

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

**Document Title: Investigations in the Community Policing
Context**

Author(s): Mary Ann Wycoff

Document No.: 189568

Date Received: August 6, 2001

Award Number: 96-IJ-CX-0081

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those
of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect
the official position or policies of the U.S.
Department of Justice.**

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT

**A Report Submitted to the National Institute of Justice
by the
Police Executive Research Forum**

ABSTRACT

As the philosophy of community policing becomes broadly embraced by both municipal police departments and sheriffs offices, police leaders are increasingly focused on ways of guiding *all* police operations with this approach. Traditionally, investigations has been considered one of the most difficult of police operations to change and, as a result, is often the last to be addressed in departments that are otherwise committed to community policing as both a service and a management philosophy.

The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) with funding from the National Institute of Justice conducted a national survey, telephone interviews and, finally, site visits, to examine the types of changes that agencies that have adopted community policing are making to the structure and function of investigations and that integrate investigations with other police services provided to communities or neighborhoods. Structural, procedural and functional changes are documented for a national sample and are described in detail for seven agencies.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT

Executive Summary

Submitted to the
National Institute of Justice
by the
Police Executive Research Forum
July 2001
Grant #96-IJ-CX-0081

Authors: Mary Ann Wycoff and Colleen Cosgrove

With the Assistance of:

Roderick Beard
Stacie Dunbar
Anne Grant
Craig Huneycutt
Don Jones
George Kelling

Timothy Oettmeier
Alexandra Olson
Donald Quire
Melissa Reuland
Tara O'Connor Shelley
Wesley Skogan

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Police Executive Research Forum.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT¹

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mary Ann Wycoff and Colleen A. Cosgrove²

As with many current issues in community policing, concerns about the investigative function and detectives are not new, and not simply generated by the adoption of the community policing philosophy. Rather, they represent old issues brought back into focus by current rethinking about police service delivery.

Questions about the nature and structure of the investigative function constitute a central concern for administrators who are implementing community policing. The concerns are both substantive and political. Substantive questions address what the investigative function should encompass, who should perform it, and its relationship to citizens and other police personnel. Political questions pertain to redefining the roles for detectives and other personnel who may be involved in the investigative process. Detectives are commonly a highly organized workgroup-often perceived as conservative, insular and elitist and subsequently, administrators who attempt to change investigators' roles often expect to encounter substantial resistance to change.

¹This project was supported by grant #96-IJ-CX-0081 awarded to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) by the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Police Executive Research Forum.

²We wish to thank the following individuals who served as our advisory board and provided vital assistance in innumerable ways: George Kelling, professor, Rutgers University; Wesley Skogan, professor, Northwestern University; Timothy Oettmeier, assistant chief, Houston, Texas Police Department; Donald Quire, major (Ret.), St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department; Craig Honeycutt, captain, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, Police Department; Roderick Beard, lieutenant, Portland, Oregon Police Bureau; Alexandra Olson, detective, Madison, Wisconsin Police Department and Don Jones, lieutenant, Sacramento County, California Sheriffs Office. We also thank Lois Felson Mock, our NIJ grant monitor, who played both supportive and substantive roles in the project's design and implementation.

When agencies consider new models of police service, questions pertaining to the role and function of detectives or investigators always arise. Because there are no easy answers, managers of change are looking for guidance on how the investigative function should be performed in a community policing context, and how to manage the change in a way that will not cause organizational turmoil.

Mike Masterson,³ previously a detective bureau manager, has written:

While there has been a considerable amount of literature written on community policing, most of it has overlooked the important goal of getting everyone in an organization working together to create safer living environments and improved service to our citizens. For the most part, emphasis on the investigative functions and its contribution to those goals has been largely ignored. Has it been done deliberately to avoid the resistance of a deeply ingrained culture and the intolerance to change by vociferous, fiercely independent, and highly talented individuals?

Detective recalcitrance notwithstanding, there is a larger question of what the investigative function should be in a community policing context. Does the largely reactive role that detectives play traditionally represent the full potential of the investigative function? Or is a proactive approach, in which police anticipate crimes and work to prevent them or to intercept the criminals, more appropriate? Then there are coactive operations in which police, citizens and other agencies work together to prevent crime and control criminogenic conditions in the community. Is this a better model? It is evident that a primarily reactive investigative function supports only one element of community policing. What might the investigative function look like if it were designed to support the full range of community policing efforts?

The research reported here was designed to address these issues and fill an important gap in our knowledge about community policing implementation. This project considered three main questions:

1. How are community policing agencies structuring the investigative function?
2. How are they integrating the investigative function with other police services?

³Masterson, Michael F. (1995). *From Polarization to Partnership: Realigning the Investigative Function to Serve Neighborhood Needs*. Unpublished manuscript.

3. How have they managed/are they managing the change process within this function?

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was divided into two parts. The first portion consisted of a national mail survey of municipal police departments and sheriffs offices in all jurisdictions with populations of more than 50,000 *and* 100 or more sworn officers.⁴ These selection criteria were based on the assumption that agencies with these characteristics would be large enough to have an investigative unit consisting of more than a handful of staff. Surveys were sent to 483 municipal departments and 405 were completed, producing a response rate of 83.9 percent. Completed surveys were received from 197 sheriffs offices, a response rate of 64.6 percent. (See footnote 4.)

The survey collected descriptive information about whether departments had implemented community policing, the organization of their investigative function, and the ways in which the investigative organizational structure or function may have been modified to accommodate a community policing approach.

Sixty-eight (12.4%) of the departments reported having implemented community policing *and* instituting some major changes in the definition or structure of the investigative function. To aid in the selection of sites for more in-depth study, this grouping of 68 departments was reduced to 41 by restricting eligibility to agencies that had at least 30 investigators, and that had implemented major changes at least two years prior to the survey. The number of investigators was set at 30 because the research team believed that

⁴While it was easy to identify sheriffs offices that met the initial selection criteria, PERF anticipated that several of these agencies had neither patrol nor investigative functions. Rather, in some jurisdictions, the responsibilities of the sheriffs office are limited to certain court functions, maintaining the jail and executing warrants. Unfortunately, we were not able to identify these agencies in advance. Therefore, in the survey packets sent to the sheriffs, we included postcards asking the respondents to return the postcards if their agencies did not have patrol and/or investigation functions. Questionnaires were sent to 355 sheriffs offices, and 26 agencies returned postcards indicating that they were ineligible for the survey. Twenty-four other agencies were excluded as we obtained additional information. This reduced the sample population to 305 agencies, of which 197 (64.6%) completed the

a smaller number would limit the types of innovations that would be possible, thus restricting what might be learned from site visits. The two year time-frame helped ensure that the agencies had sufficient experience with changes in the investigative function to understand the process' strengths, weaknesses and results.

The research team read each of the forty-one questionnaires and narrowed the candidates for site visits to fifteen. Telephone interviews were conducted with persons at each of these sites and a final selection was made of seven sites that represented innovation and advanced implementation. Site visit protocols were developed and sites were assigned to teams of two (a researcher in combination with a practitioner). Site visits typically lasted two days. Each site visit resulted in a written report that was drafted by one team member and then reviewed and revised by the other. The individual site reports are available as Appendix C of the project's technical report.

SURVEY FINDINGS

The survey produced a rich body of data that is available through NIJ's data archives. For the purposes of this project, however, the survey was conducted in order to identify the sites to be visited. The findings reported here are limited to those variables used for site identification.

Community policing implementation. Almost all (95.8%) of the responding municipal agencies reported that they have implemented or are implementing at least some aspects of community policing, compared with 80.7 percent of the sheriffs offices.

Extent of implementation. There was substantial variation in the extent to which survey agencies have implemented community policing, and the differences between the municipal agencies and sheriffs offices were marked. Among municipal police agencies that indicated they had implemented community policing, 52.3 percent reported that they were "three-quarters of the way" or "most objectives have been

survey. Although this response rate is high, we would likely have obtained a higher rate if we had been able to identify eligible agencies with greater accuracy.

accomplished," compared with 33.9 percent of the corresponding sheriff respondents. Of agencies engaged in the community policing process, sheriffs offices were more likely still to be in the planning or early implementation phases. Specifically, as Table 1 indicates, 8.5 percent of the municipal agencies reported that they were in the beginning stages, compared with 21.4 percent of the sheriffs offices.

Table 1 About Here

The nature of the community policing approaches is outlined in Table 2. Among the departments that identify themselves as community policing agencies, 67.8 percent say that community policing is "a philosophy that guides most department activities." Municipal departments are more likely to report that the entire agency is guided by the philosophy (71.6%) than are sheriffs offices (58.2%). Municipal departments are slightly more likely to report that all personnel are expected to engage in community policing (80.2%) than are sheriffs offices (74.7%). And municipal departments are slightly more likely to report that investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing (55.2%) than are sheriffs offices (49.4%).

Table 2 About Here

Redefining the role of detectives/ investigators. Table 3 illustrates that, among agencies that have implemented community policing, 14.4 percent indicated that they had made some major changes and 20.1 percent reported that they had made some initial changes in terms of redefining the role of detectives/investigators. Thus, more than a third of these agencies (34.5%) had implemented changes. Among sheriffs offices, 21.3 percent reported making either initial changes (13.8%) or major changes (7.5%). A small proportion of the municipal agencies (7%) and sheriffs offices (6.3%) stated that they were actively planning the redefinition and restructuring. Approximately 17 percent (17.3%) of the municipal agencies and 23.9 percent of sheriffs offices reported that this matter was currently under consideration.

About one out of four municipal agencies and sheriffs offices indicated that their organizations had not yet considered redefining the role of detectives/investigators.

Table 3 About Here

It is interesting to note that comparable proportions of the municipal agencies and sheriffs offices (17.8% and 18.9%, respectively) agreed with the statement, "We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goals."

Table 4 reports the current forms of organization of the investigative function in municipal and sheriffs agencies that identify themselves as engaged in community policing. While sheriffs offices are less likely to report having made major changes in the structure or function of investigations, Table 4 indicates that sheriffs offices are more likely to report that:

- investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus/divisions;
- certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and investigators are assigned specific geographic areas;
- most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents; and
- detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area.

Table 4 About Here

As we shall see in the next section, these arrangements are among those that characterize agencies that report having made major changes in the structure or function of investigations. It is likely that the necessity for sheriffs offices to cover large geographical areas has resulted in the structuring of investigations in ways supportive of community policing even before community policing was adopted as an

operational philosophy. As a result, sheriffs offices may have had less need to make major changes in order to support community policing.

MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND SITE SELECTION

After reading the questionnaires for each of the forty-one eligible agencies⁵; the research team discussed and categorized various characteristics of the investigative function that could be identified from the survey. The most prominent difference among these forty-one had to do with the physical structure of investigations as reported in Figure 1. Investigators were either physically centralized or physically decentralized. Other important differences included area vs. city-wide responsibility and bifurcated vs. unified chain of command. In a bifurcated chain of command, physically decentralized investigators report through an investigative chain of command while patrol officers report through a patrol chain of command. In a unified chain of command, everyone assigned to the geographic area reports through the area commander. Four models or "clusters of changes," representing these three factors were identified among the forty-one sites. A fourth factor, identified as generalization vs. specialization of investigative assignments, is represented in the sites selected for visits but is not explicit in the four models set forth in Figure 1--a decision made solely to simplify the models. It is important to remember as one reads this report that these models may not apply to the entire site. In some jurisdictions, particularly those with large investigative units, various combinations of centralization/decentralization, geographic assignment and chain of command may be used. These types of organizational structures are "mixed models." For example, the Mesa, Arizona Police Department divides investigators into four divisions, only one of which has physically decentralized detectives. The other detectives are physically centralized although many are responsible for specific

⁵Having more than 30 investigators and having made changes at least two years prior to the survey.

geographic areas. So, the four models are best viewed as heuristic devices rather than as literal descriptors of the current world of investigations.

Figure 1 About Here

The research team then rated the forty-one sites in terms of their "interest" and innovativeness and narrowed the list of site visit candidates to fifteen agencies. Telephone interviews were conducted with persons at each of these sites and a final selection was made of seven sites (Figure 1) that were considered to best represent innovation and advanced implementation.

OBSERVATIONS FROM SITE VISITS

The site visits confirmed that departments have adopted a variety of innovative methods for integrating investigative and patrol operations. The visits expanded the researchers' knowledge about the kinds of changes that have been made. Beyond the structural and procedural changes represented in the four models, additional procedural changes were observed and a group of functional changes also was identified. The visits provided considerable insight into the organizational, administrative and logistical problems confronted by detectives.

The changes are discussed below by type of change. Examples are provided from selected sites of changes that may have occurred in other sites, as well.

Structural Changes

Physical Decentralization. The primary structural change involved the physical decentralization of investigators from a central location (typically, police headquarters) to area or district stations where investigators and patrol officers had closer contact with each other and the opportunity to have closer and more frequent contacts with citizens. Physical decentralization was always paired with responsibility for crimes in a geographically specified area of the city or county. With the exception of the Arapahoe County,

Colorado Sheriffs Office, all of the visited sites made use of physically decentralized investigators; all of the sites except Arapahoe county retained some centralized investigators who handled special types of crimes.

Chain of Command. Among the six sites in which at least some investigators have been physically decentralized, there are three in which the decentralized investigators report through an investigative chain of command (Mesa, Arizona; Sacramento, California and Spokane County, Washington) and three in which decentralized investigators report through an area command (Arlington, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts and San Diego, California).

Procedural Changes or Developments

Many sites had not only made structural changes, but had also modified procedures; they were performing investigations differently. These changes or modifications were grouped into seven categories: 1) area responsibility, 2) generalization, 3) teamwork, 4) prioritization of cases, 5) involvement of citizen volunteers in investigations, 6) interagency linkages, and 7) technology. The following sections highlight examples of these changes, as observed during site visits, without including all of the sites that may use these procedures.

Area Responsibility/Geographic Assignment. In all seven of the sites, at least some investigators have responsibility for investigating crimes in a specific geographic area. In most cases these investigators are physically decentralized. In the Arapahoe County, Colorado Sheriffs Office, investigators are physically centralized but have responsibility for specific geographic areas and are in close contact with patrol officers who work those areas.

Generalization. Some detectives, whether physically centralized or decentralized, are crime generalists who investigate a wide variety of crimes that occur in their areas of responsibility. In all cases, investigators with area responsibility handle property crimes but in many sites (e.g., Arapahoe County,

Colorado; Arlington, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts; Mesa, Arizona; San Diego, California), assaults and street robberies are also assigned to area investigators. In one district in San Diego, the street drug unit, too, is assigned to the area commander.

Proponents of generalization contend that criminals tend not to specialize in specific crime types and therefore detectives should not. In the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office, all investigators are generalists. This agency has invested substantial time and financial resources in investigator training, with an emphasis on cross-training for different types of crimes. The investigative personnel interviewed report that the emphasis on generalization coupled with geographic assignments has been very successful. Arapahoe County detectives believe that fewer criminals are "slipping through the cracks" now that detectives are focusing on area crime patterns rather than crime types.

Teamwork (Officers, Citizens, and Agencies). In some agencies, detectives work in either formal or informal teams with officers, citizens, and/or other agencies. In Arlington, Boston, San Diego and Arapahoe County, for example, the teams are formal. Officers and detectives on the "team" may or may not have the same supervisor (i.e., participants may report through different chains of command), but detectives know "their" patrol officer and officers know "their" detective. The arrangement in Arlington is interesting in that there is an area team sergeant and an investigative sergeant. Both sergeants report to the area commander. The area sergeant directs activities for the whole team; the investigative sergeant functions more as a coach, trainer, facilitator, and subject matter specialist for the investigators. The patrol sergeant and the detective sergeant both attend community meetings. In Spokane County, Washington informal groups of detectives and citizen volunteers have become teams because they work in the same small neighborhood office.

Case Prioritization. The Spokane County Sheriffs Office was the only site visited where detectives are changing their system for prioritizing cases. Property detectives are assigned to neighborhood storefront

offices staffed and managed by neighborhood citizen volunteers. The detectives' goal is to become community-oriented and problem-oriented rather than case-driven. Rather than prioritizing cases based solely on solvability factors, they are attempting to identify neighborhood problems and to give priority to cases related to the underlying problems and community concerns. These detectives read all property crime incident reports for their area and prioritize their own cases. In this way, the detectives develop a more in-depth understanding of crime patterns and trends than if the sergeant screened and prioritized cases. Additionally, in some instances, citizen associates in the storefronts also read the cases and provide second opinions about the problem-relevance of particular complaints.

