

DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEES:

by

Jill DuBois

The Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium is located at the Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University. It also includes faculty and students from Loyola University of Chicago, DePaul University and the University of Illinois-Chicago. It is supported by grants from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the Chicago Community Trust, and the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.

April, 1995

DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEES

One of the general principles of a community policing strategy is that it calls for police to be responsive to citizen demands when local problems are identified and when priorities are set. A key vehicle for accomplishing this in Chicago is the district advisory committee, which is composed of citizens and police personnel who meet on a monthly basis to discuss conditions in the area and, ideally, discover solutions to some of the problems.

A Chicago Police Department special order was issued in April 1993 that addressed supervisory and citizen interaction, and it included certain sections that specified responsibilities for the district advisory committee. As detailed in the CAPS order, the district advisory committees were to "appoint subcommittees to identify and address the needs and problems of the community and advise the district commander of possible solutions and strategies; advise the district commander of the current matters of concern to the community; and assess the effectiveness of implemented solutions and strategies and inform the district commander of the progress or lack thereof of the solutions and strategies."

Because this directive was broad based, each of the prototypes formed committees and devised meeting formats that were appropriate to the needs of its residents and conditions of the district. Membership in the prototype advisory committees was mainly determined by the commanders, with individuals chosen on the basis of standing in the community, previous service to the community, willingness to participate and geographical representation, among other factors. In some districts, personnel from the park district and city and state government agencies are also on the committee, though by October 1994 it was mandated that these individuals would serve in an ex-officio capacity, with no voting privileges.

METHODS

The first prototype advisory committee meeting, and the first that was observed by the Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium, was held in the Rogers Park District on April 22, 1993. In 1993, 22 meetings were observed, as were 43 during 1994.

Generally, one observer from the evaluation team attended meetings, and that individual usually sat on the periphery of the group, unless doing so would have attracted more attention than sitting amidst the group. An observation guide was developed early in the evaluation to ensure that basic information would be captured, however, the evaluation team member mainly recorded in detail the activities and discussions that took place. On rare occasions, the observer would be addressed during meetings, but usually the individual maintained silence and kept a very low profile during proceedings. On the whole, committees seemed quite accustomed to the presence of an evaluation team member; the one exception was a community organizer in Austin who was obstructive in his opposition to the evaluation project.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

Prototype district advisory committees have met on a consistent basis since shortly after the April 1993 launch of the CAPS program. Membership in the committees has remained relatively stable, though district leadership has not — four of the five original prototype commanders have changed. New leadership has not seemed to appreciably affect the two districts whose commanders changed early in 1994. The effect of a third commander's promotion at the end of 1994 could not be assessed at the time this report was prepared, but it bears watching, because this commander often seemed to be the glue that held the committee together, if not its driving force. And, the fourth prototype commander, promoted in January 1995,

was an avid participant in the advisory committee, so effects of this personnel change will also be interesting to observe.

While the prototype advisory committees maintain a certain diversity, there has been a shared set of activities and experiences among them. Each of the advisory committees devised bylaws, each either elected officers or began to pave the way for elections, and several worked to write proposals for a youth network project, which would bring more services to the young people of the various districts. Several committees also began making application for 501(C)(3) status, which would have allowed them to begin fund-raising efforts and acquire drug forfeiture assets, though it was later decided by the Chicago Police Department that organized groups within the advisory committees would make application for 501(C)(3) status. Each advisory committee has begun recording minutes, and reading of the previous month's minutes is a regular part the meetings.

In September 1994, a set of CAPS district advisory committee organizational guidelines was distributed by the City Hall CAPS liaison. These guidelines, which were developed by the CAPS management team, gave specifics on such subjects as purpose, organization and composition, selection of members and terms of office, officers, attendance, department support, subcommittees and steering committees. While this document was ostensibly created to give a certain uniformity to the non-prototype districts that were beginning to implement community policing, it gave direction to the prototypes in some subject areas where there had been some questions, such as selection of officers, term limits and voting rights. Furthermore, it mandated that each district would have a court advocacy committee.

The September 1994 guidelines restated the purpose of the district advisory committee: "The District Advisory Committee (DAC) will help the district commander identify key issues, set broad priorities, verify problems and advise on solutions, including forming partnerships with community business and

government agencies. The Committee is an independent extension of the City of Chicago Department of Police. Committee members work closely with the district and other police personnel but do not have direct control over police operations."

Bylaws were also referred to in the organizational guidelines. Though never addressed directly in either the special order or the guidelines, their existence was implied in the statement on terms of office: "Members will be elected during the first Police Period of each year by Committee and subcommittee members according to DAC bylaws and procedures." Each prototype district advisory committee developed bylaws in 1994, however, by year's end, only one of the five districts' bylaws had been approved by the Chicago Police Department.

