

Smart Suite:
Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Community of Practice



Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation
Adopting CE3 in Mt. Pleasant
Joshua Kirven

May 2022

Smart Suite: Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Community of Practice

Introduction to the Smart Suite

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Smart Suite refers to a series of BJA grant programs that follow a data-driven approach to support the effective implementation of evidence-based practices to reduce crime, enhance public safety, improve the delivery of justice, and support community revitalization. The Smart Suite includes a training and technical assistance (TTA) component to support BJA grantees. A key element of the Smart Suite TTA is the [Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Academy](#). The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University leads this TTA program working with BJA and partners from the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence at George Mason University, Justice Research and Statistics Association, the Center for Public Safety Initiatives at the Rochester Institute of Technology, and subject matter experts drawn from both the community of practice and research.

Michigan Justice Statistics Center

The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University, through the Michigan Justice Statistics Center, serves as the Statistical Analysis Center (MI-SAC) for the State of Michigan. The mission of the Center is to advance knowledge about crime and justice issues in the state of Michigan while also informing policy and practice. The Center works in partnership with the Michigan State Police, Michigan's State Administering Agency (SAA), as well as with law enforcement and criminal justice agencies serving the citizens of Michigan. For further information see: <http://cj.msu.edu/programs/michigan-justice-statistics-center/>

This case study was developed by the researchers and practitioners working in one of the Smart Suite grant programs. The case study is one of a series produced by the Michigan Justice Statistics Center.

About the Author

The following Author is a graduate of the Smart Suite Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Academy. The case study was submitted through a selective mini-grant process offered to Fellows Academy graduates.

Joshua Kirven is President of KirvKorp Impact Solutions. Dr. Kirven served as a community practitioner consultant for the Cleveland-Mt. Pleasant Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation project.



kirvkorp@hotmail.com

Smart Suite: Researcher-Practitioner Fellows Community of Practice

This project was supported by Grant No. 2016-MU-BX-K001 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice

Case Study:

Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation *Adopting CE3 in Mt. Pleasant*

Cleveland Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation: Adopting CE3 in Mt. Pleasant

In 2013, the City of Cleveland (fiscal agent) working with Cleveland's *Stand Together Against Crime Every Day* (STANCE) received a Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Grant (BCJI) from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) focused on the Mt. Pleasant community – an historic African American neighborhood on the southside of Cleveland (~1.9 sq miles). The Mt. Pleasant BCJI effort aimed to improve community safety, support residents and other stakeholders in the design and implementation of effective approaches to address crime, and to advance neighborhood revitalization through cross-sector community-based partnerships.

At the time, Mt. Pleasant's population was ~17,000, a reduction of almost half of the population from its boom as a middle-class, African American cultural center. During this period, the Mt. Pleasant community had experienced a number of challenges including concentrated poverty (30% poverty rate, an 18% unemployment rate), significant vacant housing (~20), and low levels of educational attainment (Flannery & Singer, 2014). In addition to socioeconomic challenges, eleven identified gangs operated within the target area and rates of violent crime and homicides in Mt. Pleasant surpassed rates for the rest of the city. From 2008 to 2012 Cleveland's 4th Police District (serving Mt. Pleasant and several other neighborhoods on the southside of the city) generated 27% of all priority one calls for service, accounted for 36% of the homicides, 36% of the shootings, and 35% of the city's aggravated robberies. These levels of criminal activity in the Mt. Pleasant area crime are not only limited to adult populations; 30% of the juvenile warrants issued, 35% of all aggravated murders, 42% of all felony murder charges and 35% of murder charges for juvenile offenders were generated from the 4th District.

The Cleveland BCJI effort developed a community-based strategy incorporating law enforcement, prevention, and reentry. To address the various challenges of the Mt. Pleasant community, innovative and evidence-based crime reduction programs were implemented through a partnership with the STANCE program, Cleveland Division of Police's 4th District (4th District), the community, and academic partners.

Planning Process & Methods

The Cleveland BCJI planning and implementation team was comprised of a diverse group of partners including: members of the Cleveland business community, court personnel (local, state, and federal), faith-leaders, personnel from various government agencies (local, state, and federal), university faculty and research staff, Cleveland law enforcement (including tactical team and district command participation), and resident representatives from the target area. The cross-sector planning team membership can be found in the appendices.