In this jurisdiction, centralized homicide, sex crime and drug/gang detectives also prioritize their own cases. This approach allows for a problem orientation that is difficult to achieve when cases are assigned according to solvability factors alone, or by a supervisor who may not be familiar with a neighborhood's particular problems and crime patterns. It must be noted that when the self-assignment system began, property crime detectives tended to take on too many cases and become overloaded—a tendency well-known to officers assigned to neighborhood stations or storefronts. As they became more familiar with this procedure, however, they were better able to manage their caseload.

Citizen Volunteer Involvement in Investigations. In both Spokane County and San Diego, citizen volunteers assist detectives in investigations. For example, these community members may lift prints from stolen/abandoned automobiles that previously may not have been processed. They may also photograph graffiti or make follow-up calls to victims to inform them of the status of their cases or to seek additional information. Additionally, they may attend community meetings and work on citizen surveys. In Spokane County, citizen volunteers assist some detectives in establishing investigative priorities.

Interagency Linkages. Interagency drug task forces and other collaborative efforts designed to address drug problems are now common in many departments, including the visited sites. However, certain sites have applied this strategy to other crimes as well. The Mesa Police Department provides an excellent example. Two detectives from this department were instrumental in researching and obtaining city council and grant funding for what became the Center Against Family Violence (CAFV). This unit, operated by the police department, provides an aggressive, proactive, multipronged approach to handling cases involving physical and sexual abuse, domestic violence and, in some instances, elder abuse. Several detectives with expertise in domestic violence investigations and related matters are assigned to this unit. These detectives work closely with civilian victim services personnel who provide immediate, on-site intervention and long-term counseling. As part of this program, the detectives have established strong links with both the city and county prosecutors' offices, private therapeutic programs, area doctors and hospitals, and the state Child Protective Services. Anecdotal and interview data gathered during the site visit suggest that CAFV provides a systematic, humane and effective method for handling these very difficult situations. The cooperative efforts between the police department and the prosecutors have enabled these agencies to develop strong cases resulting in high conviction rates and, in certain cases, substantial prison sentences.

Technology. All of the departments visited are on the brink of major technological advances, many of which were funded by grants from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) of the U.S. Department of Justice. When the new systems are in place, detectives and officers in recipient agencies will have crime analysis capabilities that were previously not available to cash-strapped crime analysis units. In San Diego, for example, all officers and detectives will have laptop computers that facilitate automated field reporting. They will also have access to geographic information systems (GIS) capabilities that will allow them to conduct their own analyses of the data for their areas. Additionally, many of the problems often

associated with decentralization-being outside the information/communications loop, having to file reports at headquarters, not having access to crime analysis data-will be solved. Detectives will be able to retrieve the information they need through the computer, and e-mail will provide for fast and easy communication. Other departments are upgrading their computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems and reconciling and integrating disparate manual and automated databases. The Mesa Police Department is acquiring Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) software for tracking evidence as it is processed through the crime laboratory, the identification unit, and into evidence storage. Arlington, Spokane County and Arapahoe County are also introducing highly sophisticated data entry and retrieval systems.

In the interim, some agencies have made more effective use of currently available technology. In Arapahoe County, voice mail, pagers and cell phones have greatly enhanced communication both between officers and detectives, and among detectives. Both groups indicated that they were more likely to share the "small" pieces of information when they could simply leave a message, rather than having to search out the person they needed to contact.

Functional Changes and Developments

In contrast to procedural developments--detectives conducting investigations in a new or different manner--the term "functional developments" refers to tasks that detectives may not have undertaken in the past. The site visits revealed a number of functional changes that were to support community policing. These can be grouped into two often interrelated areas--1) problem solving and 2) community outreach and crime prevention--which, together, represent the core elements of community policing. It should be emphasized that these functional areas may not be new to a police department or a sheriffs office, but they may be new to detectives. Moreover, in some instances, detectives may have assumed responsibilities that had previously been assigned to another specialized unit. While a number of the visited sites have implemented one of

these functional changes, three sites were particularly noteworthy: the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office, the Mesa Police Department, and the Spokane County Sheriffs Office.

Problem Solving. In most of the visited sites, the primary problem-solving function is assigned to the patrol division, with detectives expected to assist. In the Spokane County Sheriffs Office, however, detectives have been given the primary organizational responsibility for problem solving. Detectives were assigned this function because the administration believed detectives had the most flexible schedules and the most complete and readily accessible information (all the case reports) about crime problems in any given area. Some property detectives have been decentralized to neighborhood storefronts and are attempting to select cases for investigation using priorities that reflect the problems of greatest concern to the neighborhoods in which they are working.

While detectives in the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office do not have the primary organizational responsibility for problem solving, the department has developed an innovative approach called the "45 Day Plan" to promote problem solving by investigators. Detectives are encouraged to submit plans to conduct research, investigate an unsolved case, or focus on an identified problem. If the plan is approved by the captain, the detective is freed from the regular caseload for up to 45 days to implement the plan. Other detectives assigned to that geographic area will assume the problem solver's caseload for the requisite period of time.

Community Outreach and Crime Prevention. Many police departments and sheriffs offices throughout the country have detectives actively engaged in community outreach, often through attendance at community meetings. The sites visited were no exception. One dramatic example of outreach is the pairing of detectives with citizens in Spokane County's storefront offices, as discussed previously.

Additionally, detectives in several of the project sites are participating in a broad range of crime prevention activities. For example, detectives in the Mesa Police Department have assumed responsibility for a number of "crime free" projects. As part of the Crime Free Housing program, the detectives organize property owners/managers or residents in multi-unit housing and educate them about their roles in preventing crime and quality-of-life problems. Additionally, the detectives provide program participants with training in the principles of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). Interviewees stated that this project's success is reflected in the 70 to 80 percent reduction in calls for service from certain properties. The "crime free" approach provided the framework for the Crime Free Mini-Storage program, designed to address problems of burglary and the existence of drug labs in mini-warehouse (rental storage) units. This program was designed by detectives and signaled the introduction of community-oriented policing principles into the Criminal Investigation Division. Again, detectives trained owners and managers of mini-storage facilities in CPTED principles, and in the first year of the program, burglaries dropped 86 percent. This approach is also reflected in the department's Crime Free Mini-Warehouse program and the Crime Free Hotel/Motel program.

The Arapahoe County Home Check program is another example of a crime prevention program that focuses on interventions other than arrest, and provides an alternative to placing young offenders in the juvenile justice system. Specifically, the detective deputies have received court authorization to implement the Home Check program for juvenile offenders who are "at risk," including youths who are suspects in active cases, have active warrants, or are identified as repeat runaways, habitually truant, or "wanna be" gang associates. Detectives make "cold calls" during the evening to the youths' homes to discuss their problems with them and their families. The detectives may provide referrals to counseling or other social service agencies, or may require that the youth perform community service or make restitution. The detectives also identify the associates of the at-risk youths and visit them as well, informing them that they are known to the

sheriffs office and warning them of the probable consequences of their behavior. This program is designed as a form of "caring intervention," and interviewees indicated that many parents and targeted youths have been grateful for the contacts and the referrals. Arapahoe County Social Services, County Probation and the district attorney's office participate with the sheriffs office in this collaborative effort. The Sheriffs Office views the program as a successful prevention and intervention effort that has resulted in reductions in juvenile criminal activity and the number of juveniles arrested.

Community education efforts are often part of crime prevention and community outreach programs. An Arapahoe County detective assigned to a specific neighborhood launched an initiative that combined all of these elements. This neighborhood had school-related traffic problems, and the residents formed a council to lobby for greater assistance from local authorities. The detective attended a council meeting and taught participants the SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment) model of problem solving. Following this training, citizens used this model to address their traffic problem, with some technical assistance from the sheriffs office. The detective explained, "We help people change their habits so that the [sheriffs office] is part of the solution, not *the* solution. We teach the citizens to do for themselves." Mesa's various Crime Free projects are another example of community education used as a central element of the problem-solving process.

Training and Cross-training. This third new "function" has developed in some of the sites to support the problem solving and crime prevention functions. In decentralized settings in which detectives have specific geographic assignments, an informal training process often evolves whereby detectives and patrol officers train each other. Specifically, detectives can educate or train officers in the types of information they should be collecting to assist in various types of cases, while officers can educate detectives about the assortment of crime problems, suspects, and victims in their area. An interesting variation on this theme is

provided by Spokane County, where a neighborhood prosecutor and a neighborhood detective share the same office and exchange mutually beneficial information about evidence retrieval, evidentiary standards and case-building techniques.

As another example, when the detectives in Arapahoe County became generalists in 1992, they were initially cross-trained, and property investigators were then paired with persons investigators for on-the-job training. Moreover, all investigators receive training in community policing and problem solving.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In considering these conclusions, it is important to bear in mind that this study was descriptive in nature and did not attempt to conduct an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of any of the changes observed. Instead, the objective was to describe innovative approaches to the structural, procedural and functional aspects of the investigative process that appeared to be effective in the seven sites included in the research.

Structural Changes

Physical Decentralization. There are things lost and things gained with physical decentralization. Physical decentralization enhances the advantages of the procedural change of geographic assignment by promoting a sense of "turf" and proprietorship. It provides the opportunity for in-depth knowledge of crime patterns, local suspects, and "good people" in the community who may assist in the investigative process. It also contributes to a sense of shared ownership on the part of patrol officers and detectives, which should increase levels of cooperation and facilitate team-building. Detectives, like patrol officers, may feel greater satisfaction in seeing their efforts contribute to the welfare of an area with which they identify.

But these advantages are not cost-free. Physically decentralized detectives may feel isolated at an outpost, separated from the mainstream of detective work, especially if they perceive their prior success as

dependent on close interpersonal communication with other detectives. They almost surely will lose some ease of within-group communication. There is good reason to expect that this loss of peer information will be offset by other sources of information, including a detective's increased familiarity with an area, its problems, its residents, its resources, and its trouble-makers. The detective will also benefit from increased contact with patrol officers, community members and other service providers in the geographic area of responsibility. These new contacts do not happen overnight, however, and until they are established, the newly decentralized detectives will probably feel that their resources are diminished.

Decentralized detectives may also need to drive long distances to deliver routine reports to a central office, attend meetings or line-ups, and obtain crime analysis data that would be available if they were at headquarters. Some believe that they are out of the "information loop," or "out of sight, out of mind." Interviewees indicated that they may miss out on training opportunities, including the opportunity to learn from more experienced colleagues. They may miss opportunities to participate in larger scale investigations that may aid their individual investigations and professional development. And they fear that citizens will suffer if detectives lose or fail to see information about perpetrators who range across district boundaries

Computer technology plays a major role in the loss/gain equation for decentralization, and will play an even greater role in the near future. Almost all of the departments visited are in the process of installing powerful information and communication systems that will give all personnel-patrol officers and detectives, centralized or decentralized-astonishingly greater and faster access to information and to each other. Most detectives have not even begun to envision the potential of these systems. Information about career criminals involved in a variety of criminal activities and operating across district boundaries will not be lost. It will become easier for certain analysts to be assigned the responsibility of analyzing these criminals' movements. Until such systems are in place, however, decentralized detectives who must invest substantial travel time to

do their work may feel they are wasting time they could be spending on cases, or may fear they are losing valuable information. Are these costs offset by ready access to patrol officers and local information? It probably depends on the department. But it is almost certain that new technologies will soon minimize these physical location problems in many departments.

In very low-tech settings, the problem of transferring reports between sites can be addressed by assigning couriers (citizen volunteers, perhaps) who make regular runs between department facilities. If a department does choose to physically decentralize before implementing new information and communication technology, managers need to anticipate the burdens of physical separation and devise ways to address these problems.

Chain of Command. Among departments with geographic assignment and/or physical decentralization, some have a separate chain of command for investigators, while others have a unified, area-based chain of command through which both patrol and investigative personnel report. The disadvantage of a bifurcated or dual chain of command is the difficulty it poses for developing unified objectives for a geographic area. In one department, decentralized detectives were on guard against the area commander using them for "his purposes." Clearly they felt conflicted about which boss to serve. The possible disadvantage of a unified chain of command is that investigators may be left on their own, without a supervisor who has had investigative experience. Arlington appears to have solved this problem by using investigative sergeants as facilitators, coaches, trainers and content specialists for investigators. The area (or patrol) sergeant may have more to say about what gets done by the team; the investigative sergeant helps investigators do the job better.

Procedural Changes and Developments

Degrees of Decentralization. In departments in which some detectives have been physically decentralized and/or given geographic assignments, the crimes most commonly associated with these structural arrangements are property crimes, although this varied across the departments in the survey and site studies. Arapahoe County has assigned all crimes geographically; some have geographically assigned and/or physically decentralized most crimes, and others have geographically assigned and/or physically decentralized only property crimes. The crime investigation types that are most commonly centralized are homicides, robberies, sex crimes, juvenile crimes, and fraud.

Sex crimes seem to pose the greatest challenge for geographic assignments. One department reported that centralization of sex crime investigations is required by state statute. Juvenile crimes pose similar issues.

Degrees of Generalization. In most of the sites, investigators assigned to geographic areas were area specialists and crime generalists. The "degree" of generalization depended on the agency; all except Arapahoe County still retain a group of centralized specialists, although the crimes defined as "special" vary across agencies.

Interviews during site visits left the strong impression that generalist detectives enjoy being generalists-not only for the variety this approach brings to their work but also for the sense it gives of providing a wide range of service to the community. They also tend to believe that few of the criminals operating in their districts are specialists; they see them as opportunists willing to commit a variety of crimes. The few complaints raised about the generalist approach tended to come from specialized investigators who may have felt the need to champion and protect the value of their special roles. For example, some centralized specialists suspected that generalists, if given a choice, would prefer to spend their time on the

more exciting personal crimes to the neglect of property crimes. We heard of no data to support or refute this argument but, certainly, good supervision at the area level could control this tendency if it were to develop.

Functional Changes and Developments

The survey data suggest that, to date, most efforts to integrate investigations into a community policing approach have involved changes that are physical (decentralization) or procedural (geographic responsibility). Mesa, Spokane County, and Arapahoe County were selected for site visits largely because they reported changes in the functions of at least some detectives, but they are exceptions rather than the rule. Most other agencies have not yet explored functional changes, but it seems likely that more such innovations may result from physical and procedural changes. As detectives become more closely identified with small areas and begin to work in teams with officers who are expected to be community-oriented problem solvers, they may come to see for themselves the potential for broader functions. This appears to have happened in Mesa and Arapahoe Counties. The nontraditional activities that detectives have undertaken resulted from detectives being in a better position to see the needs and to know the needy.

Training. Detectives and investigators need to receive training in the principles, strategies and tactics of problem solving and community policing if they are expected to incorporate these practices into the investigative process. They need information not only about the operations of detective units in other jurisdictions, but also about investigative and programmatic approaches to address specific problems such as domestic violence, gangs and quality-of-life problems.⁶ Although training may be expensive, labor intensive and time consuming, the benefits derived may be substantial and greatly enhance an agency's capacity to address community concerns.

⁶A substantial amount of literature containing practical information about programs in these areas is available free of charge from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (www.ncjrs.org) sponsored by the U.S. Department

Finally, Is There One Best Model?

Is there one best model? Probably not. This exploratory research was not intended to provide an evaluation of whether one model is preferable to another. However, based on the site visits, the approach that combines physical decentralization and area responsibility reporting through an area command appears to be an especially strong one. It promotes a coordinated approach at the local level (e.g., district, precinct), investigator knowledge of the territory, consistency and continuity in case and problem priorities, and information sharing and teamwork between and among investigators and patrol officers. The sense of identification with an area and its people may heighten a detective's motivation. Still, detectives may perceive a disadvantage to this model if they feel that physical and/or reporting separation places them outside the information loop and perhaps deprives them of equal consideration for choice assignments and other rewards within the investigative division.

With regard to specialization, the "detective as generalist" model has the advantage of broadening an investigator's knowledge of a geographic area and may also provide more varied and interesting workloads for many investigators. In Arapahoe County, it was also a way of equalizing the workload between persons detectives and property detectives. Nevertheless, the value of generalization may depend on the jurisdiction's volume, type and geographic distribution of crimes, and whether an agency has the financial and personnel resources for the necessary cross-training. The "detective as generalist" model need not be a "pure" model; several departments have given area-specific investigators broad general investigative responsibility while retaining a group of centralized detectives who are specialists in certain types of crimes.

of Justice. Additionally, detectives/investigators may obtain a great deal of practical information from site visits to other agencies or through peer-exchange programs.

