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3. Evaluation results of one agency’s implementation

4. Implications and considerations for integration
Evidence-Based Model

• Research results: More focused responses are more effective

• Effective policing strategies:
  — Standard model
  — Problem-oriented policing
  — Disorder policing
  — Hot Spots policing
  — Intelligence-led policing
  — Predictive policing
  — CompStat
Model Assumptions

1. **Problem solving** is an effective process for implementing crime reduction strategies at all levels

2. **Crime analysis** is useful and should guide police in implementing crime reduction strategies

3. **Systematic accountability** is imperative for organizational change and consistency
Key Concepts

- Problems are distinguished by complexity
- Stratifies responsibility of problem solving
- Analysis is stratified by purpose
- Institutionalized into the day-to-day operations
- Creates standards
- Increases minimum expectations
- Encourages creativity
- Structure and process for accountability
- Systematic communication and documentation
Types of Problems
Level of Complexity

Important to distinguish among different types of activity so they can be addressed appropriately

Immediate problems: Calls for service
- Crime
- Significant incidents

Short-term problems: Repeat incidents
- Patterns

Long-term problems: Locations
- Areas
- Offenders
- Victims
- Property
- Compound problems
Stratified Model

Level of Responsibility

Rank

Chief

Officer

Level of Problem Complexity

Immediate Problems

Short-Term Problems

Long-Term Problems

Systematic Accountability

Systematic Problem Solving
Stratification of Accountability

Temporal Nature of Accountability Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Semi-annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporal Nature of the Problem
Current Accountability Practice

Documentation and preparation only for the meeting

Accountability Meetings
Level of Preparation
Integration of Accountability

Documentation /evaluation ongoing and is part of everyday practice.
Hotspot: Residential Burglaries in Beat 31

Number of Incidents: 7
Date Range: October 22, 2010 – November 3, 2010
Time Range: All incidents occurred during the day (between 0900 and 1620) during the week
Target: Single family homes
Property Taken: TVs, computers, cash jewelry
General Location: North of Becker Rd and East of Darwin Rd; Beat 31
MO: Forced entry in all incidents, either front or rear slider/cabana door

Known Burglary Offenders:

John Smith
210 S. Mable St.
W/M, DOB: 01/15/90, 20 yrs

Mike Jones
420 E. Midland Rd.
W/M, DOB: 05/16/92, 18 yrs

Jake Evans
519 E. Rail Av.
B/M, DOB 09/01/84, 26 yrs

Map # | Case # | Date | Time | Day | Address | Entry | Property Taken |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
1 | 09-10591 | 10/22/10 | 1000-1215 | Fri | 4600 S Tacture Ter | Front door-forced | N/A Ransacked |
2 | 09-10593 | 10/22/10 | 1000-1530 | Fri | 4401 S Lander Ln | Front door-forced | TV; Jewelry |
3 | 09-10798 | 10/28/10 | 0945-1245 | Thu | 451 W Treebird Dr | Rear screen cut | Jewelry, Cash |
4 | 09-10825 | 10/28/10 | 1340-1620 | Thu | 337 W Gale Dr | Rear slider-pry | TV, Computer |
5 | 09-10829 | 10/29/10 | 0930-1500 | Fri | 200 S Ridgecrest Dr | Cabana door-pry | N/A |
6 | 09-10874 | 11/02/10 | 0900-1400 | Tue | 4815 W Boxing Ctr | Rear slider-pry | Cash |
7 | 09-10875 | 11/02/10 | 1000-1200 | Tue | 109 W Chadwick Ctr | Front door-forced | N/A Ransacked |

All data presented in this bulletin (e.g., incidents, names, and addresses) are sample data and do not represent actual crime, people, or places.
Pattern Responses

• Research shows traditional responses most effective in the short-term

• Limited number of responses to choose from

• Responses selected vary by:
  — Priorities of the agency
  — Pattern characteristics
  — Resources
Pattern Responses

Responses when and where pattern is occurring
  • Directed patrol and field contacts
  • Surveillance and bait operations