Beginning in October 2013, the initiative held over 30 planning meetings, with the full planning team or in smaller work-group configurations, to discuss process and strategy, emergent data, community composition and overlapping or parallel projects, and potential interventions. Facilitated by the STANCE and the City of Cleveland (fiscal agent), and co-chaired by Dr. Joshua Kirven, a Cleveland State University professor and community practitioner) and Debra Lewis-Curlee, a target-area resident and community advocate. The cross-sector planning team followed a three-prong process of 1) crime and data analysis, 2) community input and exploration of law enforcement and 3) complementary interventions to develop the implementation plan.

Selection of the final target area, Zone 4-6 in the 4th District, relied on a synthesis of the statistical analysis, integration of the community assessment findings, and qualitative information from CDP Commanders Gary Gingell (V-GRIP), Deon McCaulley (4th District), and demographic research compiled by Case Western Reserve University (research partner). Early in our planning process interviews with community champions and neighborhood insiders, including select 4th District Zone and command, indicated that the neighborhood felt as though it was, “oversurveyed and underserved”. The assessment plan was then revised to capitalize supplementary data such as population surveys, targeted assessments overlapping with the identified areas, housing surveys, brute-force media analysis, and school performance data (Bartholomew, Singer, Gonzalez, & Walker, 2013).

After a thorough review of these sources, focus groups were conducted with adults and youth in the target area by both the Case Western University Begun Center and Community HEALTH Action. While the Community HEALTH Action assessment focused on the viability of Mt. Pleasant Community Zone and needed interventions in the community, the focus groups

conducted by Dr. Kirven and the Begun Center specifically explored neighborhood perceptions, crime perceptions, and residents' vision for the future.

In the spirit of community involvement, the Cleveland BCJI team attempted to incorporate the voices of community members throughout the planning process. The community assessment process included key informant interviews and targeted focus groups to avoid an over-reliance on the residents and advocates on the planning team. Some modifications based on community feedback were small but profound. For example property crimes and several nuisance crimes were only preliminarily explored, but were important enough to incorporate into the ongoing research plan at the request of residents. Resident feedback also significantly shaped the selection of the intervention strategies.

Beyond these examples of direct feedback, portions of the draft plan were presented in several community forums including the Commander's monthly community meetings, the Mt. Pleasant Community Zone block clubs (informal information sharing in small-group meetings and via list-serv), and with a meeting of local pastors held to discuss the role of the faith-based community in violence prevention initiatives.

Viewing community involvement as an on-going process, the Community Engagement, Education, and Empowerment (CE3) intervention hosted a community forum on December 6, 2014 providing residents with the opportunity to begin the process of refining the intervention activities, visioning for a more engaged resident base, identifying residents interested in leadership and committee participation, and determining a process for selecting revitalization projects. Discussions from the meeting were translated into outcomes for the intervention.

Key Findings

The community assessment found two predominant themes bridging crime data and law enforcement intelligence with community data and focus group conversations. Foremost, residents were concerned about personal safety related to not only issues of community violence and property crimes, but lower-priority nuisance concerns, such as loitering as well as abandoned property concerns on home values. Also, the ability to attract new residents was a challenge as many houses were taken over by gangs or inhabited by local wildlife and interfered with a sense of community.

Safety. Adults and youth uniformly identified the need for more policing by means of enforcing current laws as well as responding to calls for service. A resident stated, "We had

everything in place, but it's not being enforced." These concerns about low-level offenses blended safety concerns with code enforcement, property maintenance (abandoned or vacant houses), and truancy. One resident remarked:

Between 1:30 and 4 o'clock in the morning, there were a bunch of kids outside my house fighting and cursing for two hours... I called, [but the officer said] 'you see them shooting a gun?' I got to wait until someone get killed for [the police] to come out?

The blended themes are important and indicate the perception that police are general problem solvers and should be working in cooperation with other city divisions to improve safety and meet residents' needs. Adult residents, though, were well informed about advocacy processes and in the focus group shared information with one another about local meetings like the 4th District Commander's monthly meeting, City Council procedures and how to contact local representatives, and how to report abandoned housing concerns both to re-secure the building and advocate for demolition.

Particularly among female participants (both adults and youth) loitering of young adult men, around the library or in front of corner markets, was particularly threatening. Though there was some sense that the participants "knew how to handle it" they all expressed frustration that their passage through the community was often impeded. The youth talked about a need for increased parks or recreational areas where youth could congregate freely, but through discussion realized that these resources are available and under-utilized. Adults engaged in a more nuanced conversation, balancing the right of citizens to interact with peers on the streets (some efforts to create community spaces had been recently supported by the City Councilman) with the purposeless gathering of youth that impedes adult access to businesses and community resources.