Another definitive effect of the guidelines was that it was unequivocally stated that members of the Chicago Police Department or city government could not serve as elected members of the committee. As a result of this, civilian chairpersons were not only elected in all but one district, but control of the meeting was handed over to the elected or duly appointed individual. While commanders or designated stand-ins continued to attend meetings, it became clear that civilians maintained order and ran the proceedings. Even in the one prototype district where a chairperson had not been elected, guest chairs coordinated and officiated with poise.

One other subject that was finally acknowledged in the guidelines, but that still remains ambiguous, was that of the role of pre-existing steering committees. Steering committees were formed in 1981 as part of the now-defunct Beat Representative Program.

The steering committees' original function was to serve in a capacity that was similar to that of the advisory committee, and after the Beat Rep program disbanded, each of the district's steering committees remained intact — at least until CAPS was launched — but their only actual function was to raise funds for various district events, like seminars about crime- and safety-related matters, or to buy t-

shirts and other sundries for district youth groups that had on-going programs. Because the descriptions of the two committees were remarkably similar, some of the prototypes disbanded their steering committees. Those that did not often found that the steering committee felt usurped by the advisory committee. The organizational guidelines finally stated that the steering committees could operate autonomously or as a subcommittee of the district advisory committee, with the tacit understanding that fund-raising activities continue under the steering committee purview. This caused a good deal of consternation for the districts that had disbanded their steering committees, because they believed they were suddenly without a fund-raising unit. The matter was eventually resolved by the Chicago Police Department's decision to allow groups within the advisory committees to apply for 501(C)(3) status.

A program milestone that seemed to coincide with the guidelines was the issuance of service awards for community members who had been involved in the program/advisory committee since its inception. Lapel pins and certificates were given to subcommittee heads and tireless participants, while only certificates were awarded to residents who had consistently volunteered their time and ideas.

District Profiles

Englewood. Englewood is a community of working-class African-Americans located approximately seven miles south and slightly to the west of the Loop. Blacks make up 99 percent of the district's population, and 31 percent of the households are headed by women. Of the five prototypes, Englewood ranks fourth in terms of income, though it has the second-highest proportion of home ownership.

Advisory committee meetings have been held consistently on the third Wednesday of each month in Englewood. This district has an open attendance policy that allows all members of the subcommittees to take part in the general

monthly meeting, though non-subcommittee members were restricted from speaking at the meeting. Attendance at this district's advisory committee meetings reached as high as 70 at various times.

These gatherings took place in the courtroom located in the station until the courtroom was torn down when remodelling of the facility began. Subsequent meetings were held in various park houses located throughout the district. When station renovations were completed, advisory committee meetings were again held in the station in the newly-built community room.

Englewood's advisory committee meetings are quite spirited and spiritual. There was a strong religious component at these sessions, with attendees often calling out "amen" or "praise God." Meetings generally began and ended with prayer, and occasionally, hands were held during prayer. The meetings had a very informal, grass-roots feel, and they were very positive. Committee members seemed to feel that if people pulled and worked together, they would make positive change in the community. Helping youths is high on this district's agenda, and often youngsters made presentations or gave performances. This is the only prototype district where youths consistently attended advisory committee meetings.

Another significant contribution to the mood of the meeting was the exuberance of the individual who was commander of the district until the end of 1994 and of the woman who was named chairperson in September of that year.

The Englewood commander was a worthy master of ceremonies. Much admired, he attended most sessions and kept the meetings on track. Often making a game-show-host entrance, he offered encouragement for ongoing efforts in addition to sometimes making unpopular decisions without apology. The chairperson of the advisory committee is a local religious leader, and her unrestrained enthusiasm had her often lauding accomplishments and stirring up the assemblage whenever things started to tone down.

Seven subcommittees comprised Englewood's advisory committee: Community Block Organization, Business-Economic Development, Court Advocacy, Ecumenical Pastors of Englewood, Seniors and Disabled, Environment and Housing, and Youth and Family. The district's steering committee operated autonomously. As stated in a brochure that was available to those who attended Englewood's advisory committee meetings, the focus of the subcommittees (except for the Seniors group, which is not described in the pamphlet) was as follows:

Environment and Housing — Taking inventory of vacant property to determine ownership and physical condition; helping residents obtain deeds to vacant properties that adjoin their own; organizing clean-up campaigns; working with the City of Chicago to ensure that necessary repairs and maintenance procedures to streets and alleys are being performed.

Community Block Organization — Helping bring neighborhood organizations and police officers together in non-confrontational settings; assisting residents organize and work with the police to share responsibility for problem solving; working with VISTA organizers.

Youth and Family — Developing programs to address the family problems in the community; working with schools to keep children in school and help those who have left prior to graduation return; working with the Criminal Court to develop positive alternative programs that are aimed at returning troubled youth to the community in positive programs; training volunteers to counsel victims of child abuse, rape and domestic violence; developing year-round park district programs; developing "peer programs" and "role model programs" for area youth.

