total number residents attending

[if none code 0 here & Q10-16; exclude clear non-residents (representatives from city services, speakers not from beat or district level)]

		<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>
Q10.	Number of Black/African-American residents	_____	_____
Q11.	Number of Latino/Hispanic residents	_____	_____
Q12.	Number of East Asian residents (Filipino, Korean, Chinese)	_____	_____
Q13.	Number of South Asian residents (Indian-subcontinent)	_____	_____
Q14.	Number of Mideastern residents (Palestinian, Iranian, Assyrian)	_____	_____
Q15.	Number of Caucasian residents	_____	_____

- Q16. **Total number identified residents present** _____ male _____ female
- Q17. _____ Number (usually 1) of civilian beat facilitators named
- Q18. _____ Number of block club representatives
- Q19. _____ Number of other civilian groups/organizations (describe)

- Q20. _____ Number of civilian trainers from Police Training Academy
- Q21. _____ Number of city outreach workers from CAPS Implementation Office
- Q22. _____ Number of reps from CAPS-contracted organizations
- Q23. _____ Number of other city agency representatives (describe)

- Q24. _____ Number of elected officials or their representatives
- Q25. _____ Number of candidates for elected positions (describe)

- Q26. _____ Number of other civilian introduced persons (describe)
- Q27. _____ **Total number of civilians present (residents + nonresidents)**

Did any of these people make a presentation?

- *code all yes or no; leave blank if no one came*
- *do not code "yes" if person makes a simple introduction or explains why they are attending the meeting*
- *code "yes" if meeting includes civilian training*

- | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | |
|------|------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|
| Q28. | 1 | 0 | block club representatives |
| Q29. | 1 | 0 | other civilian groups/organizations |
| Q30. | 1 | 0 | city agency representatives |
| Q31. | 1 | 0 | trainer from Police Training Academy |
| Q32. | 1 | 0 | city outreach/CAPS implementation office |
| Q33. | 1 | 0 | any police personnel |
| Q34. | 1 | 0 | civilian beat facilitator |
| Q35. | 1 | 0 | other introduced person _____ |
| Q36. | 1 | 0 | civilian with unknown affiliation |

Q37. Did someone read the minutes from the previous meeting?

- 1 Yes
2 No

Count all police even if they come and go (not including police trainees)

- Q38. _____ Number of male police officers introduced
- Q39. _____ Number of female police officers introduced
- Q40. _____ Number of police officers introduced (by name or rank)
- Q41. _____ Total Number of Police Attended
if none code 0 here & Q38-51

	Black	Latino	White	Other
Q42. Number of District beat officers				
Q43. Number of neighborhood relations officers				
Q44. Number of neighborhood relations sergeants				
Q45. Number of beat sergeants				
Q46. Number of other sergeants				
Q47. Number of district lieutenants, captains, commanders				
Q48. Number of Officers from other departmental units				
Q49. Number of Police Joint Trainers from Police Academy				
Q50. Number of Foot Patrol officers				
Q51. Number of "don't know rank" officers				

- Q52. _____ Total number of officers from other police forces (not CPD)
(Includes Chicago Housing Authority, Chicago Transit Authority, University Police)

Q53. _____ Time meeting ended (hhmm: military 0:00-24:00)
 hh mm

TO BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF THE BEAT MEETING:

Did police say that residents are responsible for ...

code all yes or no; leave blank if no one came

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Q54.	1	0	Being partners with police; working with police to improve relations
Q55.	1	0	Being self-sufficient/proactively dealing with problems; taking care of problems themselves
Q56.	1	0	Organizing themselves; working together (i.e.--to get more residents to show up)
Q57.	1	0	Taking measures to prevent crime (installing home protection devices, better lighting, etc.)
Q58.	1	0	Controlling their children;supervising kids in the area
Q59.	1	0	Identifying problems for police attention (calling 911 rapidly, being eyes and ears, etc.)
Q60.	1	0	Being careful; know limitations; not doing too much
Q61.	1	0	Throwing out strategies, joint problem solving