Residents noted that the behaviors of officers as well as the prioritization of calls contribute to the safety concerns. They shared stories of police identifying a specific resident as the source of calls for service despite that person's desire for anonymity, especially in problematic situations close to their homes. Residents were also concerned that low priority calls, nuisance or suspicious activity, were not responded to swiftly. While they acknowledged that this was partially a result of how calls are prioritized by dispatch, they indicated that the lax

response to these issues may have contributed to higher levels of crime throughout the neighborhood.

Positive Neighborhood Characteristics and Outreach Efforts. Youth interviewed tended to have discrete boundaries for the Mt. Pleasant community (usually falling along routes to home, school, and other important locations), while adult residents tended to be more concerned with the relationships formed and neighborhood associations. Mt. Pleasant, in both the focus groups and neighborhood meetings,, was noted for strong community identification – residents had maintained block clubs, shared gardens, and other grass-roots level affiliations focused on improving neighborhood identity, addressing (or at least being concerned with) “citizen hardening” (a term used to note the efforts of citizens to improve their security through home repairs, e.g. installation of locks, outside lights, and other simple improvements), and encouraging re-investment in the community. Residents were able to identify many positive aspects of their community, including: strong support from local non-profits, access to transportation, beautiful historic homes and landmarks, robust faith based organizations, and respectful relationships between youth and older adults (historic memory for the community).

Adult residents expressed a strong sense of self-reliance, indicating interest in measures ordinary citizens can take to improve their safety including basic home maintenance, adopting a suspicious attitude toward unknown individuals in specific situations, and acknowledging that it was their responsibility to be proactive about neighborhood concerns. Youth also echoed this self-reliant attitude.

As noted early, adults possess high levels of knowledge about advocacy processes and the will to engage elected and appointed leaders, throughout city and county government, which has been identified as a community strength to be leveraged. Youth in the focus group were similarly empowered. The neighborhood has a history of robust participation in programs like Police-Citizen Academies, community forums sponsored by police, and engagement in worship services.

Four-Pronged Outreach Approach

In order to address community violence, promote safety, and foster community efficacy, the Cleveland BCJI team established four complementary intervention strategies with implementation beginning February 1, 2015.

Strategic Enforcement. CDP's intelligence-led policing model, V-GRIP, incorporated data on gun crimes, assaults, and burglaries, which was then geo-mapped with current gang areas of concern and other intelligence to designate the targeted area of operation. V-GRIP was a form of saturation enforcement. It focused on fugitives and parolee populations (those more likely to commit crime), and incorporated knock & talks to gather intelligence without singling out individuals (reduces fear of retaliation/snitching).

V-GRIP activities, especially its saturation enforcement elements, shifted within the target area (Zone 4-6) based on current police intelligence and moved to adjacent areas (Zones 4-3 and 4-7) if it was determined that crime had shifted out of the immediate target area. Finally, within this strategy and to better prepare police for interactions with youth in the community, a portion of the grant was used to create a training module piloted in the target district. Policing the Teen Brain, was developed by nationally renowned youth development researchers Dr. Lisa Thureau (Strategies for Youth: Connecting Cops with Kids) and Dr. Mark Singer (Case Western Reserve University). This tailored, two-day training initiative included topics such as: understanding how the teen brain processes information; recognizing and responding to traumatized youth; asserting authority over teens; cultural factors affecting teen behaviors; education law for school resource officers; juvenile justice for law enforcement; community demographics and implications (training agenda available, materials in development).

Community-Police Collaboration. Still emphasizing policing and promoting safety, the Community-Police Collaboration aimed to demonstrate police responsiveness to residents. While strategic enforcement had been proven to make communities safer, especially from violent crime, we learned through our assessment process that residents were not always aware that strategic enforcement had occurred (law abiding home owners steer clear of "known" trouble areas, media only reports "major" busts so targeted traffic enforcements can go unnoticed, etc.). The issues that troubled residents in the target area most related to abandoned properties and other quality of life issues.

This strategy followed a community-oriented policing (COPs) approach. COP attempted to develop a shared agenda between police and citizens to address cooperatively determined problems and safety concerns (Mirsky, 2009). The hallmarks of this approach, which blends innovative (police/citizen academies) and traditional (foot patrol, bike patrols, community events

promoting relationship building) methods, are an open and constructive relationship between police and citizens, and proactive policing postures (Mirsky, 2009).