Business-Economic Development — Creating a plan in conjunction with Chicago's Department of Planning for total redevelopment of the community; assisting youth in finding year-round employment within the community; working with local agencies to create jobs.

Court Advocacy — Tracking cases that have an effect on the community; appearing at court proceedings in an attempt to ensure that the concerns of the community are known; disseminating information to the community about the results of various court cases; assisting members of the community who are involved in the Criminal Courts and informing them of the services that are available to them.

Ecumenical Pastors of Englewood — Working together as spiritual leaders in the community; addressing the needs of the people; ministering to the spirit, soul and body via classes, seminars and athletics; forming a bond of unity with every church and ministry in the community.

The format of the meeting was as follows: the chairperson started by giving a general update of recent events that had an effect on the district, and then the heads of the subcommittees delivered reports of the activities of their groups. It was at this point that the meetings could get bogged down — one respected subcommittee spokesperson in particular had a tendency to talk on about topics that were only marginally related to the CAPS effort. When subcommittee reports were completed, special guests were often introduced; they generally provided overviews of their role and its impact on CAPS. Guests of this type included the commander of the gang crimes unit, the City Hall CAPS liaison, an attorney who provided pro bono services, a local banking executive who described services available, and the like.

Englewood's meetings were often used as an opportunity to announce positive things that were taking place in the area. There were lots of fairs, marches and programs offered through the district's numerous churches. A very trusting and cooperative spirit was obvious among the police and the citizens who attended these meetings.

Little talk about specific crimes in the district took place at Englewood advisory committee meetings, which was a sharp contrast to some of the other prototypes. Rather, progress of the ambitious social projects that each subcommittee had undertaken was generally the focus of the meetings, and frequent reminders of the importance of community members becoming involved in at least one of the various subcommittees was a part of every gathering.

The activities that the subcommittees in Englewood were involved in were definitely non-crime, quality-of-life types of things. The police have joined with the citizens on numerous long-term civic and social problems/programs, with little

attention to addressing the crime conditions that threaten the lives of Englewood residents on a daily basis. Nonetheless, the district can point to numerous examples of solid accomplishment.

Notable projects or achievements of Englewood's advisory committee include a complete survey of the properties that comprise the district; the development of a proposal for a federal Enterprise Zone grant that, because Englewood was not selected, lives on as a local redevelopment project; the creation of several self-help workshops and first- and second-offenders programs, and the installation of an automated teller machine in the lobby of the police station to ensure that residents can have access to their funds without exposing themselves to the robbers who are known to stalk the currency exchanges in the district (for more information see Project Paper #10).

Some shorter-term issues that have been identified and addressed by the committee are the clean up of an abandoned Chicago Transit Authority garage that posed environmental hazards, the demolition of a shuttered YMCA at which a swimming pool loomed as a disaster for mischievous children, participation in the decision-making process about the renovation and reopening of area stations on the elevated transit line, and the lack of supermarkets in the Englewood community. The committee dealt with these issues by persisting with the various city agencies that would clean up the abandoned building sites, maintaining representation at Chicago Transit Authority hearings, and identifying and negotiating with a supermarket chain that would agree to set up a business in Englewood.

Two subcommittees have been somewhat slow in getting their activities underway. By the end of 1994, court advocacy had still not identified a case to track, perhaps due in part to the ongoing frail health of the chairperson. And, in spite of executing a door-to-door survey to gauge citizen interest in CAPS, the pastors

subcommittee had only held strategy-planning board meetings by year's end. General subcommittee meetings were expected to begin in 1995.

Englewood advisory committee bylaws were devised by the committee officers and heads of the subcommittees. After examining samples of other district's versions, the group composed its own rendering, and the bylaws were approved and returned by the end of 1994.

Marquette. Located about two and a half miles west and just south of Chicago's Loop, the Marquette District is composed of working-class blacks (36 percent) and Hispanics (59 percent). Among the prototypes, this district has the lowest percentage of high school graduates and the lowest income. Women head one of five households in Marquette, and only one third of the families in the district own homes, making it among the lowest of the prototypes in terms of home ownership. Also, it is ranked the second most transient of the five prototypes.

Advisory committee meetings have been held consistently on the first Thursday of each month in Marquette. While there is an open attendance policy specified in the proposed bylaws, only those members of the advisory committee and special guests are generally present. The committee is made up of beat representatives, or presidents as they are called, and heads of the subcommittees. At the time of this writing, there were also plans to include the student council presidents of the two high schools in the district.