In general, it appears that the value of any of these approaches depends on the department's characteristics, its goals, and the community it serves. In a small community, where physical decentralization may not seem necessary to ensure accountability and quality service, detectives might remain physically centralized but be given area responsibility and a unified chain of command through an area commander. A bifurcated chain of command might work if *the separate commands are in accord*, as appears to be the case in Arapahoe County, Colorado. Some cities are geographically large, therefore, physical decentralization of all basic police services may be appropriate. In these settings, decisions about the chain of command issue should probably be based on a review of the department's goals. If decentralization of investigators is done for the primary purpose of making them more effective at what they have always done (i.e., the investigation of crimes), then two chains of command may not be dysfunctional. Detectives can associate more easily with officers, citizens and others who are knowledgeable about the community, thereby expanding sources of information—all within the traditional investigative chain of command.⁷ If the primary reason for decentralizing detectives is to create an area-based service team that is working together to prevent crimes, solve crimes, and provide both a better and broader police service, then it seems critical to have an area commander who has control over all of his or her resources. Unity of purpose and effort is difficult to achieve within the context of a bifurcated chain of command.

Resistance to Change

The kinds of changes observed are not made easily. However, it is apparent that not all detectives are resistant to change, and many may be less resistant than some police chiefs and sheriffs expect. Specifically, the research indicates that some detectives not only welcome changes in structures, procedures,

⁷In one site, geographically decentralized detectives who reported through the investigative chain of command appeared to be confused and frustrated by lack of clear direction. They felt the need to "protect" themselves from what they considered the area commander's inappropriate expectations.

and functions, but may even initiate changes themselves to address perceived departmental deficiencies in responses to crime and quality-of-life problems. Moreover, while change in some agencies was met initially with skepticism or resistance, many detectives not only adjusted, but several agreed that they did not want to go back to the traditional approach. Thus, detectives are willing to change and, when provided with the opportunity (or mandate) to modify procedures or functions, they will adapt.

Change is easier, of course, when personnel are prepared for it and are given a rationale for the new approaches. In one of the most graceful transitions in this study, Arapahoe County detectives initially were prepared by being given articles to read about community policing and problem solving. They were engaged in this reading while officers in the patrol division were actively involved in the transition. Detectives began to wonder where they would fit into the overall community policing picture so that, by the time organizational attention was turned to them, they were unsurprised and were intellectually prepared for change. This preliminary preparation was then strongly reinforced with formal training in both community policing and problem solving.⁸

Careful preparation might help alleviate the stresses and strains of change. In many departments, patrol officers have been included in the process for planning the transition to community policing. It would be a good idea to include detectives in this same process. If, as is the case in many departments, patrol has made the move to community policing before the decision has been made to incorporate investigations, detectives can be part of this second planning process. It could be beneficial, if budget allows, to have some detectives visit one or more of the sites included in this study.

⁸In contrast, in another department (not one of the sites visited), several months after decentralization, detectives were still asking with genuine concern, "But what do you want us to do differently?" The change was made because department leaders believed that decentralization provided structural support for community policing. Many detectives in this department supported the idea of decentralization for patrol, but had not been given a sufficient

Recommendations

With this project, we have only begun to explore an area that is ripe for additional research. As indicated previously, the work of this project has been descriptive and does not represent an effort to evaluate the new approaches that were identified-beyond indicating some of their apparent strengths and weaknesses. Evaluation research would be a logical next step.

There is a need to develop new types of performance measures to capture some of the work being done in the seven sites in this project. But, even in the absence of new measures, it would be useful to evaluate these new approaches in terms of traditional measures of investigative performance, for instance, crime rates, arrests, case closures, time to closure, and convictions. Within sites and over time, these rates could be compared for property and persons crimes to see whether the new deployment strategies are resulting in differential handling of cases. At the same time, some measures of the quality of cases should be incorporated into this research, including the number of informants identified and the amount of information provided about suspects. In jurisdictions in which detectives are working on prevention and alternatives to arrests, there would be the reasonable expectation that arrest rates would decline over time and explanations should be provided for these changes.

Much more attention could be given to determining the extent and nature of the involvement of detectives in problem solving than was possible in this project. An important question is whether they are better suited to be primary problem solvers or to work in a support capacity with patrol officers.

Surveys should be done in selected sites to determine levels of victim satisfaction with the new approaches. These could be especially interesting in communities in which some areas already are being

rationale for their own decentralization. As they moved into the change, they could only imagine the disadvantages, not the advantages, for their job performance.

served by physically decentralized investigators while other areas continue to be served by centralized investigators until additional decentralized facilities can be constructed.

Personnel surveys could be conducted to assess patrol officer and detective responses to the changes.

There have been as many questions as answers identified in the current project, and the next generation of research could provide significant information about these important issues that are of great interest to police managers.

Table 1. Extent of Implementation of Community Policing (N=547)						
	Municipal		Sheriffs		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Planning	4	1.0	4	2.5	8	1.5
Early Phase	29	7.5	30	18.9	59	10.8
One Quarter	47	12.1	23	14.5	70	12.8
Half Way	83	21.4	38	23.9	121	22.1
Three Quarters	75	19.3	16	10.0	91	16.6
Most Objectives Accomplished	128	33.0	38	23.9	166	30.4
Other	22	5.7	6	3.8	28	5.1
Missing	0	0.0	4	2.5	4	0.7
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

Table 2. Summary of Responses on Features of Community Policing (n=547)			
Questions	Municipal % (N)	Sheriff % (N)	Total % (N)
Philosophy that guides most department activities	71.6% (278)	58.2% (92)	67.8% (370)
Primarily a program	20.9% (81)	34.8% (55)	24.9% (136)
Implemented only in a section	22.9% (89)	20.9% (33)	22.3% (122)
Specific officers assigned to community policing	58.2% (226)	62.7% (99)	59.5% (325)
Community policing officers assigned to a unit	46.9% (182)	44.3% (70)	46.2% (252)
All officers expected to engage in community policing	74% (287)	70.3% (111)	72.9% (398)
Investigative personnel expected to engage in community policing	55.2% (214)	49.4% (78)	53.5% (292)
All personnel expected to engage in community policing	80.2% (311)	74.7% (118)	78.6% (429)

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

Table 3. Department Status Regarding Redefining Roles of Detectives/Investigators (N=547)						
	Municipal		Sheriff		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The matter has <i>not yet been considered</i>	87	22.4	40	25.2	127	23.2
We <i>currently are considering</i> this matter	67	17.3	38	23.9	105	19.2
We are in the process of <i>actively planning</i> the redefinition or restructuring	27	7.0	10	6.3	37	6.8
We have implemented some <i>initial changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	78	20.1	22	13.8	100	18.3
We have implemented some <i>major changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	56	14.4	12	7.5	68	12.4
We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goal	69	17.8	30	18.9	99	18.1
Missing	4	1.0	7	4.4	11	2.0
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

Table 4. Organization of the Investigative Function in Community Policing Departments			
	Municipal (N=388) % (N)	Sheriffs (N=158) % (N)	Total (N=546) % (N)
Organizational Structure			
Almost all investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau/division	76.8% (298)	69.6% (110)	74.7% (408)
Most investigative functions are located within the patrol division	4.9% (19)	5.7% (9)	5.1% (28)
Investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus/divisions	25.5% (99)	40.5% (64)	29.9% (163)
Location and Assignment			
Most investigative personnel are <i>physically centralized</i>	39.4% (153)	47.5% (75)	41.8% (228)
Most are <i>physically centralized</i> and have <i>citywide</i> responsibilities	47.2% (183)	30.4% (48)	42.3% (231)
Most investigators are <i>physically centralized</i> , but they may work <i>specific geographic areas</i>	24.5% (95)	25.3% (40)	24.7% (135)
A core of investigators is <i>physically centralized</i> , and is responsible for <i>specific types of crimes</i> of a <i>citywide nature</i>	51.3% (199)	41.1% (65)	48.4% (264)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i>	22.2% (86)	26.6% (42)	23.4% (128)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i>	11.6% (45)	23.4% (37)	15% (82)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> , and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i> and <i>specific types of crimes</i>	21.1% (82)	32.9% (52)	24.5% (134)
Specialization			
Most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents	39.4% (153)	50.6% (80)	42.7% (233)
Most detectives/investigators are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes within their area of expertise	52.6% (204)	39.2% (62)	48.7% (266)
Most <i>centralized</i> investigators are specialists, while most <i>decentralized</i> investigators are generalists	14.2% (55)	16.5% (26)	14.8% (81)

Rank			
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers	60.6% (235)	49.4% (78)	57.3% (313)
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers	41% (159)	52.5% (83)	44.3% (242)
Relationship with Patrol			
Patrol officers have <i>no</i> investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report	15.7% (61)	8.9% (14)	13.7% (75)
Patrol officers <i>may</i> have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report	82.2% (319)	89.2% (141)	84.2% (460)
Detectives/investigators work in teams with patrol officers	14.7% (57)	16.5% (26)	15.2% (83)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation	8.5% (33)	10.8% (17)	9.2% (50)
Chain of Command			
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander (e.g., precinct or division commander) who is responsible for <i>patrol</i> operations in a specific geographic area	6.2% (24)	13.3% (21)	8.2% (45)
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area	3.6% (14)	14.6% (23)	6.8% (37)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain of command	17.3% (67)	17.1% (27)	17.2% (94)
All detectives/investigators, regardless of geographic location, report through an investigative chain-of-command	83.8% (325)	74.7% (118)	81.1% (443)

Figure 1: Structural Models for Seven Selected Sites		
	Structure	Sites Selected
1	Physical centralization of detectives who have citywide responsibilities	No sites selected ¹
2	Physical centralization of detectives; Assignment to specific geographic areas	Arapahoe County Colorado Sheriffs Office ²
3	Physical decentralization of detectives who report through an investigative chain of command	Mesa, Arizona Police Department Sacramento, California Police Department Spokane County, Washington Sheriffs Office
4	Physical decentralization of detectives who report through area command	Arlington, Texas Police Department Boston, Massachusetts Police Department San Diego, California Police Department

¹No site was selected for this model since it is a common structure, involving no changes that might provide new ideas for other agencies.

²Only one department was selected to represent this model because it tended to be less of a "mixed" model; the dominant structural innovation was the key feature. In Model #3 and #4 there tended to be other changes in various combinations with the main structural feature.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank the following individuals who served as our advisory board and provided vital assistance in innumerable ways: Roderick Beard, lieutenant, Portland Oregon Police Bureau; Craig Huneycutt, captain, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina Police Department; Don Jones, lieutenant, Sacramento, California Sheriffs Department; George Kelling, professor, Rutgers University; Timothy Oettmeier, assistant chief, Houston, Texas Police Department; Alexandra Olson, detective, Madison, Wisconsin Police Department; Donald Quire, retired major, St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department; and Wesley Skogan, professor, Northwestern University.

We also thank Lois Felson Mock, our grant monitor for the National Institute of Justice, who played both supportive and substantive roles in the project's design and implementation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I Introduction	I-1
II The Literature on Investigations	II-1
III Methodology	III-1
IV Survey Findings	IV-1
V Site Observations	V-1
VI Conclusions	VI-1
VII Research Recommendations	VII-1

References

Appendix A: Survey Instruments

Appendix B: Summaries for Forty-one Sites

Appendix C: Reports for Seven Sites

Arapahoe County, Colorado Sheriffs Office
Arlington, Texas Police Department
Boston, Massachusetts Police Department
Mesa, Arizona Police Department
Sacramento, California Police Department
San Diego, California Police Department
Spokane County, Washington Sheriffs Office

I INTRODUCTION

As with many current issues in community policing, concerns about the investigative function and detectives are not new, and not simply generated by the adoption of the community policing philosophy. Rather, they represent old issues brought back into focus by current rethinking about police service delivery.

Questions about the nature and structure of the investigative function constitute a central concern for administrators who are implementing community policing. The concerns are both substantive and political. Substantive questions address what the investigative function should encompass, who should perform it, and its relationship to citizens and other police personnel. Political questions pertain to redefining the roles for detectives and other personnel who may be involved in the investigative process. Detectives are commonly a highly organized workgroup—often perceived as conservative, insular and elitist—and subsequently, administrators who attempt to change investigators' roles often expect to encounter substantial resistance to change, no matter how minor or practical.

When agencies consider new models of police service, questions pertaining to the role and function of detectives or investigators always arise. Because there are no easy answers, managers of change are looking for guidance on how the investigative function should be performed in a community policing context, and how to manage the change in a way that will not cause organizational turmoil.

Mike Masterson (1995), previously a detective bureau manager, has written:

While there has been a considerable amount of literature written on community policing, most of it has overlooked the important goal of getting everyone in an organization working together to create safer living environments and improved service to our citizens. For the most part, emphasis on the investigative functions and its contribution to those goals has been largely ignored. Has it been done deliberately to avoid the resistance of a deeply ingrained culture and the intolerance to change by vociferous, fiercely independent, and highly talented individuals?

Detective recalcitrance notwithstanding, there is a larger question of what the investigative function should be in a community policing context. Does the largely reactive role that detectives play traditionally represent the full nature of the investigative function? Or is a proactive approach, in which police anticipate crimes and work to prevent them or to intercept the criminals, more appropriate? Then there are coactive operations in which police, citizens and other agencies work together to prevent crime and control criminogenic conditions in the community. Is this a better model? It is evident that a primarily reactive investigative function supports only one element of community policing. What might the investigative function look like if it were designed to support the full range of community policing efforts?

The research reported here was designed to address these issues and fill an important gap in our knowledge about community policing implementation. This project considered three main questions:

- How are community policing agencies in this country structuring the investigative function?
- How are they integrating the investigative function with other police services?

- How have they managed/are they managing the change process within this function?

A national survey, followed by site visits with seven selected agencies allows us to take a close look at these issues.

II

THE LITERATURE ON INVESTIGATIONS ¹

The literature on criminal investigations has largely consisted of studies regarding the effectiveness of investigations, with little literature exploring the relationship between community policing and investigations. This review will cover the history of investigations, research on the effectiveness of investigations, procedural and programmatic changes made to improve the effectiveness of investigations, and issues facing police agencies as they address the role of the investigator in community policing.

The Early History of Criminal Investigations

The forerunners of modern day detectives were initially known as “thief-takers.” Their emergence during the late 1600s or early 1700s apparently resulted from a failure of uniformed police patrols to prevent crime. Based on prevailing thought in the early 1800s that suggested crime could only be fought by former, reformed criminals (i.e., ex-convicts), the original “thief-takers” were themselves thieves. This was not without problems, however, as other police officers could not accept the notion of using ex-convicts in positions of public trust (Weston et al. 1970).

¹ This chapter relies heavily, with the authors’ permission, on the work of Timothy Oettmeier and William H. Bieck (1988).

The notion of working with individuals other than the police to catch criminals was furthered in 1740, when Thomas de Veil, the Magistrate of Westminster Court and a former military officer, directed and supervised a small group of volunteer, non-uniformed homeowners to "take thieves." Once a reported crime had come to their attention, they would respond to the scene and begin investigation.

By the latter half of the 18th century, the term "thief-takers" was rejected in favor of a new name, "Bow Street Runners," because the public had begun to equate the business of apprehending criminals with the location of the court on London's Bow Street. And, by 1780, four of the Bow Street Runners were in fact salaried police officers who performed criminal investigations in plain clothes, the first such use of non-uniformed police. While the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 formally abolished the Bow Street Runners--based partly on a suspicion of collusion between some of the criminals and a few of the runners--the widespread use of plain clothes police officers continued into the early 1800s as a way to conceal the identity of individuals as policemen.

The creation of a "Detective Department" for the London Metropolitan Police began on an experimental basis with approval from the British Home Office on June 20, 1842. Initially staffed by two detective-sergeants, this "Department" was charged with the responsibility of gathering information about crimes and criminals. The detective-sergeants were selected from the ranks of patrolmen and were given a slight salary increase (Weston et al. 1970).

In 1846, the first commanding officer of the Scotland Yard detectives, Nicholas Pearce, was ordered to develop a "field force" of detectives from among the uniformed divisions. The detectives selected were to remain in their districts and to work with detectives from other uniform divisions and the central detective force. Thus, by 1846, Scotland Yard had decentralized their criminal investigations function.

The Evolution of Criminal Investigations in the United States.

Following the appointment of Francis Tukey as Marshal of the Boston Police Department in 1846, this agency became the first department in New England to appoint police officers as detectives. It was not until 1857 that New York City appointed 20 patrol officers as detectives. These officers were selected, according to Weston (1970), because of their "knowledge of rogues and their schemes." Marshal Tukey used his detectives to perform "decents" in areas of Boston that catered to gambling and prostitution activities. In 1851, Tukey also introduced the concept of the "show-up" (line-up), which has since then been adopted by police agencies throughout the world.