Did residents say police are responsible for ...

code all yes or no; leave blank if no one came

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Q62.	1	0	Improving relations with residents
Q63.	1	0	Helping residents get organized, turn out
Q64.	1	0	Contacting and coordinating city services
Q65.	1	0	Solving non-crime problems (loitering, dogs, noise, etc.)
Q66.	1	0	Identifying problems in neighborhood
Q67.	1	0	Keeping residents informed about issues/problems
Q68.	1	0	Responding rapidly/effectively to crime calls
Q69.	1	0	Promoting crime prevention; stop it from happening
Q70.	1	0	Throwing out strategies, joint problem solving

Q71. Who principally chaired/conducted the meeting:

- 1 Neighborhood relations officer
- 2 Beat officer
- 3 Beat team leader (a sergeant)
- 4 Other officer, other sergeant, etc.
- 5 Civilian identified as a "facilitator"
- 6 Civilian identified as community organizer/staff member
ID

GROUP _____

- 7 Other resident
- 8 Joint or shared leadership between police and a civilian
- 9 Other _____
- 10 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q72. Presence of Agenda

- 1 Printed
- 2 Announced
- 3 No clear agenda/not mentioned
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q73. Were crime/arrest reports (not maps) made available?
(i.e.-- a "Top Ten" list of crime occurrences)

- 1 Printed list distributed
- 2 Verbal report only
- 3 None made available
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q74. Were crime maps passed out or made available?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q75. Overall, who dominated the discussion:

- 1 Police
- 2 Residents (civilians if not sure)
- 3 Roughly equal
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q76. Did a "problem" civilian disrupt the proceedings?

- 1 No
- 2 Rambling or demanded a great deal of attention
- 3 Confrontational or troublemaking
- 4 Both rambling and confrontational
- 5 Some other "problem citizen" disruption
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q76a. **If yes to Q76:** Was the problem civilian effectively dealt with?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes - by police
- 3 Yes - by civilian
- 4 Yes - by both
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q77. Judge the effectiveness of the police that played the largest leadership roles.

- 1 Police were not effective meeting leaders
- 2 Police were fairly effective meeting leaders
- 3 Police were very effective meeting leaders
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q78. Judge the effectiveness of the civilian(s) that played the largest leadership role(s).

- 1 Civilian(s) were not effective meeting leaders
- 2 Civilian(s) were fairly effective meeting leaders
- 3 Civilian(s) were very effective meeting leaders
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q79. Judge the overall effectiveness with which the meeting was run.

- 1 The meeting floundered; was unfocused or rambling
- 2 Other bad meeting _____
- 3 The meeting was fairly effectively run
- 4 The meeting was very effectively run
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q80. The dominant relationship between officers and residents was...

1 *Police and residents as partners* (cooperative, interdependent, need each other, can't succeed without each other, functioning on a higher level; demonstrating problem solving or pre-problem solving)

2 *Police and residents as independent operators* (officers and residents have different functions and agendas; clearly separate police & citizen roles)

3 *Police as leaders* (police set agenda-citizens follow; citizens just eyes and ears; police will take care of problems)

4 *Citizens as leaders* (citizens set agenda for meetings and neighborhood issues; actively addressing neighborhood issues, police in more passive role)

5 *Police and residents as adversaries* (conflicting goals and methods; uncooperative/unfriendly atmosphere)

6 cannot classify _____

9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q81. Referring to your notes, Who identified most of the problems or issues discussed in the meeting (choose one):

1 Police

2 Residents

3 Other participants (organizers, service agencies, etc.)

4 Problems identified equally by civilians & police

5 No problems were identified

9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q82. Did civilians brainstorm or propose strategies to identified problems?