Meetings were held in the auditorium of a local hospital, and in spite of the fact that there were several occasions when the room was not adequately set up before the meeting was to begin, the atmosphere was usually very comfortable but businesslike. Marquette's advisory committee meetings were generally friendly and somewhat relaxed. It was interesting to note, however, that when the meeting room was arranged in rows divided by a center aisle, African-American committee members generally sat on one side of the room, while the Hispanic members are on

the other. Similarly, the African-American neighborhood relations officer generally spoke to and for his ethnic group, as did a Hispanic officer for his or her group. A particularly obvious example of this was in late 1994 when a tragic fire had taken the lives of three African-American children the night before an advisory committee meeting. The commander, who is Hispanic, called on the black neighborhood relations officer to speak about the charitable efforts that were underway on behalf of the grieving family. The neighborhood relations officer came forward and unwittingly spoke only to the side of the room where African-Americans were seated. This ethnic schism originally became evident early in 1994 when one of the two groups held an exclusive meeting at which officers were elected. (The elections were nullified when the entire committee convened at the next regular monthly meeting.)

Advisory committee meetings in Marquette began with a reading of the previous month's minutes which, because no secretary had yet been elected, were recorded by the district's administrative manager or a neighborhood relations officer. On at least two occasions, significant contentious occurrences from the previous month's meeting were not mentioned in the minutes, but when there was a call for acceptance of the minutes, no objections were raised about the revisionist version. Crime maps and arrest data are generally distributed to committee members, and a variety of printed materials about upcoming events and city services was usually on hand for attendees to take at their discretion.

A special guest generally attended each meeting to present information on his or her area of expertise and how it affected CAPS. Guests have included the liquor license commissioner, who spoke of ways to vote a district dry; the chief of the Organized Crime Division, who gave an overview of his unit's function and who expressed his intention to find a viable role for it in community policing; a building commissioner who explained the lengthy legal process of tearing down abandoned

buildings; and an abandoned vehicle officer, who spoke about "towing capabilities" in Chicago. One of the district's aldermen also attended meetings occasionally.

The purpose of the advisory committee (or council, as this district calls it) as stated in its proposed bylaws was: a) to work with the district commander in identifying key community policing issues that will lead to a better quality of life in the district; b) set broad priorities for community safety, public service and crime reduction; c) verify problems and advise on solutions which could include partnerships with community, business and government agencies.

There were five subcommittees of Marquette's advisory committee, four of which were considered "ad hoc" and could be formed and disbanded as necessary by a vote to meet the overall purpose of the advisory committee and address the issues of community concern. The four ad hoc subcommittees: schools/ education, youth alternatives, public information and bylaws. Court advocacy was considered a standing subcommittee. The steering committee of the Marquette District remained an autonomous committee by its own desire, though at an advisory committee meeting at which the steering committee declared its intent to remain independent, it appeared that there were some factions of the advisory committee that preferred to see the two working in unison.

This district's meetings have undergone considerable change since they first began in August of 1993. The commander or the neighborhood relations staff generally ran the meetings, but since September 1994, the meetings were lead by beat presidents who served as guest moderators on a rotating basis. This arrangement was intended to provide the committee members with information on which to base the eventual election of an advisory committee chair.

Another meeting change that came about in autumn 1994 was that meetings, which had always gotten underway very late, were begun at precisely the time they

were slated. As a result, the number of attendees was generally much higher at the end of a meeting than it was at the start.

The most significant change in meeting proceedings, however, was that reports by the beat presidents were discontinued as a regular part of the meeting. Often these reports were a listing of problems on the beat that were more appropriate for airing at a beat meeting. The decision to terminate beat reports appeared to be unilateral, and by the end of 1994 several beat presidents expressed frustration at the restriction, saying that they found it helpful to compare and contrast problems and solutions.

Issues that have been identified by the committee include 911 (lack of response, lack of Spanish-speaking operators), drug dealing, gang intimidation/recruitment, excessive public drunkenness due to an inordinate amount of liquor stores/taverns in the district, and simmering after-school gang unrest at a public transit stop. The citizens' way of addressing these problems varied.

In terms of 911 dissatisfaction, at the time of this report, the process had not progressed beyond the complaining stage. Gang recruitment and drug dealing, however, had been addressed more aggressively and effectively by the police and the citizens: Citizens have acted as informants, police have carried out reverse sting operations, and citizens have recognized the importance of comparing and contrasting problems and solutions experienced by various beats. The committee also looked into voting precincts "dry" to impact public drunkenness and nuisance liquor stores. Finding that to be an extreme step that would negatively affect responsible premises, citizens learned that calling for hearings with the liquor license commissioner on individual businesses was an alternative. In spite of undergoing this effective problem-solving process, fear of retribution eventually made this an impractical option for many citizens in the Marquette District. (A

police officer was beaten up outside of a bar where he was making arrests based on information gleaned from a beat meeting.) To deal with the volatile after-school gang unrest, citizens met with the police, the alderman and Chicago Transit Authority representatives to reroute buses so that the rival gangs would not be coinciding (for more information, see Project Paper #10).