By the turn of this century, detectives enjoyed considerable autonomy. As Eck (1983) notes, "The political machines which ran the cities often ran the police departments... Detectives not only mixed with the criminal element, but sometimes regulated criminal enterprise for the benefit of the local politicians and themselves."

Many detectives were therefore more sensitive to the needs of local politicians than they were to their own chiefs of police.

Electoral response in attempts to dismantle these “political machines” led to an increase in power for the police chiefs. The police chiefs placed as much distance as they could between themselves and city hall, while they sought to wrest control of detectives from elected officials. Police reformers demanded closer supervision of detectives with better documentation to account for their activities. Gradually, the orientation of detective activity began to shift away from concentrating on offenders to focusing attention on individual cases. As Eck (1983) notes:

Working offenders starts with knowing who is actively engaged in criminal activity on a regular basis and then attempting to gather sufficient evidence to arrest these people for committing a particular offense. Working cases starts with the report of a criminal offense and then attempting to establish the identity of the offenders in order to make arrests. Working cases permitted numerical productivity measures (e.g. clearance and arrest rates) to be used in order to exercise greater control over the members of the detective bureau. However, working cases also meant that detectives no longer could rely to the degree they had on the criminal element for information.

Research on Criminal Investigations Effectiveness

Most of the research published in criminal investigations before the 1970s occurred in ancillary, more technical scientific fields. And most all of the research that addressed police operations during the 1970s was primarily devoted to the patrol and, to a lesser extent, dispatch functions. Therefore, relative to all the research done in police operations proper, little has concentrated on criminal investigations.

The President's commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, initiated by President Johnson on July 23, 1965, contained findings from one of the first empirical studies of criminal investigations. The study was conducted by the Institute of Defense Analysis in conjunction with the Los Angeles Police Department.

Published in the Commission's Task Force Report: Science and Technology, the study's author, Herbert Isaacs, found that 25 percent of all crimes reported to the police resulted "in arrests or other clearances" (Silver 1968). Of those cases cleared, 70 percent were cleared by arrest, of which 90 percent were made by patrol officers although one fourth of these arrests were based on leads provided by detectives who had conducted follow-up investigations. More than half of the arrests were made within eight hours of the crime, and two-thirds of the arrests were made within the first week of the crime. The author indicates that the most important factor in clearance is whether or not a suspect was named in the initial report. If the suspect was "...neither known to the victim nor arrested at the scene of the crime, the chances of ever arresting him are slim" (Silver 1968).

In 1970, a study was conducted by the New York City Rand Institute that examined how arrests were made by officers from the New York City Police Department. The study's author, Peter Greenwood, found that a substantial amount of detectives' time was wasted on the investigation of cases that could not be solved. He therefore concluded that cases be selected for follow-up investigation based on the likelihood of possible solution (Eck 1979).

In 1972, the Stanford Research Institute (SRI), having received a grant from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (now called the National Institute of Justice [NIJ]), developed criteria from an analysis of burglary cases from six police agencies in Alameda County, California, to help predict whether or not a particular burglary case would have been solved if assigned.

Once the model (i.e., the Burglary Decision Model) had been developed, the researchers drew a sample of approximately 500 burglary cases from four of the original six Alameda County police agencies to test their model. Results indicated that the model correctly predicted from 67 to 90 percent of the investigative outcomes (i.e., those that would have been screened out by the model had a much lower arrest and clearance rate than those that would have been selected for assignment).

Paralleling information presented in the report prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (already mentioned), the SRI report demonstrated that if basic information on burglary cases was collected from the witness or victim within one hour of the time of the incident, the potential for successful case solution was increased by 50 percent. Moreover, if suspect information was reported to the police no more than eight hours after a burglary, the potential for successful case closure could have been as high as 95 percent (Greenberg and Wasserman 1979). According to Greenberg and Wasserman (1979):

...all criminal cases do not have an equal potential for solution; 'that a large number of cases essentially solve *themselves*' when particular investigative elements (i.e., solvability factors) are present; and that in the absence of these elements certain cases should be screened out of

the investigative process. These conclusions lie in direct contrast to traditional investigative strategy which supports active investigation, to varying degrees, of almost all criminal cases.

Following the publication of SRI's results in screening burglary cases, the model was tested by the Peoria (Illinois) Police Department and by the Minnesota Crime Control Planning Board in four Minnesota police departments. The model's accuracy rate in predicting investigative outcomes was found to be more than 90 percent in Peoria, and, for the Minnesota agencies, ranged from 91 to 93 percent (Eck 1979).

In 1975, a similar model (i.e., the Robbery Investigation Decision Model) was developed by SRI staff to screen robbery cases for the Oakland (California) Police Department. Criteria used to review cases included 17 solvability factors, e.g., "suspect named," "suspect known," "auto color given," "auto description given," "auto license given," "weapon used," "physical evidence collected," etc. Each of the solvability factors were quantified by having a predetermined numerical weight attached to the factor. If the suspect was known, for example, this factor was accorded a weight of 10. If the weapon was known, a weight of 1.8 was assigned to this factor. If the sum of all the numerical factors exceeded 10, the case was assigned for follow-up investigations, and if the sum of the factors was less than or equal to 10 (the "cutoff" point) the case was not assigned (i.e., any further investigation was suspended).

When tested in Oakland, this system correctly predicted the outcome of follow-up investigations in 90 percent of the robbery cases. According to Greenberg and

Wasserman (1979), this achieved both of the objectives established for research that included:

...to ease the burden of investigators reviewing a high volume of felony crime reports that have a low probability of successful clearance [and]...to determine the elements of information leading to offender identification and case solution by investigative personnel.

The most ambitious effort to assess case screening procedures involved the Police Executive Research Forum's (Eck 1979) research replication of the SRI Burglary Decision Model. Called the Burglary Investigations Decision Model Replication (BIDMOR) project, this effort, initiated in 1978, involved 26 police agencies that were members of the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). The project was designed to identify burglary cases for follow-up investigation that had the greatest probability of being solved. In so doing, it sought to test the performance of SRI's "...statistically weighted information model by testing whether the model could predict case outcomes correctly by comparing the model's predictions with actual burglary case investigation results" (Eck 1979).

Results from analysis of 12,001 burglary reports (the burglary sample drawn from each participating agency ranged from 480 to 523 cases) indicated that the prototype developed by SRI, while not perfect, was very accurate in predicting the outcome of investigative effort 85 percent of the time.

According to the study's author (Eck 1979), several implications can be adduced from the results of this work:

... it is the characteristics of burglary cases, not the follow-up investigations, that determines the overall success or failure rate of burglary investigations. This finding means also that police management can use the screening device to select from the flood of burglary reports they receive those cases that have the best chances of being solved. The screening model provides police managers with a tested tool with which they can direct their investigators to be more productive, or, put another way, less wasteful of increasingly scarce police resources. Managers thus have a device by which they can control assignment of burglary investigations and impose a degree of order in an area—police investigations—where attempts at management traditionally have been the exception rather than the rule. Currently, investigators make case assignment decisions based on their intuition or experientially derived judgment. Collectively these individual decisions determine department practice in the absence of an established management policy. Individuals, rather than management, are making the important choices inherent in the investigative decision-making process, thus removing control of the process from management.

Between the time the SRI case screening model was initially tested on burglary cases and the 26-city test replication of that model was completed by PERF, another study of criminal investigations, much broader in scope, was implemented that achieved almost immediate national notoriety. The Rand Corporation's study (three volumes) of The Criminal Investigation Process (Greenberg and Petersilia 1975) sought to describe "investigative organization and practices" including, among other things, how detectives spent their time and how crimes were solved. Restricting its analysis to the crimes of homicide, rape, assault, robbery, burglary, and theft, the study collected survey information from 153 police jurisdictions (out of 300 solicited) in the United States from country and municipal law enforcement agencies that had 150 or more full-time employees or that served jurisdictions whose 1970 populations exceeded 100,000. Information obtained from survey responses was bolstered by a more detailed

examination of data collected from more than 25 cities that had completed the surveys. A "limited phone survey" was made of robbery and burglary victims in one of the cities in which on-site observations were made.

Based on analysis of data collected, the findings revealed that the work actually performed by detectives stood in sharp contrast to the media image of the working detective as a "...clever, imaginative, perseverant, streetwise cop who consorts with glamorous women and duels with crafty criminals...trying to break a single case, which is ultimately solved by means of the investigator's deductive powers" (Greenberg and Petersilia 1975). Rand further cited an almost complete lack of administrative control in managing criminal investigations. As presented by Greenberg and Petersilia (1975) in the first volume (i.e., Summary and Policy Implications) of the study's three reports, Rand reported that:

- Differences in investigative training, staffing, workload, and procedures appear to have no appreciable effect on crime, arrest or clearance rates.
- The method by which police investigators are organized (i.e., team policing, specialists vs. generalists, patrolmen-investigators) cannot be related to variations in crime, arrest, and clearance rates.
- Substantially more than half of all serious reported crimes receive no more than superficial attention from investigators.
- An investigator's time is largely consumed in reviewing reports, documenting files, and attempting to locate and interview victims on cases that experience

shows will not be solved. For cases that are solved (i.e., a suspect is identified), an investigator spends more time in post-clearance processing than he does in identifying the perpetrator.

- The single most important determinant of whether or not a case will be solved is the information the victim supplies to the patrol officer who responded immediately. If information that uniquely identifies the perpetrator is not presented at the time the crime is reported, the perpetrator, by and large, will not be subsequently identified.
- Of those cases that are ultimately cleared (but in which the perpetrator is not identifiable at the time of the initial police incident report), almost all are cleared as a result of routine police procedures that is, they required no imaginative exercise of investigative experience and skills. Investigative 'special action' made a perceptible difference in only three types of crimes: commercial burglary, robbery, and homicide. In these crimes, RAND found that roughly 10 percent of the cases were solved as the result of nonroutine initiatives taken by investigators.
- Most police departments collect more physical evidence than can be productively processed. Allocating more resources to increasing the processing capabilities of the department can lead to more identifications than some other investigative actions.

- Latent fingerprints rarely provide the only basis for identifying a suspect; fingerprint identification did not have a significant effect on overall arrest rates in any department.
- In relatively few departments do investigators consistently and thoroughly document the key evidentiary facts that reasonably assure that the prosecutor can obtain a conviction on the most serious applicable charges.
- Police failure to document a case investigation thoroughly may have contributed to a higher case dismissal rate and a weakening of the prosecutor's plea bargaining position [in one of the jurisdictions studied].
- Victims desire to be notified officially as to whether or not the police have 'solved' their case.
- Investigative strike forces have significant potential to increase arrest rates for a few difficult target offenses, provided they remain concentrated on activities for which they are uniquely qualified; in practice, however, they are frequently diverted elsewhere.

Prefaced by the remark that "...the effectiveness of criminal investigation would not be unduly lessened if approximately half of the investigative effort were eliminated or shifted to more productive uses" (Greenberg and Petersilia 1975), Rand researchers suggested nine "proposed reforms" to improve investigative productivity. These reforms, taken verbatim from the first volume, include the following:

- Reduce follow-up investigation on all cases except those involving the most serious offenses.

- Assign generalist-investigators (who would handle the obvious leads in routine cases) to local operations commander.
- Establish a Major Offenses Unit to investigate serious crimes.
- Assign serious-offense investigations to closely supervised teams, rather than to individual investigators.
- Strengthen evidence-processing capabilities.
- Increase the use of information processing systems in lieu of investigators.
- Employ strike forces selectively and judiciously.
- Place post-arrest (i.e., suspect in custody) investigations under the authority of the prosecutor.
- Initiate programs designed to impress on the citizen the crucial role he plays in crime solution.

In general, these results and proposed reforms infuriated detectives. A satire of the stereotypical role of the detective in light of the findings was presented on "The Barney Miller Show," a situational comedy series that was popular at the time. Aside from the initial shock, however, the results did eventually provoke serious inspection of the traditional investigative process by those in the field.

While the Rand and SRI studies were being conducted, several police departments were beginning to experiment with various procedural strategies and management techniques to improve criminal investigations. These agencies included: Fremont, California; DeKalb County, Georgia; Cincinnati, Ohio; Rochester, New York;

and Washington, D.C. According to Greenberg and Wasserman (1979), these departments identified a number of common objectives that reinforced recommendations forthcoming from the Rand and SRI studies, including the following:

- Increased patrol officer involvement in investigative functions;
- Increased patrol officer and detective cooperation;
- Utilization of some form of early case closure [procedures]; and
- Increased cooperation between the police and prosecutor.

Other studies explored "team policing," a concept first introduced in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1946. The Police Foundation funded two research initiatives in Rochester, New York and Cincinnati, Ohio, to examine the effects of decentralizing some of the investigative functions to small geographical areas within these cities. Detectives were assigned to "team areas," where they were assisted by patrol officers in conducting preliminary and follow-up investigations. The studies produced mixed results, including the following:

- Team areas (decentralized) made a greater *percentage* of arrests for larcenies, burglaries, and robberies than non-team areas (centralized);
- Team areas showed a greater number of on-scene arrests and follow-up investigation arrests than non-team areas;
- Team investigators gathered more information during follow-up investigations and seemed to use this information better than non-team investigators;

- Team policing produced a higher clearance by arrest rate than either a fully or partly centralized approach;
- There were no differences between team and non-team areas in terms of the ability to obtain *descriptions of suspects* from witnesses during preliminary investigations; and
- There were no differences between the team and non-team areas in terms of arrests that resulted in prosecutions.

Moving into the 1980s, the Police Executive Research Forum (beginning in 1980) initiated a two-year comprehensive study to determine how much the preliminary and follow-up investigations contribute to the solution of burglary and robbery cases. Findings from this effort, which involved analysis of investigative information taken from more than 320 robberies and 3,360 burglaries in three jurisdictions, revealed that robbery and burglary cases are generally investigated for no more than four hours, counting both the preliminary investigation done by patrol officers and the follow-up investigation done by detectives. As the investigations continued, there was a shift in focus away from the victims to possible suspects, and the pattern of investigative action became less routine and increasingly more unique (Eck 1983).

In addition, Eck found that while patrol officers interviewed crime victims in 90 percent of the cases, they interviewed witnesses far less--in approximately 17 percent of the burglaries and approximately 44 percent of the robberies (Eck 1983). The

officers collected physical evidence in 10 percent of the cases, and they conducted neighborhood canvases in less than 20 percent of the cases.

Almost half of the burglary cases were screened out for lack of leads immediately after the preliminary investigation. While all robbery cases were assigned for follow-up investigation, 75 percent of the robbery cases and the assigned burglary cases were suspended for lack of leads after just one day of investigation.

Investigators obtained most of their information from victims, primarily because they interviewed almost all of them. But a very small percentage of victims were able to provide fruitful information. Although used less often than victim information, other sources of information including witnesses, informants, other department members, and record searches were collectively likely to produce more relevant information. Eck (1983) notes:

... in robbery cases in which detectives obtained the name of the suspect, the robbery victims provided that name in more than 40 percent of the cases. But the [overall] probability that a robbery victim could provide a suspect's name to a detective was little more than ten percent; the probability that an informant could provide the name was 30 percent. The probability that the name could be learned from informants or department records was over 50 percent. Witnesses and patrol officers were also more likely than victims to provide suspect names to detectives.

Analysis of the investigative process revealed that the preliminary investigations performed by patrol officers and follow-up investigations conducted by detectives were equally important in determining whether crimes would be cleared through arrests. Arrests were made in either the preliminary investigation or follow-up investigation in eight percent of the burglary cases and in 18.8 percent of the robbery cases. Of

course, decisions made to assign cases for follow-up investigations are heavily dependent upon information obtained during the preliminary investigation. "If few or no leads are developed, the case is likely to be screened out and never assigned for follow-up or, if assigned, the follow-up will be quickly suspended" (Eck 1983).

Eck's work tends to challenge previous research that questioned the role of detectives and the value of follow-up investigations. While previous research emphasized the importance of patrol officers in conducting preliminary investigations, PERF's research on robbery and burglary cases concludes that "...both patrol officers and detectives contribute equally important work toward the solution of cases" (Eck 1983).

Procedural and Programmatic Changes in Investigations

A response to remedy the "investigative inefficiencies" outlined in the Rand and SRI reports resulted in the development of a national program—termed Managing Criminal Investigations (MCI)—to help law enforcement agencies more effectively manage criminal investigations. The investigative and post-investigative processes outlined by MCI consisted of four operational components. These included: 1) the initial investigation; 2) case screening; 3) managing ongoing, follow-up investigations; and 4) establishing good liaison with the district attorney's office. Dividing the investigative process up into a series of discrete steps was intended to improve each individual step thereby improving overall investigative productivity.