The 4th District already employed some COP best-practices including a citizen police academy, monthly open meetings with the Commander, email listserv and a social media presence. However, the Community-Police Collaboration broadened these practices and tailored them specifically to resident concerns – piloting a focus on abandoned properties in the target area, freeing officers from directed patrols to walk the neighborhood, instituting a bike-patrol, and allowing the Commander and zone-officers to tour the neighborhood spending time hearing/responding to resident concerns. This strategy also allowed for some officer time to be tasked to interfacing and collaborating with several identified agencies working to address abandoned property issues (e.g. boarding, mowing, demolition, sale to residents, and rehabilitating).

Community Engagement, Education and Empowerment (CE3). Turning to the ability of residents to connect with one another, as well as with the police, the Community Engagement, Education, and Empowerment (CE3) strategy worked to establish a network of interconnected programs that was created, managed and implemented by residents (transitioning over time) to address needs as they arose in the targeted area (Kirven & Jacinto, 2017; 2021).

The Cleveland BCJI team adopted a community efficacy framework of the “willingness of local residents to intervene for the common good” based on trust and relationship among residents (Singer, 2016). This framework dictated that strategies centered on the continued empowerment of youth and adult residents finding a role for existing grass-roots neighborhood collectives, and leveraging the pride residents feel for the community – both in its historic roots as well as the new and multi-generational relationships formed there. Innovative in the way the program elements are woven together, CE3 incorporated intergenerational programming and neighborhood pride to help establish positive social norms, emphasizing safety, neighborhood advocacy, and engagement reflecting on elements of trauma informed community building (Kirven & Jacinto, 2017; 2021).

CE3 capitalized on the existing system of block clubs in the Mt. Pleasant neighborhood, established by Mt. Pleasant Community Zone (MPCZ), to draw together residents to discuss community concerns and mobilize for change. During this planning period, MPCZ, one of several CDCs (community development corporations) operating in the area, was officially

disbanded. Residents were concerned that the infrastructure they worked so diligently to establish would wither without the guidance and purpose provided by MPCZ. Working with Dr. Kirven, Cleveland's BCJI team proposed to revamp the block clubs to include both home owners and renters, and welcome the participation of youth. Models like this had a deep history in neighborhood preservation and revitalization of urban neighborhoods, with active block clubs working to acquire resources, maintain local areas, and build systems of informal social control.

Given the aging demographic of the area, CE3 was designed to give seniors a safe outlet to participate in community events. Moreover, the intergenerational components (e.g. small volunteer projects, oral history workshops) provided venues for old and young to learn from one another. A positive activity that signified this intent was the Community Voices Forum.

Other community engagement programming included:

- Block clubs
- Neighborhood attachment, history & coalition building
- Youth/adult training
- Barbershop mentoring program
- Police-Youth Olympic Fun Day
- Community Conference

Community Deliverables achieved included:

- BCJI newsletter and website;
- Distribution of outreach materials to local businesses (laundry mats, barbershops, salons)
- Creation and branding of a social media presence on twitter and Facebook;
- An annual meeting on the BCJI progress, as well as public meetings at least once a quarter with law enforcement and the resident body.

Most scheduled meetings were open to the public. Churches distributed project updates with their weekly bulletins.

Neighborhood Revitalization. Finally, within the community efficacy frame, the initiative connected emotional empowerment with the resources needed to create tangible change in the target area. The key element of the neighborhood revitalization strategy was a series of small grants available to block clubs or community groups to undertake identified projects. This program was modeled on the East End Community Services grant project in Dayton, OH. The average grant was estimated to be \$5,000.00 (approximately 10 per year) and could be used to

maintain, expand, or create community gardens, beautification efforts for existing public spaces, and mural or community art installations. The grant process required that the group complete an application (including cost estimates, goals, and timelines). A panel of neighborhood residents, working with the CE3 team, selected successful projects. All work was contracted and paid through the City of Cleveland and its approved vendors, freeing residents from the need to account for larger grant expenditures.

The use of small grants followed research findings in other communities. Specifically, Molitor, Rossi, Branton, and Field (2011) found when tracking small community grants disbursed from funds recouped from tobacco taxes, participation in neighborhood events increased measures of social capital – neighborhood relationships and trust in others. These factors are also key constructs in informal social control and collective efficacy.