This prototype advisory committee got off to a very promising start. It was among the first to propose and investigate seeking not-for-profit status in order to be eligible for drug forfeiture assets, and it devised and executed a problem-solving workshop with CAPS training officers at the academy. By the end of 1994, however, non-profit status had not been granted (and the Chicago Police Department mandated that advisory committees could not seek 501(C)(3) status), and the problem-solving workshop was not looked upon favorably by the CAPS project managers, because they wanted to have more input in the problem solving workshop, which they perceived as hastily conceived and somewhat chaotic.

Creation of bylaws appears to be the only viable project in which the advisory committee was involved, and officers had yet to be elected (though their duties are clearly defined in the proposed bylaws distributed in December 1994). This is not to say that the various subcommittees did not meet or show signs of getting involved in some projects — there was talk of involvement with local schools and mention of development of activities for the district's youths. But advisory committee meetings had been so laden in beat reports and bylaws filibustering that accomplishments of the subcommittees were not at all clear to the evaluator, and perhaps many committee members. In addition, the court advocacy subcommittee had not really gotten underway by the end of 1994.

There is a cultural dynamic that distinguishes this district's committee from the other four prototypes. The two ethnic groups that have joined together on this committee had not previously worked with one another in this district, and the

melding of these two factions is viewed with a sense of understandable achievement. Nonetheless, there is a linguistic component that may prove to be a challenge. A significant amount of meeting discussion is carried out in Spanish, with translation provided by a member of the neighborhood relations staff. There has been at least one instance when an African-American committee member voiced concern that something she said was not translated accurately, based on the intensity of a Latino committee member's reaction to one of her statements.

Another challenge facing this committee is that there is little top-level guidance. The commander, who is relatively new to the district, rarely attends meetings, and when he does, he seems unfamiliar with many of the matters under discussion. Though the neighborhood relations staff is apparently very attentive and invested in both CAPS and the advisory committee, a compassionate and engaged commander could provide a stable, unifying force.

At the end of the second calendar year of the CAPS program, the Marquette advisory committee appeared to be at a crossroads. There was a realization by at least one citizen that the committee seemed to be "meeting just for the sake of meeting," while the beat presidents were beginning to exert their will in attempting to reinstate beat reports at the advisory committee meetings.

Austin. Austin lies at the western edge of Chicago, about five miles due west of the Loop. The community is largely made up of working and middle class African-Americans. With blacks composing 95 percent of the population, Austin has the second highest proportion of African Americans among the prototypes, and 29 percent of the families are headed by women. This district ties with another prototype for second place in terms of high school graduates and ranks third for income. Slightly more than one-third of the district's residents own homes, but more than half of the population has lived in the same residence for more than 10 years, making it the third most stable of the prototypes.

The Austin advisory committee has been meeting consistently on the last Monday of each month. This is the only advisory committee that holds its meetings during the day on a regular basis. Until autumn of 1994, the group met in the roll call room of the station, and as a result there was a constant bustle of activity in the room as officers walked through the room to get to the locker room or to another part of the station house. There was also a fluidity to the attendance, as police officers wandered in and out of the meeting. Meetings were moved to the auditorium of local branch library, and in this new and dignified setting, advisory committee meetings seemed to become more focused.

Austin's meetings often begin and end in prayer, and a goodly number of the community leaders are ministers. There is a grass-roots atmosphere, but there is also a greater presence of police officers at these meetings than at any of the other prototype meetings; beat officers and tactical team members are often called upon to provide details about recent successful missions or projects in the works.

The committee is composed of beat facilitators (one per beat), subcommittee chairs and community leaders. The Austin district's subcommittees are business, court advocacy, schools, youth, senior citizens, ministries and churches, and general enforcement. Subcommittee updates are not a regular part of the advisory committee meetings in this district, with the exception of court advocacy, and it is difficult to discern whether each or any of the subcommittees is involved in particular projects. Rather, in Austin, a lot of the programs or projects seem to be undertaken by individuals from across the district, with little regard for subcommittee affiliation. Those efforts include a positive alternatives program that focuses on youth empowerment, a program in which adults escort children to and from school to ensure their safe arrival, and the development of block grant proposals.

Some matters that are handled by committee in other districts are dealt with individually in Austin. For example, no apparent group effort took place in the composition of the bylaws. A set that was devised by a member of the neighborhood relations staff, based on Robert's Rules of Order, was submitted to the Chicago Police Department for approval in late 1994.

The court advocacy subcommittee in Austin was quite active and believed it had successfully affected the outcome of several cases that were of importance to the community. For example, there was a problem with the proliferation of recovery houses in the community. The committee traced the ownership to one entrepreneur, and his efforts have been seriously hampered by the continuous attentions of the court advocacy group. Another successful case the subcommittee pursued involved a resident of the YMCA who was dealing drugs from his room. He was eventually evicted, in large part because of the group's persistence.