The MCI program was field-tested in five agencies in the late 1970s. Although representatives from the field-test agencies indicated the program was successful, analysis of findings were less encouraging. For example, only two of the five departments reassigned detectives to other areas within their departments as a result of reduced caseloads created through implementing case screening procedures and local evaluations did not reveal any significant before and after differences in arrest, clearance, and conviction rates (Greenberg and Wasserman 1979). While the initial test of MCI failed to produce major change, it did provide a milestone for future development.

Efforts to implement the MCI program on a wider scope included LEAA's funding in 1980 of 15 cities from across the country to participate in this program. Because of the demise of LEAA in 1982, however, the full impact of these programs was never thoroughly evaluated. In fact, the overall impetus generated by LEAA during the mid-to late 1970s to improve management of criminal investigations resulted in only spotty and infrequent MCI implementations among law enforcement agencies.

Results published during the late 1970s about the "success" of MCI program implementations that appeared in the Urban Institute's evaluation report and a variety of other "prescriptive packages," "program implementation guides," and MCI "test site manuals" were, in general, ambiguous and inconclusive. In its generic form, MCI displayed a propensity to address broad generalities in suggesting ways to improve investigative efficiency rather than in providing substantive detail in suggesting exactly

how particular functions were to be performed. In-depth thought had not addressed differences in investigative routines among the various types of investigations performed, e.g., burglary, theft, homicide, robbery, rape, motor vehicle theft, arson, aggravated assault. And little, if any, consideration was given to the rationale used in differentiating criteria for case screening vis-a-vis case assignment--two separate functions. While some departments did experience positive results in implementing certain programmatic components, no single agency achieved "complete success" with the MCI program.

In retrospect, the MCI prototype did provide a structural framework for organizing some of the investigative functions that previously had gone undocumented. By analytically dividing the overall investigative process into a series of discrete, logically interdependent functions, the MCI model (at least) suggested a more formal method to establish objectives and thus monitor investigative performance through accounting for the outcome and disposition of cases. In so doing, it suggested the importance of establishing positive relations between the police and the prosecutors to review changes in the filing of charges and in tracking cases through the courts.

Perhaps of tantamount importance to the model itself, efforts to implement MCI revealed the weight tradition carries in thwarting organizational change. An important component of MCI included expanding the responsibilities of patrol officers in the investigative process. This change from tradition required patrol officers to perform more comprehensive "initial investigations" (the term, "preliminary investigation,"

suggests another investigation will follow), for instance, to conduct neighborhood canvasses, detect and collect physical evidence, interview witnesses, interrogate suspects. It also included latitude to seek “early case closures” through following leads obtained during the initial investigation that resulted in the apprehension of suspects or, in having exhausted all leads or in failing to obtain any meaningful evidence, to inform victims that further investigation was unlikely, rather than telling them that they would be contacted by a detective.

Little wonder that MCI appears to be “detective negative.” Aside from management initiatives to identify “performance anchors” and develop methods to better account for detectives’ time and activities, using solvability factors to screen “unsolvable” cases out from assignment together with expanding the role of patrol officers to perform some follow-up investigations tends to threaten detectives. Many detectives perceive that a loss of work traditionally performed only by them would mean fewer detectives would be needed to pursue criminal investigations. This rationale is not illogical. As previously mentioned, two of the five departments involved in the original MCI research cut their investigative strength. Perhaps it is not surprising that MCI has continued to struggle with piecemeal implementations.

Other initiatives that are national in scope and appear to have potential in enhancing local investigative efforts include the Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program (SHOCAP), sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice

and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VI-CAP) sponsored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Although managed through the local police department, SHOCAP is a comprehensive community-based program that includes officials and representatives from the schools, the juvenile court, the business community, probation and corrections, the clergy, and various social welfare and human services (after care) agencies. Vitally dependent on crime analysis as an information and case management system, SHOCAP seeks to identify serious, violent prone, and habitual juvenile offenders. Research from this initiative, published in OJJDP's SHOCAP manuals and other materials, suggests that two percent of habitual offenders are responsible for as much as 40 percent of all juvenile crime and that 10 percent of this group commit approximately 75 percent of the total amount of juvenile crime.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VI-CAP) originated from LEAA's Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP). It linked nationally the crime analysis systems that had been established among ICAP agencies so information could be shared among Agents from each of the F.B.I.'s 59 field offices that were trained to instruct local law enforcement authorities in their jurisdictions on how to develop and submit information for analysis.

Issues for Community Policing Planners

Whenever new models of police service are considered, such as in today's trend toward community policing, questions pertaining to the role and function of detectives

or investigators always arise. Forst (1998) has argued that detectives should gather and analyze data on where and when crimes are occurring, to enable them to identify similarities and predict crime patterns. In attempting to redefine the role of the detective to accommodate these activities, managers are faced with many questions. For example, how should detective units be restructured, in terms of physical location and chain of command? Should detectives remain centralized and focused on all crimes, or should they be decentralized into the community and specialize? Little research is available to help community policing planners address these issues. Horvath, Bucqueroux and Meesig (1997) assert that community policing strategies and philosophies stand a good chance of improving investigations because they focus on increasing the exchange of information between the community and the police. They state: "The emphasis of community policing on community building advocates a more active police approach toward the relationship between the people and their police, which can result in generating more and better information..." (Horvath et al. 1997). These authors relate the experiences of several departments that have made innovations in criminal investigations. Although these innovations have not been evaluated rigorously, they reveal a range of possible, even promising, structural and procedural changes. These changes, summarized by the authors, included:

- physical decentralization (move the investigators into the community);
- decentralization of function (ask investigators to work on all types of crimes in a certain area);

- redistribution of some or all investigative responsibilities to community policing officers; and
- expansion of the investigative role to include preliminary investigative work, case screening and collaboration with community policing officers (Horvath et al. 1997).

The purpose of many of these changes--decentralization in particular--is to put the investigator closer to the community where the crimes will occur, thereby achieving several things. First, the investigator can gain a better knowledge of crime patterns in the area and, perhaps most importantly, a better working relationship with the people who live and work there (Horvath et al 1997). In light of the Rand study, which found that "...the most important factor in crime solution is the information provided by the victim to the responding police officer" (Greenberg and Petersilia 1975), community policing strategies--especially those that enhance the community's trust of the police--seem well suited to improving investigations effectiveness.

Echoing the importance of decentralization, the Sacramento Police Department explored the ways that community policing will impact the role of detectives (Najera 1995). The author of this report used a nominal group technique, which involved bringing several members of nearby police departments and the community together to speculate on future trends in crime and the criminal justice response. Numerous potential scenarios were identified based on these conjectures and likelihood scores were assigned by the group. Ultimately, this process resulted in three potential

scenarios about crime and justice in the year 2004. What emerged with regard to the impact of community policing on investigations was that decentralization of the investigative role will occur, and that it will greatly facilitate the interchange of information between the community and the police.

This author also collected case study data from four departments in his area that had decentralized investigations units, were involved in community policing and had made changes to the role of their investigators as a result. The types of changes observed that were made based on community policing philosophy included:

- restructuring the investigative role from one of a specialist to generalist;
- assigning the investigators to an area of responsibility that matched the patrol responsibility; and
- promoting free exchange of information between investigators and the community through training, flexibility in hours and use of problem solving techniques.

In 1988 the Houston Police Department held a series of Executive Sessions to explore the integration of investigations into Neighborhood Oriented Policing. In the report from these sessions (Houston Police Department, 1988), three alternative models were proposed for doing this. One involved the development of an Interactive Service Unit in which officers and investigators would work in teams in the specific neighborhoods to which they were assigned. Citizens would be part of this self-managing team. It was a model that built on much that had previously been suggested

in the research literature. With a change of administrations, this idea was dropped in Houston.

More than ten years later, John Eck (1999) lamented the lack of involvement by detectives in problem solving, particularly when they seem such “naturals” for it.

Placing the responsibility largely at the feet of leadership, he concluded:

If investigators will not address the problems of repeat bank robberies, domestic assaults, auto thefts, burglaries, defrauding the elderly, drug places, or any of the many problems they could address, why not get someone else to do it? What really matters to the public is not who solves their problem but that it gets solved....If investigative work is to be the mainstay of policing in the next millennium, investigators will have to address problems.

Comment

Police leaders clearly wish for a more thorough and a more prescriptive literature on the relationship between investigations and community policing and problem solving. Whatever its limitations, the existing literature clearly has been absorbed by the policing executives and managers we met in the course of this study. They are using its findings and ideas in a variety of ways to shape innovative new approaches to the conduct of investigations and the structuring of the investigative function.

III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The research was based on two methodological approaches: a national survey and site visits to agencies identified on the basis of the survey. The written survey was sent to municipal police departments and sheriffs offices in all jurisdictions with populations of more than 50,000 *and* 100 or more sworn officers. These selection criteria were based on the assumption that each agency with these characteristics would be large enough to have an investigative unit consisting of more than a handful of staff. The survey collected descriptive information about both community policing and non-community policing departments, the organization of the investigative function, and the ways in which the investigative organizational structure or function had been modified to accommodate a community policing approach. Based on the survey results, seven agencies were selected for site visits. The site visits confirmed that departments have adopted innovative methods for integrating investigative and patrol operations. The visits also provided considerable insight into the organizational, administrative and logistical problems confronted by detectives.

Research Team

A significant feature of the methodology was the composition of the research team. In addition to the research director and research assistants from the Police Executive Research Forum, the team also consisted of experienced police detectives

and managers from six departments that were in the process of attempting to integrate investigations into community policing. The departments represented in the team included Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina Police Department; Houston, Texas Police Department; Madison, Wisconsin Police Department; St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department; Portland, Oregon Police Department and Sacramento, California Sheriffs Office. These team members were key participants in the project from the first framing of the issues, through questionnaire development, the telephone interviews with representatives of departments that were candidates for site visits, the site visits, the writing of reports and the review of final drafts. Their substantive knowledge was critical to the development of the project. It is not overstatement to say this project could not have been completed without them.

The Survey Population

The survey was mailed in the late fall of 1997 to 483 municipal police departments and 355 sheriffs' offices that served jurisdictions with populations of more than 50,000 and that had 100 or more sworn officers. It was accompanied by a letter from the executive Director of the Police Executive Research Forum, explaining the significance of the study and urging participation. The National Sheriffs Association had reviewed and approved the questionnaire and this information was included in the cover letter for sheriffs. One month after the first mailing, a second copy of the questionnaire was sent to non-responding agencies, along with a letter from the executive director of the Police Executive Research Forum, again requesting their participation.

While it was easy to identify sheriffs offices that met the initial selection criteria, PERF anticipated that several of these agencies had neither patrol nor investigative functions. Rather, in some jurisdictions, the responsibilities of the sheriff's office are limited to certain court functions, maintaining the jail and executing warrants. Unfortunately, we were not able to identify these agencies in advance. Therefore, in the survey packet sent to each sheriffs office, we included a postcard asking the respondent to return the postcard if the agency did not have patrol and or investigative functions. Twenty-six agencies returned postcards indicating that they were ineligible for the survey. Twenty-four other agencies were excluded as we obtained additional information. This reduced the sample population to 305 agencies, of which 197 (64.6%) completed the survey. Although this response rate is high, we would likely have obtained a higher rate if we had been able to identify eligible agencies with greater accuracy. The response rate for municipal agencies was 83.9%. (These rates were accomplished with only one follow-up mailing to agencies that did not respond initially.)

Two members of the research staff had substantial experience with conducting surveys in police agencies; neither had ever experienced the kind of enthusiasm this survey generated among participating agencies. There were numerous phone calls from agencies to make certain they were providing the kind of information that was needed and calls from others to ask for additional time to complete the form. Some

called for a second questionnaire to replace one that had been lost. Many responding departments made the effort to attach many pages of information to supplement what was requested in the questionnaire. All of this, plus the nature of the conversations with agency representatives who contacted researchers, and the high response rates indicted a high level of interest in this topic.

Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire collected descriptive information about the agencies, including number of personnel and size of population served, number of detectives and whether the organization was represented by a bargaining unit. It asked whether community policing had been implemented and, if so, about the nature of the implementation. It asked about the organization of the investigative function and about ways in which the investigative structure or function had been modified to accommodate a community policing approach. If changes had been made to investigations, the date of the change was recorded.

Questionnaires were similar but modified, depending on whether they were sent to municipal or sheriffs agencies. Both forms are provided in Appendix A.

Analysis

Survey data were analyzed to identify those departments that had implemented community policing and had made modifications to investigations to accommodate community policing. Sixty-eight (12.4%) of the departments reported having implemented community policing *and* instituting some major changes in the definition

or structure of the investigative function. To aid site selection, this grouping of 68 departments was reduced to 41 by restricting eligibility to agencies that had at least 30 investigators, and that had implemented major changes at least two years prior to the survey (by 1995). The number of investigators was set at 30 because the research team believed that a smaller number would limit the types of innovations that would be possible, thus restricting what might be learned from site visits. The two year time-frame helped ensure that the agencies had sufficient experience with changes in the investigative function to understand the process' strengths, weaknesses and results.

Site Selection

The research team read each of the forty-one questionnaires and narrowed the candidates for site visits to fifteen. Telephone interviews were conducted with persons at each of these sites and a final selection was made of seven sites that represented innovation and advanced implementation. Site visits protocols were developed and sites were assigned to teams of two (a researcher and a practitioner). Site visits typically lasted two days. Each site visit resulted in a written report that was drafted by one team member and then reviewed and revised by the other. The individual site reports comprise Appendix C.

IV

SURVEY FINDINGS

The survey produced a rich body of data that is available through NIJ's data archives. For the purposes of this project, however, specific items were used to identify the sites to be visited. The findings reported here are limited to those variables used for site identification.

Community Policing Implementation

Almost all (95.8%) of the responding municipal agencies reported that they have implemented or are implementing at least some aspects of community policing, compared with 80.7 percent of the sheriffs offices.

Extent and Nature of Implementation

There was substantial variation in the extent to which responding agencies have implemented community policing, and the differences between the municipal agencies and sheriffs offices were marked. As indicated in Table 1, 52.3 percent of the municipal agencies that reported having implemented community policing indicated in their responses that they were "three-quarters of the way" or "most objectives have been accomplished," compared with 33.9 percent of the corresponding sheriff respondents. Of departments engaged in the community policing process, sheriffs offices were more likely still to be in the planning or early implementation phases. Specifically, as Table 1 indicates, 8.5 percent of the municipal agencies reported that they were in the beginning stages, compared with 21.4 percent of the sheriffs offices.

Table 1. Extent of Implementation of Community Policing (N=547)						
	Municipal		Sheriffs		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Planning	4	1.0	4	2.5	8	1.5
Early Phase	29	7.5	30	18.9	59	10.8
One Quarter	47	12.1	23	14.5	70	12.8
Half Way	83	21.4	38	23.9	121	22.1
Three Quarters	75	19.3	16	10.0	91	16.6
Most Objectives Accomplished	128	33.0	38	23.9	166	30.4
Other	22	5.7	6	3.8	28	5.1
Missing	0	0.0	4	2.5	4	0.7
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

The nature of the community policing approaches is outlined in Table 2. Among the departments that identify themselves as community policing agencies, 67.8 percent say that community policing is "a philosophy that guides most department activities." Municipal departments are more likely to say the entire agency is guided by the philosophy (71.6%) than are sheriffs offices (58.2%). Municipal departments are slightly more likely to report that all personnel are expected to engage in community policing (80.2%) than are sheriffs offices (74.7). And municipal departments are slightly more likely to report that investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing (55.2%) than are sheriffs offices (49.4%).