1 Yes

2 No

Q83. Did police brainstorm or propose strategies to identified problems?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q84. Who proposed most of the solutions discussed in the meeting:

- 1 Police
- 2 Residents
- 3 Other participants
- 4 Solutions proposed equally by civilians and police
- 5 No solutions were proposed
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q85. Did civilians report back on previous problem solving efforts?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q86. Did police report back on previous problem solving efforts?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q87. If previous problem-solving efforts were mentioned, who primarily acted to solve the problem:

- 1 Police
- 2 Residents
- 3 City services
- 4 Other meeting participants
- 5 Action taken jointly by police and residents
- 6 Other_____ (specify)
- 7 No problem-solving efforts were mentioned
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q88. Were volunteers called for or sign-up sheets passed around for a particular activity?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No
- 9 NA-not enough citizens showed up to meet

Q89. Did residents leave the meeting with a commitment to future action? (i.e.-- phone trees, planning marches, letter writing, stake outs, talking to aldermen, etc.)

1 Yes

2 No

Problems and Issues Page

Completed for Every Meeting

Discussion was:

Major Minor

A. Drugs

- 1. Street sales or use _____
- 2. Drug houses _____
- 3. Drugs-gangs involved _____
- 4. Other drug problem _____

B. Gangs

- 1. Gang violence _____
- 2. Gang intimidation _____
- 3. Gang graffiti _____
- 4. Gang recruiting _____
- 5. Other gang problem _____

C. Personal Crime

- 1. Robbery, pursesnatch, or muggings _____
- 2. Domestic violence _____
- 3. Assault (general) _____
- 4. Homicide, shootings _____
- 5. Rape/sexual assault _____
- 6. Other personal crime _____

D. Property Crime

- 1. Burglary (home) _____
- 2. Burglary (garage) _____
- 3. Car theft _____
- 4. Car break-ins/damage _____
- 5. General theft _____
- 6. Other property crime _____

E. General Crime Conditions

- 1. Unspecific crime _____
- 2. Fear of crime _____
- 3. Impact on area _____
- 4. Other general _____

F. Physical Decay

- 1. Abandoned buildings _____
- 2. Abandoned cars _____
- 3. Graffiti & vandalism _____
- 4. Trash or junk _____
- 5. Walks/street repair _____
- 6. Garbage collections _____
- 7. Lights out/too dark _____
- 8. Other decay (specify) _____

G. Other Problems/Issues (specify)

- 1. (Arson) _____
- 2. (Prostitution) _____
- 3. (Praising local partnerships) _____
- 4. (Gang Loitering Ordinance) _____

Discussion was:

Major Minor

H. Social Disorder

- 1. Public drinking _____
- 2. Liquor outlet problems _____
- 3. Bad residents/ out of control _____
- 4. Suspicious people _____
- 5. Loitering, congregating _____
- 6. Panhandling _____
- 7. Curfew or truancy _____
- 8. Noise _____
- 9. Fights/brawls (not gang) _____
- 10. Guns, gunfire _____
- 11. Bad landlords _____
- 12. Disorderly cars _____
- 13. Other social disorder _____

I. Parking and Traffic

- 1. Drunk driving _____
- 2. Traffic congestion _____
- 3. Parking problems _____
- 4. Speeding/reckless _____
- 5. Other parking/traffic _____

J. Police Issues

- 1. Discuss 911/response _____
- 2. Criticize 911/response _____
- 3. Praise 911/response _____
- 4. Criticize performance _____
- 5. Praise performance _____
- 6. Discuss CAPS program _____
- 7. Criticize CAPS program _____
- 8. Praise CAPS program _____

K. Public Services

1. Discuss services _____
2. Criticize services _____
3. Praise city services _____

L. Public Officials

1. Discuss officials _____
2. Criticize officials _____
3. Praise officials _____

M. Citizen Involvement

1. Organizing/Turnout
Probs. _____
2. Not working together _____
3. Need to make city
service requests _____
4. Need to follow through
on crimes/problems _____
5. CourtWatch/Court Adv. _____
6. Discuss retaliation _____
7. Reports of retaliation

Appendix B: Participant Questionnaire (English)

NOTE ORIGINAL PRINTED WITH A LARGER FONT ON TWO SIDES OF ONE SHEET OF LEGAL-SIZE PAPER

Northwestern University CAPS Beat Meeting Questionnaire 1998

Your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire will help us understand the opinions of community members.