Finally, money from BCJI was set aside for a Signature Community-Based Initiative designed and implemented by residents. Initial suggestions included convening a neighborhood summit or holding a series of community meetings with the police around current issues. In summary, the Cleveland BCJI team engaged in substantial problem analysis, strategic planning, community and multi-sector collaboration. Unfortunately, during the planning period, Cleveland experienced a high profile shooting which resulted in the death of an adolescent by a CDP officer. Combined with the release of the Department of Justice's use of deadly force report, there was a strong sense that police-community relations needed to be improved and positive change needed to happen (Kirven, 2020).

Other Trends

Despite concerns about safety – major crimes, gun violence, property crimes, and lower-priority examples of structural disorganization – residents repeatedly expressed support for the efforts of the local police and security forces (primarily school based). This support though, was not absent from calls for increased police-citizen interactions and relationship building. In media coverage and interviews, residents, organizations, and the police themselves, indicated an appetite for increased communication, positive stories, higher visibility, and closer coordination of goals.

In September 2014, the Cleveland BCJI planning and implementation team moved a draft implementation plan to the STANCE Executive Committee. Positioning this into the STANCE executive structure served to embed the BCJI initiative within an established crime prevention

collaboration in order to leverage future funding and capitalize on existing relationships among other programs and organizations with similar goals serving the target area (e.g. Peacemakers Alliance and Third Federal Educational Initiatives). The STANCE Executive Committee had a prior track record and was spearheading the process of community empowerment and sustainability prior to BCJI funding. Police Commanders' knowledge of the community was instrumental in forming a deeper understanding of crime trends and movement within the considered areas to determine the feasibility of supporting both tactical and community police interventions in the area.

Community Engagement Roles

The Cleveland BCJI team worked not only to record residents' input, but to provide a meaningful avenue to strengthen residents' communication with law enforcement, local government, and their business community. Community engagement was imbued within the proposed strategies (described earlier), however three important community roles are worth mentioning:

Community Council – CE3 identified and empowered representatives of the community who were selected by fellow residents to serve in an advisory role through the creation of a BCJI Community Council. The Council created and established committees of residents to participate with the planning and action steps throughout the implementation phase. Members of the BCJI Community Council attended district command's safety meetings (monthly) and local block clubs in soliciting pertinent information and feedback.

Focus on Youth – Also, CE3 will to involve youth (10-17) and young adults (18-30) as active community partners. Proposed new initiatives developed for youth were the No CAP Initiative, a Youth Citizen Police Academy and an Employment 2 Empowerment Readiness Program (through CE3). The intent of youth engagement was both to record their voice and perspective as to how these initiatives can positively impact them, as well as strengthen their engagement. The primary goal was to dispel the notion that “*youth are the problem*” and work to challenge that assumption within the community in combatting the stigma that many of the youth face. The Cleveland 4th District BCJI had determined that it was important for adults (community members, businesses, government, and police) to validate the role of youth as part of the solution, not the problem. The youth were expected to collaborate from beginning-to-end to design projects as part of the neighborhood revitalization mini-grant process, and also had a

role in determining the Signature Community-Based Initiative. In addition, youth were encouraged to “adopt” existing neighborhood efforts to build inter-generational programs (especially with the younger group).

Residents in Research – While still meeting the high empirical standards, the Cleveland BCJI team aimed to provide residents with a foundational knowledge of research, following the core activities of a community based participatory research philosophy. Residents, through CE3, worked with researchers to select tools (from a series of validated measures), determined the research processes, collected data, and interpreted results. This allowed residents to be better consumers of the assessments they are presented (e.g. housing stock surveys and development plans), as well as providing the block-club structure with the means and knowledge of conducting independent research once the project ends.

The Cleveland BCJI team was involved and continued to focus on residents input throughout the development, implementation, and evaluation of each strategy presented above. Further, residents had a planned role and feedback mechanism as small adjustments were made to the strategies (in the event that crime shifts, or emergent topics surfaced). It was the intent of the Cleveland 4th District BCJI to use the implementation period to bring residents, both adults and youth, together through a process of engagement, collaboration, empowerment, engagement, revitalization and self-sustainability.