Redefining the Role of Detectives/Investigators

Table 3 illustrates that, among municipal agencies that have implemented community policing, 14.4 percent indicated that they had made some major changes and 20.1 percent reported that they had made some initial changes in the structure or function of the investigative role. Thus, more than a third of these agencies (34.5%) had implemented changes. Among sheriffs offices, 21.3 percent reported making either initial changes (13.8%) or major changes (7.5%). A small proportion of the municipal agencies (7.0%) and sheriffs offices (6.3%) stated that they were actively planning the redefinition and restructuring. Approximately 17 percent (17.3%) of the municipal agencies and 23.9 percent of sheriffs offices reported that this matter was currently under consideration. About one out of four municipal agencies and sheriffs offices

Table 2. Summary of Responses on Features of Community Policing (n=547)			
Questions	Municipal % (N)	Sheriff % (N)	Total % (N)
Philosophy that guides most department activities	71.6% (278)	58.2% (92)	67.8% (370)
Primarily a program	20.9% (81)	34.8% (55)	24.9% (136)
Implemented only in a section	22.9% (89)	20.9% (33)	22.3% (122)
Specific officers assigned to community policing	58.2% (226)	62.7% (99)	59.5% (325)
Community policing officers assigned to a unit	46.9% (182)	44.3% (70)	46.2% (252)
All officers expected to engage in community policing	74% (287)	70.3% (111)	72.9% (398)
Investigative personnel expected to engage in community policing	55.2% (214)	49.4% (78)	53.5% (292)
All personnel expected to engage in community policing	80.2% (311)	74.7% (118)	78.6% (429)

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

	Municipal		Sheriff		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The matter has <i>not yet been considered</i>	87	22.4	40	25.2	127	23.2
<i>We currently are considering this matter</i>	67	17.3	38	23.9	105	19.2
We are in the process of <i>actively planning</i> the redefinition or restructuring	27	7.0	10	6.3	37	6.8
We have implemented some <i>initial changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	78	20.1	22	13.8	100	18.3
we have implemented some <i>major changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	56	14.4	12	7.5	68	12.4
We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goal	69	17.8	30	18.9	99	18.1
Missing	4	1.0	7	4.4	11	2.0
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

indicated that their organizations had not yet considered redefining the role of detectives/investigators.

It is interesting to note that comparable proportions of the municipal agencies and sheriffs offices (17.8% and 18.9%, respectively) agreed with the statement, "We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goals."

Table 4 reports the current forms of organization of the investigative function in municipal and sheriffs agencies that identify themselves as engaged in community policing. While sheriffs offices are less likely to report having made major changes in the structure or function of investigations, Table 4 indicates that sheriffs offices are more likely to report that:

- investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus/divisions;
- certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and investigators are assigned specific geographic areas;
- most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents; and
- detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area.

As we shall see in the next section, these arrangements are among those that characterize agencies that report having made major changes in the structure or

Table 4. Organization of the Investigative Function in Community Policing Departments			
	Municipal (N=388) % (N)	Sheriffs (N=158) % (N)	Total (N=546) % (N)
Organizational Structure			
Almost all investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau/division	76.8% (298)	69.6% (110)	74.7% (408)
Most investigative functions are located within the patrol division	4.9% (19)	5.7% (9)	5.1% (28)
Investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus/divisions	25.5% (99)	40.5% (64)	29.9% (163)
Location and Assignment			
Most investigative personnel are <i>physically centralized</i>	39.4% (153)	47.5% (75)	41.8% (228)
Most are <i>physically centralized</i> and have <i>citywide</i> responsibilities	47.2% (183)	30.4% (48)	42.3% (231)
Most investigators are <i>physically centralized</i> , but they may work <i>specific geographic areas</i>	24.5% (95)	25.3% (40)	24.7% (135)
A core of investigators is <i>physically centralized</i> , and is responsible for <i>specific types of crimes</i> of a <i>citywide nature</i>	51.3% (199)	41.1% (65)	48.4% (264)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i>	22.2% (86)	26.6% (42)	23.4% (128)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i>	11.6% (45)	23.4% (37)	15% (82)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> , and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i> and <i>specific types of crimes</i>	21.1% (82)	32.9% (52)	24.5% (134)

Specialization			
Most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents	39.4% (153)	50.6% (80)	42.7% (233)
Most detectives/investigators are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes within their area of expertise	52.6% (204)	39.2% (62)	48.7% (266)
Most <i>centralized</i> investigators are specialists, while most <i>decentralized</i> investigators are generalists	14.2% (55)	16.5% (26)	14.8% (81)
Rank			
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers	60.6% (235)	49.4% (78)	57.3% (313)
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers	41% (159)	52.5% (83)	44.3% (242)
Relationship with Patrol			
Patrol officers have <i>no</i> investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report	15.7% (61)	8.9% (14)	13.7% (75)
Patrol officers <i>may</i> have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report	82.2% (319)	89.2% (141)	84.2% (460)
Detectives/investigators work in teams with patrol officers	14.7% (57)	16.5% (26)	15.2% (83)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation	8.5% (33)	10.8% (17)	9.2% (50)
Chain of Command			
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander (e.g., precinct or division commander) who is responsible for <i>patrol</i> operations in a specific geographic area	6.2% (24)	13.3% (21)	8.2% (45)
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area	3.6% (14)	14.6% (23)	6.8% (37)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain of command	17.3% (67)	17.1% (27)	17.2% (94)
All detectives/investigators, regardless of geographic location, report through an investigative chain-of-command	83.8% (325)	74.7% (118)	81.1% (443)

function of investigations. It is likely that the necessity for sheriffs offices to cover large

geographical areas has resulted in the structuring of investigations in ways supportive of community policing even before community policing was adopted as an operational philosophy. As a result, sheriffs offices may have had less need to make major changes in order to support community policing.

The “Models” that Emerged and the Representative Sites

After reading the questionnaires for each of the forty-one eligible agencies (i.e., agencies with more than 30 investigators that made changes at least two years prior to the survey); the research team discussed and categorized various characteristics that could be identified from the survey. The most prominent difference among these forty-one had to do with the physical structure of investigations as reported in Figure 1. Investigators were either physically centralized or physically decentralized. Other important differences included area vs. city-wide responsibility and bifurcated vs. unified chain of command. In a bifurcated chain of command, physically decentralized investigators report through an investigative chain of command while patrol officers report through a patrol chain of command. In a unified chain of command, everyone assigned to the geographic area reports through the area commander. Four models or “clusters of changes,” representing these three factors were identified among the forty-one sites. The four models are:

- Physical centralization of detectives who have citywide responsibilities;
- Physical centralization of detectives; assignment to specific geographic areas;
- Physical decentralization of detectives who report through an investigative chain of command; and

- Physical decentralization of detectives who report through area command.

A fourth factor, identified as generalization vs. specialization of investigative assignments, is represented in the sites selected for visits but is not explicit in the four models set forth in the figure--a decision made solely to simplify the models. It is important to remember as one reads this report that these models may not apply to the entire site. In some jurisdictions, particularly those with large investigative units, various combinations of centralization/decentralization, geographic assignment and chain of command may be used. These types of organizational structures are "mixed models." For example, the Mesa, Arizona Police Department divides investigators into four divisions, only one of which has physically decentralized detectives. The other detectives are physically centralized although many are responsible for specific geographic areas. So, the four models are best viewed as heuristic devices rather than as literal descriptors of the current world of investigations.

The research team then rated the forty-one sites in terms of their "interest" and innovativeness and narrowed the list of site visit candidates to fifteen agencies. Telephone interviews were conducted with persons at each of these sites and a final selection was made of the seven sites listed in Figure 1 that were considered to best represent innovation and advanced implementation.

Figure 1: Structural Models for Seven Selected Sites		
	Structure	Sites Selected

1	Physical centralization of detectives who have citywide responsibilities	No sites selected ¹
2	Physical centralization of detectives; Assignment to specific geographic areas	Arapahoe County Colorado Sheriffs Office ²
3	Physical decentralization of detectives who report through an investigative chain of command	Mesa, Arizona Police Department Sacramento, California Police Department Spokane County, Washington Sheriffs Office
4	Physical decentralization of detectives who report through area command	Arlington, Texas Police Department Boston, Massachusetts Police Department San Diego, California Police Department

¹No site was selected for this model since it is a common structure, involving no changes that might provide new ideas for other agencies.

²Only one department was selected to represent this model because it tended to be less of a "mixed" model; the dominant structural innovation was the key feature. In Model #3 and #4 there tended to be other changes in various combinations with the main structural feature.

V

OBSERVATIONS FROM SITE VISITS

The site visits confirmed that departments have adopted a variety of innovative methods for integrating investigative and patrol operations. The visits expanded the researchers' knowledge about the kinds of changes that have been made. Beyond the structural and procedural changes represented in the four models, additional procedural changes were observed and a group of functional changes also was identified. The visits provided considerable insight into the organizational, administrative and logistical problems confronted by detectives. The changes are discussed below by type of change. Examples are provided from selected sites of changes that may have occurred in other sites, as well.

Structural Changes

Physical Decentralization. The primary structural change involved the physical decentralization of investigators from a central location (typically, police headquarters) to area or district stations where investigators and patrol officers had closer contact with each other and the opportunity to have closer and more frequent contacts with citizens. Physical decentralization was always paired with responsibility for crimes in a geographically specified area of the city or county. With the exception of the Arapahoe County, Colorado Sheriffs Office, all of the visited sites made use of physically decentralized investigators; all of the sites except Arapahoe county retained some

centralized investigators who handled special types of crimes.

Chain of Command. Among the six sites in which at least some investigators have been physically decentralized, there are three in which the decentralized investigators report through an investigative chain of command (Mesa, Arizona; Sacramento, California and Spokane County, Washington) and three in which decentralized investigators report through an area command (Arlington, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts and San Diego, California).

Procedural Changes or Developments

Many sites had not only made structural changes, but had also modified procedures; they were performing investigations differently. These changes or modifications were grouped into seven categories: 1) area responsibility, 2) generalization, 3) teamwork, 4) prioritization of cases, 5) involvement of citizen volunteers in investigations, 6) interagency linkages, and 7) technology. The following sections highlight examples of these changes, as observed during site visits, without including all of the sites that may use these procedures.

Area Responsibility/Geographic Assignment. In all seven of the sites, at least some investigators have responsibility for investigating crimes in a specific geographic area. In most cases these investigators are *physically* decentralized. In the Arapahoe County, Colorado Sheriffs Office, investigators are physically centralized but have responsibility for specific geographic areas and are in close contact with patrol officers who work those areas.

Generalization. Some detectives, whether physically centralized or decentralized, are crime generalists who investigate a wide variety of crimes that occur in their area of responsibility. In all cases, investigators with area responsibility handle property crimes but in many sites (e.g., Arapahoe County, Colorado; Arlington, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts; Mesa, Arizona; San Diego, California), assaults and street robberies are also assigned to area investigators. In one district in San Diego, the street drug unit, too, is assigned to the area commander.

Proponents of generalization contend that criminals tend not to specialize in specific crime types and therefore detectives should not. In the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office, all investigators are generalists. This agency has invested substantial time and financial resources in investigator training, with an emphasis on cross-training for different types of crimes. The investigative personnel interviewed report that the emphasis on generalization coupled with geographic assignments has been very successful. Arapahoe County detectives believe that fewer criminals are “slipping through the cracks” now that detectives are focusing on area crime patterns rather than crime types.

Teamwork (Officers, Citizens, and Agencies). In some agencies, detectives work in either formal or informal teams with officers, citizens, and/or other agencies. In Arlington, Boston, San Diego and Arapahoe County, for example, the teams are formal. Officers and detectives on the “team” may or may not have the same supervisor (i.e., participants may report through different chains of command), but detectives know

“their” patrol officer and officers know “their” detective. The arrangement in Arlington is interesting in that there is an area team sergeant and an investigative sergeant. Both sergeants report to the area commander. The area sergeant directs activities for the whole team; the investigative sergeant functions more as a coach, trainer, facilitator, and subject matter specialist for the investigators. The patrol sergeant and the detective sergeant both attend community meetings. In Spokane County, Washington informal groups of detectives and citizen volunteers have become teams because they work in the same small neighborhood office.

Case Prioritization. The Spokane County Sheriffs Office was the only site visited where detectives are changing their system for prioritizing cases. Property detectives are assigned to neighborhood storefront offices staffed and managed by neighborhood citizen volunteers. The detectives’ goal is to become community-oriented and problem-oriented rather than case-driven. Rather than prioritizing cases based solely on solvability factors, they are attempting to identify neighborhood problems and to give priority to cases related to the underlying problems and community concerns. These detectives read all property crime incident reports for their area and prioritize their own cases. In this way, the detectives develop a more in-depth understanding of crime patterns and trends than if the sergeant screened and prioritized cases. Additionally, in some instances, citizen associates in the storefronts also read the cases and provide second opinions about the problem-relevance of particular complaints.

In this jurisdiction, centralized homicide, sex crime and drug/gang detectives also

prioritize their own cases. This approach allows for a problem orientation that is difficult to achieve when cases are assigned according to solvability factors alone, or by a supervisor who may not be familiar with a neighborhood's particular problems and crime patterns. It must be noted that when the self-assignment system began, property crime detectives tended to take on too many cases and become overloaded—a tendency well-known to officers assigned to neighborhood stations or storefronts. As they became more familiar with this procedure, however, they were better able to manage their caseloads.

Citizen Volunteer Involvement in Investigations. In both Spokane County and San Diego, citizen volunteers assist detectives in investigations. For example, these community members may lift prints from stolen/abandoned automobiles that previously may not have been processed. They may also photograph graffiti or make follow-up calls to victims to inform them of the status of their cases or to seek additional information. Additionally, they may attend community meetings and work on citizen surveys. In Spokane County, citizen volunteers assist some detectives in establishing investigative priorities.

Interagency Linkages. Interagency drug task forces and other collaborative efforts designed to address drug problems are now common in many departments, including the visited sites. However, certain sites have applied this strategy to other crimes as well. The Mesa Police Department provides an excellent example. Two detectives from this department were instrumental in researching and obtaining city

council and grant funding for what became the Center Against Family Violence (CAFV). This unit, operated by the police department, provides an aggressive, proactive, multipronged approach to handling cases involving physical and sexual abuse, domestic violence and, in some instances, elder abuse. Several detectives with expertise in domestic violence investigations and related matters are assigned to this unit. These detectives work closely with civilian victim services personnel who provide immediate, on-site intervention and long-term counseling. As part of this program, the detectives have established strong links with both the city and county prosecutors' offices, private therapeutic programs, area doctors and hospitals, and the state Child Protective Services. Anecdotal and interview data gathered during the site visit suggest that CAFV provides a systematic, humane and effective method for handling these very difficult situations. The cooperative efforts between the police department and the prosecutors have enabled these agencies to develop strong cases resulting in high conviction rates and, in certain cases, substantial prison sentences.

Technology. All of the departments visited are on the brink of major technological advances, many of which were funded by grants from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) of the U.S. Department of Justice. When the new systems are in place, detectives and officers in recipient agencies will have crime analysis capabilities that were previously not available to cash-strapped crime analysis units. In San Diego, for example, all officers and detectives will have laptop computers that facilitate automated field reporting. They will also have access to

geographic information systems (GIS) capabilities that will allow them to conduct their own analyses of the data for their areas. Additionally, many of the problems often associated with decentralization—being outside the information/communications loop, having to file reports at headquarters, not having access to crime analysis data—will be solved. Detectives will be able to retrieve the information they need through the computer, and e-mail will provide for fast and easy communication. Other departments are upgrading their computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems and reconciling and integrating disparate manual and automated databases. The Mesa Police Department is acquiring Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) software for tracking evidence as it is processed through the crime laboratory, the identification unit, and into evidence storage. Arlington, Spokane County and Arapahoe County are also introducing highly sophisticated data entry and retrieval systems.

In the interim, some agencies have made more effective use of currently available technology. In Arapahoe County, voice mail, pagers and cell phones have greatly enhanced communication both between officers and detectives, and among detectives. Both groups indicated that they were more likely to share the “small” pieces of information when they could simply leave a message, rather than having to search out the person they needed to contact.

Functional Changes and Developments

In contrast to procedural developments—detectives conducting investigations in a new or different manner—the term “functional developments” refers to tasks that

detectives may not have undertaken in the past. The site visits revealed a number of functional changes that were made to support community policing. These can be grouped into two often interrelated areas--1) problem solving and 2) community outreach and crime prevention--which, together, represent the core elements of community policing. It should be emphasized that these functional areas may not be new to a police department or a sheriffs office, but they may be new to detectives. Moreover, in some instances, detectives may have assumed responsibilities that had previously been assigned to another specialized unit. While a number of the visited sites have implemented one of these functional changes, three sites were particularly noteworthy: the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office, the Mesa Police Department, and the Spokane County Sheriffs Office.

Problem Solving. In most of the visited sites, the primary problem-solving function is assigned to the patrol division, with detectives expected to assist. In the Spokane County Sheriffs Office, however, detectives have been given the primary organizational responsibility for problem solving. Detectives were assigned this function because the administration believed detectives had the most flexible schedules and the most complete and readily accessible information (all the case reports) about crime problems in any given area. Some property detectives have been decentralized to neighborhood storefronts and are attempting to select cases for investigation using priorities that reflect the problems of greatest concern to the neighborhoods in which they are working.