Austin's commander is very involved with the advisory committee, and until the election of a chairman toward the end of 1994, he carefully orchestrated the meetings, including randomly calling on police officers to speak to the assembly, deciding how long certain subjects would be discussed, and determining exactly when and how advisory committee officers would be elected. In spite of the commander's apparent attention to detail, there were times, however, when his planning backfired. The most striking example was early in 1994, when the commander introduced an individual who was to give a presentation on a recovery homes project that he was launching in Austin. Members of the community had already learned of this individual's efforts, and the meeting tenor of the meeting quickly changed to rancor. (This individual became the focus of court advocacy efforts, as mentioned above.) At another meeting, considerable and lengthy angst ensued over the format and appearance of some beat meeting flyers. And, a recurring disruption at Austin's meetings was the result of the intolerance of a

community organizer to the CAPS evaluator's presence at advisory committee meetings.

The Austin commander did eventually relinquish control of the meetings when a civilian chairperson was elected at the end of 1994, however this action was so uncharacteristic and abrupt that the chairperson appeared stunned when he was suddenly controlling a meeting that he had begun as a participant.

The election of the advisory committee chairperson in Austin was a bit tenuous. After speaking to the committee about the need to finally come to closure on this, the commander asked for nominations. Neither of the two individuals that were nominated accepted, and the matter was reslated for the following month's meeting. There was some concern on the part of at least one of the nominees about involvement in community policing potentially having a negative effect on his business. A chair was nominated and elected at the next meeting. Nominations for other positions went a little more smoothly, however, at year's end a secretary had not yet been elected.

A distinguishing feature of the Austin advisory committee is that it is regarded by many to be a titular committee; the work is believed to be done by the facilitators, who meet with the commander in closed session on a biweekly basis. It is thought that the advisory committee is "a committee of special interests;" that is, the business subcommittee only cares about business, and so forth.

Regardless of this sentiment, two successful undertakings that fall under the aegis of the advisory committee are that of the Youthnet and the Empowerment Zone, for which the Austin area was selected to receive substantial grants.

Morgan Park. Morgan Park lies in the southwestern corner of Chicago, bounded by six suburbs. The district is composed of four distinct communities (Beverly, Morgan Park, Washington Heights and Mt. Greenwood), and portions of two others (Auburn Gresham and Roseland). Approximately 60 percent of the district's population is African American, while less than one percent is Hispanic. Nine of 10 residents have at least a high school diploma, and 78 percent report annual incomes of more than \$20,000, making it the most affluent of the CAPS prototype districts. Nearly 60 percent of this district's residents are more than 40 years old, and just more than one out of ten families are headed by women. Four out of five adult residents own homes in this district, and nearly 60 percent of the residents have lived in their homes for more than 10 years. Consequently, this district is one of the most residentially stable of the prototypes. Another significant demographic factor is that more police officers and city employees reside in this district than any other prototype and, possibly, any other district.

Advisory committee meetings have been held on an ongoing basis in Morgan Park since July 1993. Meetings in this district took place in the meeting room of a local bank. The sessions were guided by Roberts Rules of Order, and despite the somewhat formal nature of the meetings, there was an easygoing, friendly atmosphere. Attendance was taken at the start of each meeting, and though it is not specified in the bylaws, there is an understanding that consistent attendance is a requirement. Each month, a plethora of information was distributed to committee members, including crime maps, beat meeting attendance graphs and beat meeting logs.

Until December 1994, the committee was made up of subcommittee chairs and vice chairs, the district commander, neighborhood relations sergeant and officers, tactical lieutenant and officers, watch commanders, beat officers, aldermen from the four wards that fall within district boundaries, a representative from the

Mayor's Office of Inquiry and Information and other city agency employees as deemed necessary. A contingent of elected beat delegates was to join the group in 1995, though they were not to be afforded voting rights. The purpose for bringing on beat delegates was to enable persons who represent each beat to voice their concerns to the advisory committee and to take information from the meetings back to the beats.

Officers of the Morgan Park district advisory committee were chair, vice-chair, treasurer, secretary and communications coordinator. A good portion of the committee consisted of community leaders who had worked together for years on issues facing the district. In addition, a number of the committee members were acquainted with influential persons in city government and were adept at drawing attention to their concerns. A criminal courts judge who resides in the district attended advisory committee meetings on a fairly regular basis, and he proved to be a helpful resource for court advocacy subcommittee issues. Aldermen attended this district's advisory committee meetings more consistently than any other prototype, and they were often active participants. Each made funds available for a CAPS-related function aimed at celebrating the one year anniversary of the program and garnering new interest within the community. One alderman in particular appeared to consider herself a motivator and adjudicator; she was willing to dive into any discussion and offer advice or remonstrations.

The commander, who was promoted out of the district in early 1995, provided strong leadership to this committee. He was quite comfortable with the committee members, and he was obviously admired by them. The commander was a resident of the district and had undoubtedly worked with a good number of the individuals on the committee for many years, showing great deference to all. The commander seemed to be knowledgeable about most endeavors of the advisory committee and his officers, and he was reputed to be very accessible.