Some key takeaways from the research of this model worth mentioning were:

- The uncontrollable and chronic nature of community violence may result in unique patterns of coping.
- It is necessary to identify positive developmental assets that are particularly protective for youth exposed to high levels of violence
- It is important for prevention and intervention programs not only to enhance coping skills, but to understand how future expectations and coping influence each other.
- Establishing interventions that work to counter low expectations and perceptions of control for the future among adolescents who are exposed to community violence may reduce delinquent behaviors in violence-exposed youth.
- Adopting a multifaceted approach that includes both prevention and intervention strategies is needed that focuses on poverty, crime, police culture and oversight, and implicit bias.

- Advocating for police training, transparency, authentic engagement and inclusion of key informants should be part of community policing

Conclusion

The small target area of Mt. Pleasant was geographically dense and impacted by crime, delinquency and abandoned houses, yet was rich in history, pride, commitment and connectivity. With this key variable being unveiled, conducting the planned activities written in the scope of work shifted from focusing solely on V-GRIP and policing crime hot spots to more establishing a coalition where law enforcement and community members worked collectively, from the inside out, with the community taking the lead. As the original planning process changed course and with the flexibility of BCJI research team, engagement and implemented activities became more intentional and community driven in complimenting intelligence-led policing activities. Also, the public health approach to violence prevention was embraced to ensure that efforts to address youth violence 1) were firmly grounded in science, 2) were attentive to community perceptions and conditions, and 3) were designed to address the behavioral, social, and environmental factors that cause violence.

In summation, the most practical and responsible path of BCJI was through a willingness and flexibility to engage and collaborate with all Mt. Pleasant stakeholders and learning from our mutual efforts to compliment, support, and build on each other's work for the betterment of the Mt. Pleasant community. It is important in this type of work that all voices in communities are heard, felt and included if we are to transform safe, healthy communities.

References

Bartholomew, J., Singer, M., Gonzalez, A., & Walker, M. (2013). Police assisted referrals: Empowering law enforcement to be first social responders. In *Law Enforcement Executive Forum* (Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 38-49).

Flannery, D. J., & Singer, M. I. (2014). The Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education at Case Western Reserve University. *Research on Social Work Practice, 25*(2), 278-285.

Kirven, J., & Jacinto, G. (2021). Community Healing and Reconciliation: A Reassessment. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*: Oxford Press.

Kirven, J. (2020). Racial profiling and policing black communities. *Encyclopedia of social work*: Oxford Press.

Kirven, J., & Jacinto, G. (2017). Community Healing and Reconciliation. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*: Oxford Press.

Mirsky, I. (2009). Community oriented policing. *Internet Journal of Criminology, 14*.

Molitor, F., Rossi, M., Branton, L., & Field, J. (2011). Increasing social capital and personal efficacy through small-scale community events. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(6), 749-754.

Singer, M. (2016). *Police Assisted Referral (PAR) study results*. Cleveland: The Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education at Case Western Reserve University.

Appendices:

**Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation
*Adopting CE3 in Mt. Pleasant***

Appendix A

Community Voices of Success

Date _____

The intent of this initial engagement outreach forum was to hear the voices and concerns of the community. The findings and responses from residents that live in the community will more accurately reflect what change and solutions they want to see. The format of the forum was to break into four (4) focus groups. Three of the groups were designated by the 3 wards (4-3, 4-6, 4-7) that make up the target area of the Mt. Pleasant community. The final fourth group was specifically designated from 12-17 whom live in the target area. Over **75 people were in attendance** marking a positive turnout of interest.

The following findings were recorded from the forum.

QUESTION 1: “Tell me the assets and strengths in your community”, the following responses were given:

Zone 4-3 (12 participants)	Zone 4-6 (29 participants)	Zone-4-7 (15 participants)	Youth (21 participants)
Resident involvement	Sense of history	We are the change	People care about us
Committed community leaders	Large population of home owners	Good public transportation	All of us are not bad and want to have a future

QUESTION 2: “Tell me the concerns or areas of improvement you would like to see in the community”, the following responses were given:

Zone 4-3 (12 participants)	Zone 4-6 (29 participants)	Zone-4-7 (15 participants)	Youth (21 participants)
Lack of communication between neighbors	Children feel excluded from community	No supervision or protection for youth	Too many guns ** When asked, all youth stated they seen a gun in the past month. ** Four youth stated they seen a gun in the past week.
Poor parenting skills and being bad example	Kids raising kids	Better communication between adults and youth	A safe place to hangout; hanging out is not a crime

QUESTION 3: “Tell me your views, concerns and thoughts about the police in your community”, the following responses were given:

Zone 4-3 (12 participants)	Zone 4-6 (29 participants)	Zone-4-7 (15 participants)	Youth (21 participants)
They don't care	They need to live in the community	They want to shoot our black boys	They want to shoot us. I might be next.
It's terrible how they treat us; not all, but some	They are out of control	Police accountability	They need to get to know us.