While detectives in the Arapahoe County Sheriffs Office do not have the primary organizational responsibility for problem solving, the department has developed an innovative approach called the "45 Day Plan" to promote problem solving by investigators. Detectives are encouraged to submit plans to conduct research, investigate an unsolved case, or focus on an identified problem. If the plan is approved by the captain, the detective is freed from his/her regular caseload for up to 45 days to implement the plan. Other detectives assigned to that geographic area will assume the problem solver's caseload for the requisite period of time.

Community Outreach and Crime Prevention. Many police departments and sheriffs offices throughout the country have detectives actively engaged in community outreach, often through attendance at community meetings. The sites visited were no exception. One dramatic example of outreach is the pairing of detectives with citizens in Spokane County's storefront offices, as discussed previously.

Additionally, detectives in several of the project sites are participating in a broad range of crime prevention activities. For example, detectives in the Mesa Police Department have assumed responsibility for a number of "crime free" projects. As part of the Crime Free Housing program, the detectives organize property owners/managers or residents in multi-unit housing and educate them about their roles in preventing crime and quality-of-life problems. Additionally, the detectives provide program participants with training in the principles of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). Interviewees stated that this project's success is reflected in the 70 to

80 percent reduction in calls for service from certain properties. The “crime free” approach provided the framework for the Crime Free Mini-Storage program, designed to address problems of burglary and the existence of drug labs in mini-warehouse (rental storage) units. This program was designed by detectives and signaled the introduction of community-oriented policing principles into the Criminal Investigation Division. Again, detectives trained owners and managers of mini-storage facilities in CPTED principles, and in the first year of the program, burglaries dropped 86 percent. This approach is also reflected in the department’s Crime Free Mini-Warehouse program and the Crime Free Hotel/Motel program.

The Arapahoe County Home Check program is another example of a crime prevention program that focuses on interventions other than arrest, and provides an alternative to placing young offenders in the juvenile justice system. Specifically, the detective deputies have received court authorization to implement the Home Check program for juvenile offenders who are “at risk,” including youths who are suspects in active cases, have active warrants, or are identified as repeat runaways, habitually truant, or “wanna be” gang associates. Detectives make “cold calls” during the evening to the youths’ homes to discuss their problems with them and their families. The detectives may provide referrals to counseling or other social service agencies, or may require that the youth perform community service or make restitution. The detectives also identify the associates of the at-risk youths and visit them as well, informing them that they are known to the sheriffs office and warning them of the probable

consequences of their behavior. This program is designed as a form of “caring intervention,” and interviewees indicated that many parents and targeted youths have been grateful for the contacts and the referrals. Arapahoe County Social Services, County Probation and the district attorney’s office participate with the Sheriffs Office in this collaborative effort. The Sheriffs Office views the program as a successful prevention and intervention effort that has resulted in a reduction in juvenile criminal activity and the number of juveniles arrested.

Community education efforts are often part of crime prevention and community outreach programs. An Arapahoe County detective assigned to a specific neighborhood launched an initiative that combined all of these elements. This neighborhood had school-related traffic problems, and the residents formed a council to lobby for greater assistance from local authorities. The detective attended a council meeting and taught participants the SARA (**S**canning, **A**nalysis, **R**esponse, **A**ssessment) model of problem solving. Following this training, citizens used this model to address their traffic problem, with some technical assistance from the sheriffs office. The detective explained, “We help people change their habits so that the [sheriffs office] is *part* of the solution, not *the* solution. We teach the citizens to do for themselves.” Mesa’s various Crime Free projects are another example of community education used as a central element of the problem-solving process.

Training and Cross-training. This third new “function” has developed in some of the sites to support the problem solving and crime prevention functions. In

decentralized settings in which detectives have specific geographic assignments, an informal training process often evolves whereby detectives and patrol officers train each other. Specifically, detectives can educate or train officers in the types of information they should be collecting to assist in various types of cases, while officers can educate detectives about the assortment of crime problems, suspects, and victims in their area. An interesting variation on this theme is provided by Spokane County, where a neighborhood prosecutor and a neighborhood detective share the same office and exchange mutually beneficial information about evidence retrieval, evidentiary standards and case-building techniques.

As another example, when the detectives in Arapahoe County became generalists in 1992, they were initially cross-trained, and property investigators were then paired with persons investigators for on-the-job training. Moreover, all investigators receive training in community policing and problem solving.

VI

CONCLUSIONS

In considering these conclusions, it is important to bear in mind that this study was descriptive in nature and did not attempt to conduct an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of any of the changes observed. Instead, the objective was to describe innovative approaches to the structural, procedural and functional aspects of the investigative process that appeared to be effective in the seven sites included in the research.

Structural Changes

Physical Decentralization. There are things lost and things gained with physical decentralization. Physical decentralization enhances the advantages of the procedural change of geographic assignment by promoting a sense of "turf" and proprietorship. It provides the opportunity for in-depth knowledge of crime patterns, local suspects, and "good people" in the community who may assist in the investigative process. It also contributes to a sense of shared ownership on the part of patrol officers and detectives, which should increase levels of cooperation and facilitate team-building. Detectives, like patrol officers, may feel greater satisfaction in seeing their efforts contribute to the welfare of an area with which they identify.

But these advantages are not cost-free. Physically decentralized detectives may feel isolated at an outpost, separated from the mainstream of detective work, especially if they perceive their prior success as dependent on close interpersonal communication

with other detectives. They almost surely will lose some ease of within-group communication. There is good reason to expect that this loss of peer information will be offset by other sources of information, including a detective's increased familiarity with an area, its problems, its residents, its resources, and its trouble-makers. The detective will also benefit from increased contact with patrol officers, community members and other service providers in the geographic area of responsibility. These new contacts do not happen overnight, however, and until they are established, the newly decentralized detectives will probably feel that their resources are diminished.

Decentralized detectives may also need to drive long distances to deliver routine reports to a central office, attend meetings or line-ups, and obtain crime analysis data that would be more immediately available if they were at headquarters. Some believe that they are out of the "information loop," or "out of sight, out of mind." Interviewees indicated that they may miss out on training opportunities, including the opportunity to learn from more experienced colleagues. They may miss opportunities to participate in larger scale investigations that may aid their individual investigations and professional development. And they fear that citizens will suffer if detectives lose or fail to see information about perpetrators who range across district boundaries

Computer technology plays a major role in the loss/gain equation for decentralization, and will play an even greater role in the near future. Almost all of the departments visited are in the process of installing powerful information and communication systems that will give all personnel—patrol officers and detectives,

centralized or decentralized—astonishingly greater and faster access to information and to each other. Most detectives have not even begun to envision the potential of these systems. Information about career criminals involved in a variety of criminal activities and operating across district boundaries will not be lost. It will become easier for certain analysts to be assigned the responsibility of analyzing these criminals' movements. Until such systems are in place, however, decentralized detectives who must invest substantial travel time to do their work may feel they are wasting time they could be spending on cases, or may fear they are losing valuable information. Are these costs offset by ready access to patrol officers and local information? It probably depends on the department. But it is almost certain that new technologies will soon minimize these physical location problems in many departments.

In very low-tech settings, the problem of transferring reports between sites can be addressed by assigning couriers (citizen volunteers, perhaps) who make regular runs between department facilities. If a department does choose to physically decentralize before implementing new information and communication technology, managers need to anticipate the burdens of physical separation and devise ways to address these problems.

Chain of Command. Among departments with geographic assignment and/or physical decentralization, some have a separate chain of command for investigators, while others have a unified, area-based chain of command through which both patrol and investigative personnel report. The disadvantage of a bifurcated or dual chain of

command is the difficulty it poses for developing unified objectives for a geographic area. In one department, decentralized detectives were on guard against the area commander using them for "his purposes." Clearly they felt conflicted about which boss to serve. The possible disadvantage of a unified chain of command is that investigators may be left on their own, without a supervisor who has had investigative experience. Arlington appears to have solved this problem by using investigative sergeants as facilitators, coaches, trainers and content specialists for investigators. The area (or patrol) sergeant may have more to say about *what* gets done by the team; the investigative sergeant helps investigators do the job better.

Procedural Changes and Developments

Degrees of Decentralization. In departments in which some detectives have been physically decentralized and/or given geographic assignments, the crimes most commonly associated with these structural arrangements are property crimes, although this varied across the departments in the survey and site studies. Arapahoe County has assigned all crimes geographically; some have geographically assigned and/or physically decentralized most crimes, and others have geographically assigned and/or physically decentralized only property crimes. The crime investigation types that are most commonly centralized are homicides, robberies, sex crimes, juvenile crimes, and fraud.

Sex crimes seem to pose the greatest challenge for geographic assignments. One department reported that centralization of sex crime investigations is required by state statute. Juvenile crimes pose similar issues.

Degrees of Generalization. In most of the sites, investigators assigned to geographic areas were area specialists and crime generalists. The “degree” of generalization depended on the agency; all except Arapahoe County still retain a group of centralized specialists, although the crimes defined as “special” vary across agencies.

Interviews during site visits left the strong impression that generalist detectives enjoy being generalists—not only for the variety this approach brings to their work, but also for the sense it gives of providing a wide range of service to the community. They also tend to believe that few of the criminals operating in their districts are specialists; they see them as opportunists willing to commit a variety of crimes. The few complaints raised about the generalist approach tended to come from specialized investigators who may have felt the need to champion and protect the value of their special roles. For example, some centralized specialists suspected that generalists, if given a choice, would prefer to spend their time on the more exciting personal crimes to the neglect of property crimes. We heard of no data to support or refute this argument but, certainly, good supervision at the area level could control this tendency if it were to develop.

Functional Changes and Developments

The survey data suggest that, to date, most efforts to integrate investigations into a community policing approach have involved changes that are physical (decentralization) or procedural (geographic responsibility). Mesa, Spokane County, and Arapahoe County were selected for site visits largely because they reported

changes in the functions of at least some detectives, but they are exceptions rather than the rule. Most other agencies have not yet explored functional changes, but it seems likely that more such innovations may result from physical and procedural changes. As detectives become more closely identified with small areas and begin to work in teams with officers who are expected to be community-oriented problem solvers, they may come to see for themselves the potential for broader functions. This appears to have happened in Mesa and Arapahoe Counties. The nontraditional activities that detectives have undertaken resulted from detectives being in a better position to see the needs and to know the needy.

Training. Detectives and investigators need to receive training in the principles, strategies and tactics of problem solving and community policing if they are expected to incorporate these practices into the investigative process. They need information not only about the operations of detective units in other jurisdictions, but also about investigative and programmatic approaches to address specific problems such as domestic violence, gangs and quality-of-life problems.¹ Although training may be expensive, labor intensive and time consuming, the benefits derived may be substantial and greatly enhance an agency's capacity to address community concerns.

Finally, Is There One Best Model?

¹ A substantial amount of literature containing practical information about programs in these areas is available free of charge from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (www.ncjrs.org) sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice. Additionally, detectives/investigators may obtain a great deal of practical information from site visits to other agencies or through peer-exchange programs.

Is there one best model? Probably not. This exploratory research was not intended to provide an evaluation of whether one model is preferable to another. However, based on the site visits, the approach that combines physical decentralization and area responsibility with reporting through an area command appears to be an especially strong one. It promotes a coordinated approach at the local level (e.g., district, precinct), investigator knowledge of the territory, consistency and continuity in case and problem priorities, and information sharing and teamwork between and among investigators and patrol officers. The sense of identification with an area and its people may heighten a detective's motivation. Still, detectives may perceive a disadvantage to this model if they feel that physical and/or reporting separation places them outside the information loop and perhaps deprives them of equal consideration for choice assignments and other rewards within the investigative division.

With regard to specialization, the "detective as generalist" model has the advantage of broadening an investigator's knowledge of a geographic area and may also provide a more varied and interesting workload for many investigators. In Arapahoe County, generalization was also a way of equalizing the workload between persons detectives and property detectives. Nevertheless, the value of generalization may depend on the jurisdiction's volume, type and geographic distribution of crimes, and whether an agency has the financial and personnel resources for the necessary cross-training. The "detective as generalist" model need not be a "pure" model; several departments have given area-specific investigators broad general investigative

responsibility while retaining a group of centralized detectives who are specialists in certain types of crimes.

In general, it appears that the value of any of these approaches depends on the department's characteristics, its goals, and the community it serves. In a small community, where physical decentralization may not seem necessary to ensure accountability and quality service, detectives might remain physically centralized but be given area responsibility and a unified chain of command through an area commander. A bifurcated chain of command might work *if the separate commands are in accord*, as appears to be the case in Arapahoe County, Colorado. Some cities are geographically large; therefore, physical decentralization of all basic police services may be appropriate. In these settings, decisions about the chain of command issue should probably be based on a review of the department's goals. If decentralization of investigators is done for the primary purpose of making them more effective at what they have always done (i.e., the investigation of crimes), then two chains of command may not be dysfunctional. Detectives can associate more easily with officers, citizens and others who are knowledgeable about the community, thereby expanding sources of information—all within the traditional investigative chain of command.² If the primary reason for decentralizing detectives is to create an area-based service team that is

² In one site, geographically decentralized detectives who reported through the investigative chain of command appeared to be confused and frustrated by lack of clear direction. They felt the need to "protect" themselves from what they considered the area commander's inappropriate expectations.

working together to prevent crimes, solve crimes, and provide both a better and broader police service, then it seems critical to have an area commander who has control over all of his or her resources. Unity of purpose and effort is difficult to achieve within the context of a bifurcated chain of command.

Resistance to Change

The kinds of changes observed are not made easily. However, it is apparent that not all detectives are resistant to change, and many may be less resistant than some police chiefs and sheriffs expect. Specifically, the research indicates that some detectives not only welcome changes in structures, procedures, and functions, but may even initiate changes themselves to address perceived departmental deficiencies in responses to certain crime and quality-of-life problems. Moreover, while change in some agencies was met initially with skepticism or resistance, many detectives not only adjusted, but several agreed that they did not want to go back to the traditional approach. Thus, detectives are willing to change and, when provided with the opportunity (or mandate) to modify procedures or functions, they will adapt.

Change is easier, of course, when personnel are prepared for it and are given a rationale for the new approaches. In one of the most graceful transitions in this study, Arapahoe County detectives initially were prepared by being given articles to read about community policing and problem solving. They were engaged in this reading while

officers in the patrol division were actively involved in the transition. Detectives began to wonder where they would fit into the overall community policing picture so that, by the time organizational attention was turned to them, they were unsurprised and were intellectually prepared for change. This preliminary preparation was then strongly reinforced with formal training in both community policing and problem solving.³ Careful preparation might help alleviate the stresses and strains of change. In many departments, patrol officers have been included in the process for planning the transition to community policing. It would be a good idea to include detectives in this same process. If, as is the case in many departments, patrol has made the move to community policing before the decision has been made to incorporate investigations, detectives can be part of this second planning process. It could be beneficial, if budget allows, to have some detectives visit one or more of the sites included in this study.

³ In contrast, in another department (not one of the sites visited), several months after decentralization, detectives were still asking with genuine concern, "But what do you want us to do differently?" The change was made because department leaders believed that decentralization provided structural support for community policing. Many detectives in this department supported the idea of decentralization for patrol, but had not been given a sufficient rationale for their own decentralization. As they moved into the change, they could only imagine the disadvantages, not the advantages, for their job performance.

VII

RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

This project described changes that, in 1997, were being made by many departments in their efforts to integrate investigations into community policing approaches. It scratched the surface, even in terms of description, and it involved no evaluation—either longitudinal or comparative--of these approaches. What remains is a field that is ripe for additional research.

The State of Investigations

The survey on which this project was based was conducted at the end of 1997. While 68 responding agencies indicated at that time that they had “implemented some major changes in the definition or structure of investigations,” another 242 reported that they were considering the matter, were in the process of actively planning redefinition of restructuring, or had made some initial changes. It is recommended that at least these agencies be re-surveyed to determine the types and the extent of change that have occurred since the original survey was conducted.

If site visits were to constitute a part of this new project, it is recommended that the seven sites in this study be included for followup visits. None that we visited would have characterized their transition as complete. It would be valuable to see how far, and in what directions, they have moved since the original research was done and to determine whether modifications have been made to the initial developments.

Collecting New Types of Information

The research team for this project regretted not having asked in the survey questionnaire whether performance evaluation for investigators had been re-designed to reflect the changes that had been implemented. This question was asked of the seven visited sites and no new evaluations were found, but that does not mean there are no new ones in place among agencies that were not selected for site visits.