Your responses to this survey will be kept strictly confidential. Thank you for your help.

1. Besides this meeting, how many other beat meeting have you been able to attend during the past 12 months? (Please circle)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

2. During the past 12 months have you tried to get anyone else to attend a beat meeting in your neighborhood?

Yes 1
No 2

3. How did you first learn when and where the meetings are held for this beat?

HOW I HEARD

- a. local newspaper
- b. brochure, flyer, newsletter
- c. someone came to my door
- d. someone gave me a call
- e. casual conversation
- f. other announcement

WHO TOLD ME

- j. police officer
- k. trainer or organizer
- l. community member/neighbor
- m. school program
- n. through church
- o. other source

Thinking about the people that you see at beat meetings, have you ...

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
4. Seen them around the beat?	1	0
5. Attended any other kinds of meetings with them	1	0
6. Talked with them on the phone?	1	0
7. Worked on any beat problems with them?	1	0

8. Are you or anyone in your household involved in or a member of a ...

9.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. Block club	0	1	f. Nationality Association	0	1
b. Business association	0	1	g. Sports/recreation club	0	1
c. Social service group	0	1	h. Political organization	0	1
d. PTA/local school council	0	1	i. Church/synagogue/mosque	0	1
e. Neighborhood watch group	0	1	j. Another community group	0	1
			(specify)_____		

9. How long have you lived in your neighborhood? _____
Years Months

10. We would like to know about the different issues that may be a problem in your neighborhood. Please tell us your opinion: Are these issues no problem, some problem, or a big problem in your neighborhood?

	<u>No Problem</u>	<u>Some Problem</u>	<u>A Big Problem</u>
a. Abandoned cars in the streets and alleys?	1	2	3
b. Abandoned buildings?	1	2	3
c. Graffiti, that is, writing or painting on walls or buildings?	1	2	3
d. People breaking in or sneaking into homes to steal things?	1	2	3
e. Shootings and violence by gangs?	1	2	3
f. Drug dealing on the streets?	1	2	3
g. People being attacked or robbed?	1	2	3
h. Vacant lots filed with junk or trash?	1	2	3

1. How good a job are the police doing in working together with residents in your neighborhood to solve local problems? Would you say they are doing a:

very good job .	4
good job .	3
fair job. .	2
poor job .	1
don't know .	9

12. How responsive are the police in your neighborhood to community concerns? Do you think they are ...

very responsive .	4
somewhat responsive .	3
somewhat unresponsive.	2
very unresponsive .	1

13. How good a job are the police doing in dealing with the problems that really concern people in your neighborhood? Would you say they are doing a ...

very good job .	4
good job .	3
fair job. .	2
poor job .	1

We are asking the following questions all over Chicago to learn about people's different experiences

14. Are you: Male . . . 1
Female . . . 2

15. In what year were you born? 19_____
Year

16. What is your background? Please circle the appropriate number.

Black/African American	1	East Asian	
Latino/Hispanic American	2	Filipino	6
White/Caucasian	3	Korean	7
Middle Eastern	4	Vietnamese or Cambodian	8
South Asian:		Other East Asian	9
Indian subcontinent	5	Other (specify) _____	

17. Do you own or rent your home?

Own	1	
Rent	2	--> (Is this public housing? Yes 1 No 2)
Other	3	

18. Please circle the highest level of education you completed.

Did not finish high school	1
High School graduate, GED	2
Further technical or vocational training	3
Some college, but did not graduate .	4
College graduate	5

Appendix C: Participant Questionnaire (Spanish)

NOTE THE ORIGINAL WAS PRINTED WITH A LARGER FONT ON TWO SIDES OF ONE SHEET OF LEGAL-SIZE PAPER

Northwestern University CAPS Beat Meeting Questionario 1998

Su colaboración al completar esta encuesta nos ayudará a conocer la opinión de los miembros de su comunidad. **Sus respuestas son estrictamente confidenciales.** Muchas gracias por su colaboración.