Morgan Park was among the first of the prototype advisory committees to appoint a civilian chair to run the meetings, though in the chair's absence, the commander would officiate. Other officers were not elected until after the guidelines mandated it. Elections were held at the district advisory committee's last meeting of 1994.

According to the bylaws, the Morgan Park district advisory committee's mission is to be "responsible for the implementation and ongoing success of the CAPS program. The Committee will establish a forum to discuss, create, review and critique ways to facilitate a collaborative citizen and police partnership in order to reduce crime and improve the quality of life within the 22nd District."

Eleven subcommittees comprised the advisory committee in Morgan Park: business, civic organizations, clergy, court watch, legislative, neighborhood watch, parks, schools, seniors, steering committee and youth. (Though the steering committee is listed in the bylaws as a subcommittee of the advisory committee, at the end of 1994, the steering committee continued to declare itself a separate committee with its own bylaws and officers.) For several months there was some concern about the fact that several subcommittees had chairs but no apparent membership. Since that time, subcommittee chairs have worked to increase the rolls of their respective committees. Subcommittees that have established membership are court advocacy, youth, neighborhood watch, steering and seniors, though the seniors subcommittee had no active involvement in any projects. Subcommittee chairs were also assigned to compose mission and goal statements.

The Morgan Park advisory committee grappled over bylaws for several months. Painstaking deliberation ensued over the structure of the body, voting rights, reporting responsibilities and the phrasing of the bylaws. Comment and/or opinion was sought at numerous successive meetings. In spite of the substantial

amount of time devoted to the bylaws, the committee did identify several key issues affecting the district, and they took appropriate and effective action to address them.

Among the core issues identified in this district were slow police response time on the main business strip, ineffectual sentencing for youth crimes, lack of beat meeting interest, the complex, user-unfriendly computer system purchased for crime analysis, and the lack of a lock-up in the Morgan Park District police station.

Because business owners were concerned that calling 911 was not yielding timely help in emergencies, an arrangement was struck with Ameritech to supply pagers for the beat officers assigned to the Western Avenue business district. Those proprietors who participated in the pager program reported decreased response time and a greater feeling of security. To address the youth sentencing issue, an alternative consequences program was set up with the state's attorney that sentences youth to community service in the district (for more information see Project Paper #10). Beat meeting interest and participation has been addressed by arranging rallies and launching an aggressive marketing campaign. Regarding the UNIX computer system problem, the committee demanded meetings with and explanations from the Data Systems department when they believed that the SUN computer system was unwieldy and time-consuming. A meeting was held at the Morgan Park police station at which Data Systems managers presented a demonstration of the system for advisory committee members, district personnel and an alderman. (According to those who attended, the awkward demonstration confirmed the worst fears of the advisory committee and the alderman about the system's usefulness.) The absence of a district lock-up and what to do about it was in the discussion stage at the time this report was prepared.

A particularly noteworthy aspect of the Morgan Park district advisory committee is its court advocacy subcommittee. Its roots predate the CAPS program, nonetheless, it has grown to include representation from the entire district (at least

one person per beat is a member of the subcommittee), and four people from the district generally attend cases that are being tracked. It is a highly organized, ongoing operation.

Rogers Park. Rogers Park is located 10 miles north of the Loop, on the northeast edge of Chicago. The district encompasses two Chicago communities, Rogers Park and West Ridge, and it includes the northern portion of Edgewater. Blacks make up 16 percent of the district's residents; 14 percent are Hispanic, 12 percent are Asian and 58 percent are white. Of all the prototypes, Rogers Park has the lowest proportion of black residents and the second highest proportion of Hispanics. Rogers Park is one of the most ethnically diverse communities within the city, with an estimated 47 cultures represented. With only 45 percent of the district's population being over the age of 40, Rogers Park residents are younger than all other prototype districts except the Marquette District. Nine of 10 area residents have at least a high school education, ranking it on a par with Morgan Park for the highest proportion of residents with high school diplomas. Though Rogers Park is the second most affluent prototype district with 62 percent of households reported an income of more than \$20,000 per year, only 30 percent of the residents live in buildings they own. This represents the lowest rate of home ownership of the five prototype districts.

This district's advisory committee was one of the first to get underway, and it has met consistently since April 1993. From the start, Rogers Park District Advisory Committee meetings were directed by a community member, however after her unexpected death, the then-district commander took over until a committee member, who also was a member of the Community Policing Task Force, criticized this "top down" arrangement several months later. A new civilian chair was appointed in 1994, and he appears to be a prudent, independent leader.