Responses during business/waking hours
  • Investigation of patterns
  • Contacting potential victims
  • Contacting general public
Pattern Response and Accountability
Centered in Patrol Function

Command Staff

Patrol District/Division Commander

Patrol Shift Supervisor

Patrol
Criminal investigations
Crime Prevention
Public information

Pattern
Pattern Process

Daily
- Sergeants ensure crime reports are completed correctly and in a timely manner

Weekly
- Patrol lieutenant oversees immediate and coordinated responses
- Documentation to track progress and results

Monthly
- Patrol captain uses documentation to report successes to command staff and answer questions about appropriate responses
- Monthly statistics evaluate effectiveness

Analysts identify patterns
Monthly Evaluation of Patterns

- **District 2 Street Robbery Last Yr**
- **District 2 Street Robbery Current Yr**
- **Linear (District 2 Street Robbery Last Yr)**
- **Linear (District 2 Street Robbery Current Yr)**

- Last Yr Total: 107
- Current Yr Total: 81
- 24% Decrease

Graph showing monthly evaluation of patterns with bars and linear trends.
Monthly Evaluation of Patterns
Stratified Model Summary
Responsibility and Accountability

Immediate: Calls for Service and Crime
Patrol Officers and Detectives

Short-term: Repeat Incidents and Patterns
Sergeants and Lieutenants

Long-term: Problems
Captains

Long-term: Goals
Command Staff

Immediate: Calls for Service and Crime
Patrol Officers and Detectives

Short-term: Repeat Incidents and Patterns
Sergeants and Lieutenants

Long-term: Problems
Captains

Long-term: Goals
Command Staff

Accountability
Implementation of Stratified Model

- Developed in Port St. Lucie, FL Police Department over last 7 years
- IACP Law Enforcement/Research Award 2008
- COPS Guidebook for implementation
- State of Maryland implementation initiative (3 years)
- Other agencies implementing/advocating the model
Port St. Lucie, Florida

- 163,089 people
- 110 square miles
- 2,206 crimes per 100,000 persons (2010)
- 206 police officers
- Research partnership since 2004
- Practice-based approach
Evaluation Methods and Data

• Evaluation period: 2004 – 2010
• Participation in and observation of operational practices and organizational culture
• Personnel interviews and focus groups
• Content analysis of meeting minutes and departmental policies
• Content analysis of agency data systems, crime analysis products, and technology development
• Examination of crime data
Phase I: Initial Implementation

• 2004-2006
• Conception of the Stratified Model
• Building a foundation for implementation
  – Expanding the knowledge of problem solving
  – Improving data
  – Improving the agency’s crime analysis capacity
  – Building a technological communication mechanism
Phase II: Intermediate Implementation

• 2006-2008
• Transitional period
• New practices implemented on a small scale
• Key successes
• Pushback against new practices
Phase III: Implementation

- 2008 – 2010
- Strong leadership
- Significant advances in accountability processes
- Stratified Model became part of the agency’s culture
Impact Theft from Auto by Phase

Phase I
Phase II
Phase III
Results

• Leadership clear factor in full implementation
• Actionable crime analysis imperative
• Mechanisms for communication important

• Perceptions of personnel:
  – Problem solving not pushed to a specialized unit
  – Greater impact on crime by the focused and prioritized nature of crime reduction responses
  – More and consistent accountability
Challenges

• Data and technology changes were slow because purpose not obvious
• Pushback from command level even when success is apparent
• One or two key “change agents” not enough to change the agency
Implications

• Implementation lead by chief and command staff
• Organizational flexibility and cultural readiness
• Problem solving process effective for crime reduction efforts at all levels
• Crime analysis capacity
• System of accountability to ensure problem solving occurs consistently and effectively
• Practice-based approach
Considerations for Implementation

- Data quality and accessibility
- Crime analysis capacity and relevance
- Training of personnel
- Tailor model to individual organization
- Systematic process development
- Resources: Agencies and Guidebooks
Resources
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