1 Sin contar este encuentro, ¿a cuántas otras reuniones de ronda ha asistido usted en los últimos 12 meses? (por favor marque un número)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

2. ¿Durante los últimos 12 meses, ha invitado usted a alguna otra persona a las reuniones de ronda de su vecindario?

Si 1
 No 2

3. ¿Cómo se enteró por primera vez dónde y cuándo se realizaban las reuniones para esta ronda? (marque todas las opciones que sean pertinentes)

COMO ME ENTERE

QUIEN ME DIJO

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| a. diario local | j. oficial de policia |
| b. folleto, afiche, carta | k. instructor u organizador |
| c. alguien visitó mi casa | l. miembro de la comunidad/
vecino |
| d. alguien llamó por teléfono | m. a través de un programa en la
escuela |
| e. en una conversación informal | n. a través de la iglesia |
| f. otro tipo de anuncio | o. otra fuente |

Pensando en la gente que Ud. ve en las reuniones de ronda, Ud....

	<u>SI</u>	<u>NO</u>
4. ¿Los ha visto en la ronda?	1	0
5. ¿Ha ido a otras reuniones con ellos?1	0
6. ¿Ha hablado con ellos por teléfono?1	0
7. ¿Ha trabajado en algún problema de la ronda con ellos?	1	0

8. **Es Ud. o alguien en su casa participa o miembro de ...**

	<u>SI</u>	<u>NO</u>		<u>SI</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. Club de cuadra	0	1	f. Asociación nacional	0	1
b. Asociación de negocios	0	1	g. Club deportivo o recreativo	0	1
c. Grupo de servicio social	0	1	h. Organización política	0	1
d. PTA /consejo escolar	0	1	i. Iglesia, sinagoga, mezquita	0	1
e. Grupo vigilancia/ patrulla de ciudadanos del vecindario (especifique)_____	0	1	j. Otro grupo comunitario	0	1

9. ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva viviendo en su vecindario? _____
Años Meses

10. Nos gustaría conocer las cuestiones que pueden ser un problema en su vecindario. Por favor díganos su opinión: ¿son las siguientes cuestiones "ningun problema", "algo de problema", o un "gran problema" en su vecindario?

	<u>Ningún Problema</u>	<u>Algo de Problema</u>	<u>Gran Problema</u>
a. ¿Autos abandonados en las calles y callejones?.	1	2	3
b. ¿Edificios abandonados?	1	2	3
c. ¿Graffiti, es decir, escritura o pintura en paredes o edificios?	1	2	3
d. ¿Gente entrando en las casas para robar cosas?	1	2	3
e. ¿Disparos y violencia con armas de fuego?	1	2	3
f. ¿Venta de drogas en las calles?	1	2	3
g. ¿Gente que es atacada o asaltada?	1	2	3
h. ¿Solares vacíos llenado de basura?	1	2	3

11. Qué opina del trabajo que esta haciendo la policía junto con los vecinos de su barrio para resolver problemas locales? Diría que la policía está haciendo un:

muy buen trabajo . . .	4
buen trabajo. . .	3
regular trabajo . . .	2
mal trabajo . . .	1
no se . . .	9

12. ¿Está la policía de su vecindario interesada en las preocupaciones de la comunidad? Ud. piensa que ellos están:

muy interesados . . .	4
algo interesados . . .	3
algo desinteresados . . .	2
muy desinteresados. . .	1