At the beginning of 1994, the leadership of the district changed due to the retirement of the original commander, and a younger, dynamic commander came in. Though there were never complaints from the advisory committee about the previous commander (many mentioned how they had learned to work with him), the new commander has an obvious attitude of cooperation and interest. The previous commander appeared to be meeting an obligation by interacting with the advisory committee; the current commander's enthusiasm and dedication is obvious and, in fact, he developed a mission statement at the beginning of his tenure that he distributed to beat representatives for distribution at beat meetings.

Advisory committee meetings took place on the third Thursday of each month, and the group generally alternated between daytime meetings, which were more convenient for a number of the business people who do not live in the district, and evening gatherings, which accommodated the work schedules of Rogers Park residents. Meetings were held in the auditorium/meeting room of the district police station.

This district advisory committee is quite large. Non-Chicago Police Department members included elected officials as well as representatives from city agencies (none of whom are permitted to vote), and citizens, defined in the bylaws as "general membership [that] represents the diversity of the community and is drawn from established community groups including, but not limited to, business, social services, education, religious, community associations/groups, police district sectors." Beat representatives were added to the advisory committee in September 1994, and at the end of that year, membership numbered 47, according to the membership list.

The Rogers Park district advisory committee's mission statement, as stated in the bylaws, is as follows: "The 24th District Advisory Committee represents the diversity of the community. The representatives are invested in and committed to

the success of CAPS. We promote partnership between the community and the police department. We proactively work together to improve public safety and the quality of life in the district." Subcommittees were also to write mission statements, but when this report was prepared, only one had submitted such a statement.

Officers of the advisory committee are chair, vice chair, recording secretary, corresponding secretary and treasurer. Subcommittees comprising the committee are beat, resources, court advocacy, youth/school, and business and finance; each subcommittee is headed by a chairperson. The beat subcommittee is quite active, as is the court advocacy subcommittee, which has achieved positive results in several court cases. The remaining groups appear to still be in the formative stages.

Advisory committee meetings in Rogers Park were generally amicable, and a good working relationship between the committee and the dedicated and effective Neighborhood Relations team was evident. Nonetheless, there was often an undercurrent of tension -- a sparring of various citizen blocs -- though the roots are not evident to the observer. This area has a history of community activism, and many of the key players were members of the advisory committee.

The level of sophistication and experience among the Rogers Park District Advisory Committee members, which has allowed them to accomplish several noteworthy things, has also served to complicate and draw out the decision-making process. Deliberations about seating arrangements at advisory committee meetings, which in this district are correlated with status, took several months. A written statement prohibiting local candidates from aligning themselves with the CAPS advisory committee also took several months to come to fruition because of jockeying about who should write and distribute it. Development of bylaws took three-quarters of a year, with the document finally being accepted in October 1994. By the end of that year, however, officers had yet to be elected.

Notable accomplishments of this advisory committee were a self-imposed day-long problem-solving retreat held to help the committee gain form and direction; civilian training sessions devised and executed by the beat subcommittee to help prepare the community to take an active role in the CAPS program, and a mock trial conceived and executed by the court advocacy subcommittee that involved an actual judge and court personnel that educated the community about court proceedings.

Key issues facing the district that were identified by the committee included panhandling, public drinking and an increase in robberies in a commercial district, and numerous unsavory buildings and delinquent landlords. To address the problem of disorder in the business district, community members formed a positive loitering program called "Beat Feet," in which citizens formed volunteer foot patrols with coordination with beat and foot patrol officers. Unsafe buildings have been cleaned up and boarded up by citizen groups, while court cases involving negligent landlords have been steadfastly tracked and attended by the court advocacy subcommittee (for more information, see Project Paper #10).

A challenge that continues to face this advisory committee is that it consists mainly of whites, which is at the very least an inaccurate representation of the diversity of the community as well as a lost opportunity to involve all segments of the community in this empowerment enterprise.

CONCLUSIONS

Because the purpose of the district advisory committee, as stated by the Chicago Police Department-issued guidelines, is broad, each of the prototype advisory committees can be considered successful at some level. Each of the five districts has an active, impassioned group that meets on a regular basis with their respective commanders and/or neighborhood relations staff to help identify key

issues, set priorities and work on solutions. Each committee has some impressive achievements to be proud of, though each faces some challenges in terms of the effectiveness of some of their subcommittees. For two districts, getting two disparate community segments to work together on an ongoing basis can be deemed a preliminary success. For two others, the sustained grass-roots effort represents an initial success. Another has maintained an ongoing effort despite potentially divisive political agendas. These types of triumphs are appropriate for the beginning stages of a large program like this, however as the CAPS program ages, judging the success of the prototype advisory committees shall justifiably become more accomplishment-based.

The advisory committees that seem to be experiencing the most success have citizens who have come to a consensus about the most important issues facing the district, in addition to enjoying strong commander leadership in terms of committee involvement, understanding the committee's mission and directing that mission in a proactive manner.

Advisory committees that are experiencing less success have citizens with divided opinions about issues that need to be addressed, and they have a less positive relationship with the police as well as less clear police/citizen roles.