QUESTION 4: “What realistic solutions and action strategies do you propose in improving police engagement and community-police relations, the following responses were given:

Zone 4-3 (12 participants)	Zone 4-6 (29 participants)	Zone-4-7 (15 participants)	Youth (21 participants)
Understanding the community and where they work	Officers understanding the community	Recruits go into agencies and participate in community programs and activities	Youth Police Academy
Training/Diversity Training (Race & Economics)	Having representatives from all parts of community talk at trainings and at districts	Retraining older officers	Mini-stations

QUESTION 5: “What realistic solutions and action strategies do you propose in empowering and revitalizing the community”, the following responses were given:

Zone 4-3 (12 participants)	Zone 4-6 (29 participants)	Zone-4-7 (15 participants)	Youth (21 participants)
Resident involvement	Block clubs talking to one another and working together	Become active if we want change	Leave us alone when we're not causing trouble and just hanging out
Residents take care of their properties	Parents be accountable to your kids	Pastors working together	Letting us know that you care

**BCJI Implementation Plan
Benchmark Objectives (Tentative):**

Target Goals
1. Increase positive visibility and engagement of police officers through community engagement in targeted community
2. Provide training on bias, culture, disenfranchisement and how it relates to community
3. Collaborative activities between police and community in building partnership of safety an empowerment
4. Continue Citizen Police Academy and start a Youth Police Academy and Leadership Institute

After completion of 90 minute breakout focus groups with police officers in each group, a luncheon was provided where each facilitator did a tell back of each group's responses. Participants left forum upbeat, optimistic towards positive efforts to improve community and police relations.

BCJI Implementation Team consists of: **Dr. Joshua Kirven**, Coordinator and **Debra Lewis-Curlee**, Specialist and long-time resident of Mt. Pleasant community.

Appendix B

Our SPACE³
Mt. Pleasant Small Grants Program
Proposal Format & Elements

Organization Name: _____

Address: Cleveland, Ohio 44XXX _____

Contact Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Project Title: Police & Youth Community Fun Day _____

- I. Project Abstract** – The Project Abstract provides an overview of the project (goals, objectives, proposed activities and amount of funding being requested). The proposed project should relate to at least **one** of the Our SPACE³ Program Areas goals. Identify which goal(s) the proposal will address. (See page 2 Small Grants Program)

This event falls under the Quadrant of Community and Safety in the Target Area of Community Engagement, Education & Empowerment (CE³).

II. Project Narrative

Be certain the proposal addresses the following elements. (Add additional pages as needed and label each in the proposal.)

- a. Include a description of the sponsoring group(s), agency and its qualifications to administer the project. If using a separate fiscal agency, please include a brief description in this section.

Problem Statement: Explain the problem you will impact with your program. How does the problem impact the neighborhood? What consequences if the problem is not resolved?

Project Goals & Objectives

Goals:

This event will help bridge the gap between police and youth by having them interact in a positive setting reducing tensions, fears and concerns leading to less crime, delinquency and citations towards youth.

Objectives:

Project Description and Activities

Target Population (number to be served, brief description, who will be involved?)

Location of Project

III. Project Timeline(s);

a. Planning:

IV. Project Budget

Designated expenses:

V. Other/Appendix

Benchmark Outcomes:

Information Collected:

- a. Attendance sheets of events
 - b. Surveys
 - c. Youth, police and community at-large get to know each other.
 - d. Create a signed proclamation—“**Community Safety Agreement**” that promotes ongoing dialogue, respect, communications, responsibility and safety for the entire community.
-
- a. Include precise information on the role of all project personnel. Attach job descriptions.
 - b. Describe all partners who will collaborate on the project, their role and responsibilities.
 - c. A signed letter from collaborative partner(s) agreeing to roles and responsibilities should be included in the Appendix.
 - d. Current Annual Report, if applicable.
 - e. List of Board Members with their business affiliations.
 - f. Recent list of major contributors.
 - g. Prior year audited Financial Statements, if applicable.
 - h. Copy of determination letter granting IRS 501 (c) (3) tax-exempt status.
 - i. Letter of Collaboration from partnering individuals, agencies and organizations