13. ¿Qué opina del trabajo que está haciendo la policía con respecto a problemas que realmente preocupan a la gente de su vecindario? Diría que la policía está haciendo un:

muy buen trabajo . . .	4
buen trabajo. . .	3
regular trabajo . . .	2
mal trabajo . . .	1

Estamos haciendo las siguientes preguntas en todo Chicago para conocer diferentes experiencias de la gente

14. **Es Usted:** Hombre . 1
 Mujer . 2

15. **En qué año nació?** 19
 Año

16. **¿Cuál es su ascendencia? Por favor haga un círculo el número indicado.**

Black/Africo-Americano	1	East Asian	
Latino/Hispanic American	2	Filipino	6
Blanco/Caucásico	3	Coreano	7
Middle Eastern	4	Vietnamés o Cambayano	8
South Asian/Indian subcontinent	5	Otro East Asiático	9
		Otro (especifique)	<u>10</u>

17. **¿Es usted dueño de su casa o alquila?**

Dueño	.	.	.	1			
Alquila.	.	.	.	2	➡	(¿Es vivienda pública?	Si No)
Otro	.	.	.	3		1	0

18. **¿Cuántos años de educación formal ha tenido Usted? Favor de elegir solo un número...**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12+

18. **Por favor haga un círculo en el nivel de educación más alto que usted alcanzó.**

Secundaria incompleta	1
Secundaria completa, GED	2
Educación terciaria (técnica o vocacional)	3
Universitaria incompleta	4
Universitaria completa	5

Appendix D: Police Officer Questionnaire

NOTE THE ORIGINAL WAS PRINTED WITH A LARGER FONT ON TWO SIDES OF ONE SHEET OF LEGAL-SIZE PAPER

Q1. How long have you been working on your current beat?

Years Months

Q2. How often do you attend beat community meetings?

every meeting.....	4	less than half per year.....	2
every other meeting.....	3	never.....	1

Q3. What are your responsibilities at beat community meetings? (Please circle all of your responsibilities)

supervise.....	12	bring crime maps/stats.....	6
chair meeting.....	11	answer questions from the floor.....	5
set agenda.....	10	make presentations.....	4
complete CAPS service request.....	9	represent Neighborhood Relations.....	3
report on a case or issue.....	8	just attend; don't have a role.....	2
provide special information.....	7	other _____	1
		(explain briefly)	

Q4. Who sets the agenda for your beat community meeting? (Circle all that apply.)

beat officer/sergeant.....	5	neighborhood relations officer.....	2
civilian facilitator.....	4	other (describe briefly) _____	1
police <u>and</u> civilian facilitator.....	3		

Q5. Who typically chairs your beat community meeting? (Circle all that apply.)

beat officer/sergeant.....	5	neighborhood relations officer.....	2
civilian facilitator.....	4	other (describe briefly) _____	1
police <u>and</u> civilian facilitator.....	3		

Q6. How satisfied are you with community attendance?

very satisfied.....	4	somewhat dissatisfied.....	2
somewhat satisfied.....	3	very dissatisfied.....	1

Q7. How well do beat meeting attendees represent the beat?

very representative.....	4	somewhat not representative.....	2
somewhat representative.....	3	not representative.....	1

Q7a. Who is not being represented? (Skip if not applicable) _____

Q8. In general, what is the relationship between police and residents at beat community meetings?

very congenial.....	4	somewhat strained.....	2
somewhat congenial.....	3	very strained.....	1

Q9. In general, are problems discussed at beat community meetings usually of concern to the entire beat, part of your beat, or just individuals?

entire beat.....	4	just individuals.....	2
part of the beat.....	3	all of the previous options.....	1

Q10. Who most often implements strategies for solving problems discussed at beat community meetings?

(Circle all that apply.)

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| police..... | 8 | private agencies..... | 4 |
| individual residents..... | 7 | community groups/block clubs..... | 3 |
| police and residents..... | 6 | CAPS implementation organizers.. | 2 |
| city services | 5 | no one..... | 1 |

Q11. Do supervisors take beat team meetings seriously?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| very seriously..... | 4 | not too seriously..... | 2 |
| somewhat seriously..... | 3 | not at all seriously..... | 1 |

Q12. How often do you attend beat team meetings?

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| every meeting..... | 4 | infrequently..... | 2 |
| almost every meeting..... | 3 | almost never..... | 1 |

Q13. Is there discussion of the Beat Plan(s) at the beat team meeting?

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| most of the time..... | 4 | almost never..... | 2 | don't attend meetings..... | 9 |
| some of the time..... | 3 | never..... | 1 | | |

Q14. How often are the Beat Plans updated?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| very often..... | 4 | not very often..... | 2 |
| somewhat often..... | 3 | never..... | 1 |

Q15. How often do you fill out beat plan implementation logs?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| very often..... | 4 | not very often..... | 2 |
| somewhat often..... | 3 | never..... | 1 |

Q16. Do you find Beat Plans useful?

- | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| very useful..... | 4 | not very useful..... | 2 |
| somewhat useful..... | 3 | not at all useful..... | 1 |

Q17. Does your beat team consider resident input to help identify priority problems?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| very often..... | 4 | not very often..... | 2 |
| somewhat often..... | 3 | never..... | 1 |

Q18. Have you seen the District Plan?

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---------|---|
| yes..... | 1 | no..... | 0 |
|----------|---|---------|---|

Q19. How often do you actually use the CAPS problem-solving model (identify, prioritize, analyze, strategize, implement)?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|------------------|
| very often..... | 4 | not very often..... | 2 |
| somewhat often..... | 3 | never..... | 1 [skip to Q20] |

Q19a. Is the CAPS problem-solving model actually useful?

- | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| very useful..... | 4 | not very useful..... | 2 |
| somewhat useful..... | 3 | not at all useful..... | 1 |

Q20. Do you have the time to do preventive work and not just react to the radio?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| very often..... | 4 | not very often..... | 2 |
| somewhat often..... | 3 | never..... | 1 |

Q21. Can you request and get down time to work on your Beat Plans?

very often.....	4	not very often.....	2
somewhat often.....	3	never.....	1

Q22. Generally, how satisfied are you with city service request response?

very satisfied.....	4	not very satisfied.....	2
somewhat satisfied....	3	not at all satisfied.....	1

Q23. Do you actually use ICAM2/crime analysis to identify problems?

very often.....	4	not very often.....	2
somewhat often.....	3	never.....	1

Q24. Generally, do the same officers consistently work in your beat?

yes.....	1	no.....	0
----------	---	---------	---

Q25. Do your supervisors correct dispatchers if they do not assign the proper units to handle calls?

very often.....	5	not very often.....	3	rarely needed.....	1
somewhat often.....	4	never.....	2		

Q26. Do supervisors set aside time for face-to-face communication during roll call?

very often.....	4	not very often.....	2
somewhat often.....	3	never.....	1

Q27. Do you find face-to-face communication useful?

very useful.....	4	not very useful.....	2
somewhat useful.....	3	not at all useful.....	1

Q28. How often do beat officers use the master beat file?

very often.....	4	not very often.....	2
somewhat often.....	3	never.....	1

Q29. Do your supervisors ensure that tactical and gang officers will provide appropriate support to field units?

very often.....	4	not very often.....	2	not needed.....	1
somewhat often.....	3	never.....	1		

Q30. Have you worked with a community organizer or service coordinator from the CAPS Implementation Office?

yes.....	1	uncertain.....	9
no.....	0	[skip to Q31]	

Q30a. If yes, do you find them a useful resource?

very useful.....	4	not very useful.....	2
somewhat useful....	3	not at all useful.....	1