Developing Performance Evaluations to Reflect the Changes

It is recommended that a project be developed to focus on the issue of performance evaluations for investigators working in a community policing context. Investigators at some of the sites (especially Arapahoe County) expressed the desire to have such new measures and indicated that they were working among themselves to identify the dimensions of such evaluations. This is a widespread need for investigations—whether traditional or rooted in community policing—and a developmental project could make an important contribution to the field.

Evaluating the New Approaches

Even in the absence of new types of evaluations, it would be useful to evaluate the models identified in this project (and perhaps others that might emerge in a replication of the survey) in terms of traditional measures of investigative performance (e.g., crime rates, arrests, case closures, time to closure, convictions). Within sites and over time, these rates should be compared for property and persons crimes to see whether the new deployment strategies are resulting in differential handling of cases. At

the same time, some measures of the quality of cases should be incorporated into this research, including the number of informants identified and the amount of information provided about suspects. In jurisdictions in which detectives are working on prevention and alternatives to arrests, it would be reasonable to expect that arrest rates would decline over time and explanations should be provided for these changes.

Surveys should be conducted in selected sites to determine levels of victim satisfaction with the new approaches. These could be especially interesting in communities in which some areas already are being served by physically decentralized investigators while other areas continue to be served by centralized investigators until additional decentralized facilities can be constructed.

Personnel surveys could be conducted to assess patrol officer and detective responses to the changes.

Problem Solving Among Investigators

Much more attention could be given to determining the extent and nature of the involvement of detectives in problem solving than was possible in this project. John Eck is right: detectives are logical candidates for problem solving—a position that the Spokane County Sheriffs Office has formally adopted. The physically decentralized team-based approaches would seem especially supportive of problem solving and it would be important to know whether problem solving is, indeed, more prominent in these approaches.

The Impact of Technology

All of the visited sites and undoubtedly many others represented in the survey were just embarking on major technological developments of their information and communication systems at the time of this project. It would be valuable to know the ways in which, and the extent to which, these new developments have impacted the various approaches to investigations outlined in this report. It was too early in the implementation of the technological upgrades to make such a determination in 1998 and 1999.

High Levels of Interest

There is no lack of topics to be explored in this arena and certainly no lack of interest among practitioners. This research team has never worked on a project that has generated so many inquiries and requests for information from police and sheriffs agencies in this country and abroad. There have been as many questions raised as answered in the current project and the next generation of research could provide significant information about these important issues that are of great interest to police managers.

References

- Eck, John E. (1983). *Solving Crimes: The Investigation of Burglary and Robbery*, Washington, D.C., Police Executive Research Forum.
- Eck, John E. (1979). *Managing Case Assignments: The Burglary Investigation Decision Model Replication*, Washington, D.C., Police Executive Research Forum.
- Forst, Brian. (1998). Problem-Oriented Criminal Investigations. In *Problem Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work*, edited by T.O. Shelley and A. Grant. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Greenberg, Ilene and Robert Wasserman. (1979). *Managing Criminal Investigations*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance and Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Greenwood, Peter W. and Joan Petersilia. (1975). *The Criminal Investigation Process*, Santa Monica, California, The Rand Corporation.
- Horvath, Frank, Bonnie Bucqueroux, and Robert Meesig. (1997). *Community Policing and the Police Criminal Investigation Process*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Louisville, KY.
- Masterson, Michael F. 1995. *From Polarization to Partnership: Realigning the Investigative Function to Serve Neighborhood Needs*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Najera, Albert (1995). *What Will be the Impact of Community Policing on Criminal Investigations in a Large Police Department by the Year 2004?* State of California, Department of Justice, Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Sacramento, CA.
- Oettmeier, Timothy N. and William H. Bieck. (1988). "History of Criminal Investigations," Chapter 2 in *Integrating Investigative Operations Through Neighborhood Oriented Policing*. Houston: Houston Police Department.
- Silver, Isidore (1968). *The Challenge of Crime in A Free Society—A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice*. New York, New York, An Avon Book.

APPENDIX A:

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Questionnaire for Municipal Police Departments

Questionnaire for Sheriffs Offices

I. AGENCY INFORMATION

Department: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Name of Chief Executive Officer: _____

Name of Person Completing This Questionnaire: _____

Title and Assignment: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____ E-mail: _____

Residential Population of Jurisdiction: _____

Number of Sworn Personnel: _____ Number of Civilian Personnel: _____

Number Full-Time Sworn: _____ Number Full-Time Civilian: _____

Number Part-Time Sworn: _____ Number Part-Time Civilian: _____

Are sworn personnel represented by a union or another organization authorized to bargain or negotiate labor contracts?

- _____ Yes
- _____ No

Is your agency accredited?

- _____ Yes
- _____ No

II. COMMUNITY POLICING

This section contains eight questions about whether and the extent to which your agency has implemented a community policing approach to the delivery of services.

1. Has your department implemented a community policing approach to the delivery of services?

_____ Yes

_____ No **(If your answer is "No," please skip to Question 9.)**

2. Community policing has been implemented in a variety of ways around the country. Which of the following features describe community policing as it is currently structured in your agency? **Please review this list and then check all items that apply.**

_____ A philosophy that guides most of the agency's policies, management practices and operations.

_____ It is primarily a program that affects only some of the agency's personnel and practices.

_____ Community policing has been implemented in only a section (or certain sections) of the city or in only a specific setting(s) (e.g., public housing, an experimental district, or the commercial district).

_____ Specific officers are assigned to perform community policing (e.g., those that have the designation of community policing officers or neighborhood service officers).

_____ Community policing officers are assigned to a unit, special detail or team.

_____ All patrol officers are expected to engage in community policing activities.

_____ Investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities.

_____ All department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

_____ Other. **Please specify:** _____

3. Community policing is implemented in many different ways. **Please add anything that helps describe the nature of community policing in your agency. You may enclose documents or other materials to supplement your description.**

4. How far into the implementation process is your organization?

We realize that implementation may be a multi-year, multi-faceted process, and that it may be difficult to determine exactly where your agency is in its transition. Therefore, please answer this question in terms of how much progress you believe your agency has made in achieving its major objectives. **Please review the following list, then check the one item that best describes your agency's progress to this point.**

- _____ (1) Planning stage **(Please skip to Question 9.)**
- _____ (2) Early phases of implementation (e.g., Just getting started, but some changes in the day-to-day operations are being made.)
- _____ (3) About one-fourth of the way toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (4) About halfway toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (5) About three-quarters of the way toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (6) Most major objectives have been accomplished.
- _____ (7) Other. Please specify:

5. In what year did your organization begin the implementation process?

6. Approximately how many sworn personnel (including supervisors) have assignments that specifically include community policing activities?
_____ Sworn Personnel
7. Is someone in your agency specifically responsible for overseeing community policing activities or implementation?
_____ Yes
_____ No **(If your answer is "No," please skip to Question 9.)**
8. What is the rank and title of the person(s) responsible for overseeing community policing in your agency? (e.g., Assistant Chief in Charge of Patrol, all area Captains)

Please attach a copy of the organizational chart for your agency, if it is readily available.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION

Questions 9 and 10 apply to all agencies, regardless of whether they have implemented community policing. **When responding to these questions, please include supervisors and managers, but exclude forensic personnel and internal affairs investigators.**

9. At present, approximately how many sworn personnel are assigned specifically to investigative/detective functions?

_____ Sworn Personnel

10. The investigative function can be structured in many ways. **Please review the following list, then check all items that describe the organization of the investigative function in your agency.**

Organizational Structure

_____ Almost all investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau/division of the agency.

_____ Most investigative functions are located in the patrol bureau/division of the agency.

_____ Investigative functions are shared between the patrol bureau/division and the investigative bureau/division.

Location and Assignment

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same physical facility).

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same physical facility) and have citywide investigative responsibilities.

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same facility), but they may work specific geographic areas.

_____ A core of detectives/investigators are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same facility) and are responsible for specific types of crimes of a citywide nature. **Please specify crime types (e.g., fraud):** _____

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized.

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives/investigators are assigned specific geographic areas to work.

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives/investigators are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes on which to work. **Please specify crime types (e.g., burglary):**

Specialization

_____ Most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents.

_____ Most detectives/investigators are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes within their area of expertise.

_____ Most centralized detectives/investigators are specialists while most decentralized detectives/investigators are generalists.

Rank

_____ Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

_____ Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers. Please specify rank:

Relationship With Patrol

- _____ Patrol officers have no investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report.
- _____ Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report.
- _____ Detectives/investigators work in teams with patrol officers.
- _____ Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation.

Chain-of Command

- _____ Detectives/investigators report to an area commander (e.g., precinct or division commander) who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area.
- _____ Detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area.
- _____ Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain-of-command.
- _____ All detectives/investigators, regardless of geographic location, report through an investigative chain-of-command.

11. The investigative function is defined and operationalized in many different ways across the country. We welcome any information that will help us understand the organization and structure of investigations in your agency. Please use the following space to provide us with any additional information. An organizational chart reflecting the investigative function would be particularly useful to us, ***if it is readily available***. Any other descriptive material is also welcome.

Note: If your agency has not implemented a community policing approach, please skip now to Question 15. If your agency has adopted a community policing approach, please proceed to the next section of the questionnaire.

IV. INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT

12. Since your agency implemented a community policing approach, has consideration been given to redefining the role of detectives/investigators or to restructuring the investigative function? **Please review all the following responses and then check the one response that best represents your agency's position on this matter.**

- _____ (1) This matter has not yet been considered.*
- _____ (2) We currently are considering this matter.*
- _____ (3) We are in the process of actively planning the redefinition or restructuring.*
- _____ (4) We have implemented some initial changes in the definition or structure of the function.**
- _____ (5) We have implemented some major changes in the definition or structure of the function.**
- _____ (6) We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goals.* **Please explain:** _____

Notes:

- **If you selected response 1, 2, 3 or 6, please skip to Question 15.**
- ** **If you selected response 4 or 5, please proceed to Question 13.**

13. When were these changes first implemented?
_____ **(Please specify year)**

14. Please use the following space to provide us with any additional information about the redefinition or restructuring of the investigative function in your agency. You may attach any documents, including an organizational chart, that may be of use to us in understanding the conduct of investigations in your agency.

15. **Comment (Optional):** Please use the following space to provide any additional information about your agency that may be of use in describing its philosophy and operations.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

I. AGENCY INFORMATION

Sheriff's Department/Sheriff's Office: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Name of Chief Executive Officer: _____

Name of Person Completing This Questionnaire: _____

Title and Assignment: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____ E-mail: _____

Residential Population of Jurisdiction: _____

Square Miles in Jurisdiction: _____

Number Sworn Personnel: _____ Number Civilian Personnel: _____

Number Full-Time Sworn: _____ Number Full-Time Civilian: _____

Number Part-Time Sworn: _____ Number Part-Time Civilian: _____

Number Auxillary Personnel: _____ Number Rescue Personnel: _____

Are sworn personnel represented by a union or another organization authorized to bargain or negotiate labor contracts?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Is your agency accredited?

_____ Yes
_____ No

II. COMMUNITY POLICING

This section contains eight questions about whether and the extent to which your agency has implemented a community policing approach to the delivery of services.

1. Has your agency implemented a community policing approach to the delivery of services?

_____ Yes

_____ No **(If your answer is "No," please skip to Question 9.)**

2. Community policing has been implemented in a variety of ways around the country. Which of the following features describe community policing as it is currently structured in your agency? **Please review this list and then check all items that apply.**

_____ A philosophy that guides most of the agency's policies, management practices and operations.

_____ It is primarily a program that affects only some of the agency's personnel and practices.

_____ Community policing has been implemented in only a section (or certain sections) of the city or in only a specific setting(s) (e.g., public housing, an experimental district, or the commercial district).

_____ Specific officers/deputies are assigned to perform community policing (e.g., those that have the designation of community policing officers/deputies or neighborhood service officers/deputies).

_____ Community policing officers/deputies are assigned to a unit, special detail or team.

_____ All patrol officers/deputies are expected to engage in community policing activities.

_____ Investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities.

_____ All agency employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

_____ Other. Please specify: _____

3. Community policing is implemented in many different ways. **Please add anything that helps describe the nature of community policing in your agency. You may enclose documents or other materials to supplement your description.**

4. How far into the implementation process is your organization?

We realize that implementation may be a multi-year, multi-faceted process, and that it may be difficult to determine exactly where your agency is in its transition. Therefore, please answer this question in terms of how much progress you believe your agency has made in achieving its major objectives. **Please review the following list, then check the one item that best describes your agency's progress to this point.**

- _____ (1) Planning stage **(Please skip to Question 9.)**
- _____ (2) Early phases of implementation (e.g., Just getting started, but some changes in the day-to-day operations are being made.)
- _____ (3) About one-fourth of the way toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (4) About halfway toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (5) About three-quarters of the way toward the accomplishment of major objectives.
- _____ (6) Most major objectives have been accomplished.
- _____ (7) Other. **Please specify:** _____
-
-

5. In what year did your organization begin the implementation process?

6. Approximately how many sworn personnel (including supervisors) have assignments that specifically include community policing activities?
_____ Sworn Personnel
7. Is someone in your agency specifically responsible for overseeing community policing activities or implementation?
_____ Yes
_____ No **(If your answer is "No," please skip to Question 9.)**
8. What is the rank and title of the person(s) responsible for overseeing community policing in your agency? (e.g., Assistant Chief in Charge of Patrol, all area Captains)

Please attach a copy of the organizational chart for your agency, *if it is readily available.*

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION

Questions 9 and 10 apply to all agencies, regardless of whether they have implemented community policing. **When responding to these questions, please include supervisors and managers, but exclude forensic personnel and internal affairs investigators.**

9. At present, approximately how many sworn personnel are assigned specifically to investigative/detective functions?

_____ Sworn Personnel

10. The investigative function can be structured in many ways. **Please review the following list, then check all items that describe the organization of the investigative function in your agency.**

Organizational Structure

_____ Almost all investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau/division/section of the agency.

_____ Most investigative functions are located in the patrol bureau/division/section of the agency.

_____ Investigative functions are shared between the patrol bureau/division/section and the investigative bureau/division/section.

Location and Assignment

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same physical facility).

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same physical facility) and have citywide investigative responsibilities.

_____ Most investigative personnel are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same facility), but they may work specific geographic areas.

_____ A core of detectives/investigators are physically centralized (e.g., they are housed in the same facility) and are responsible for specific types of crimes of a citywide nature. **Please specify crime types (e.g., fraud):** _____

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized.

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives/investigators are assigned specific geographic areas to work.

_____ Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives/investigators are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes on which to work. **Please specify crime types (e.g., burglary):** _____

Specialization

_____ Most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents.

_____ Most detectives/investigators are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes within their area of expertise.

_____ Most centralized detectives/investigators are specialists while most decentralized detectives/investigators are generalists.

Rank

_____ Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers/deputies.

_____ Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers/deputies.
Please specify rank: _____

Relationship With Patrol

- _____ Patrol officers/deputies have no investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report.
- _____ Patrol officers/deputies may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report.
- _____ Detectives/investigators work in teams with patrol officers/deputies.
- _____ Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation.

Chain-of Command

- _____ Detectives/investigators report to an area commander (e.g., precinct or division/section commander) who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area.
- _____ Detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area.
- _____ Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain-of-command.
- _____ All detectives/investigators, regardless of geographic location, report through an investigative chain-of-command.

11. The investigative function is defined and operationalized in many different ways across the country. We welcome any information that will help us understand the organization and structure of investigations in your agency. Please use the following space to provide us with any additional information. An organizational chart reflecting the investigative function would be particularly useful to us, ***if it is readily available***. Any other descriptive material is also welcome.

Note: If your agency has not implemented a community policing approach, please skip now to Question 15. If your agency has adopted a community policing approach, please proceed to the next section of the questionnaire.

IV. INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT

12. Since your agency implemented a community policing approach, has consideration been given to redefining the role of detectives/investigators or to restructuring the investigative function? **Please review all the following responses and then check the one response that best represents your agency's position on this matter.**

- _____ (1) This matter has not yet been considered.*
- _____ (2) We currently are considering this matter.*
- _____ (3) We are in the process of actively planning the redefinition or restructuring.*
- _____ (4) We have implemented some initial changes in the definition or structure of the function.**
- _____ (5) We have implemented some major changes in the definition or structure of the function.**
- _____ (6) We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goals.

*** Please explain:** _____

Notes:

*** If you selected response 1, 2, 3 or 6, please skip to Question 15.**

**** If you selected response 4 or 5, please proceed to Question 13.**

13. When were these changes first implemented?
_____ **(Please specify year)**

14. Please use the following space to provide us with any additional information about the redefinition or restructuring of the investigative function in your agency. You may attach any documents, including an organizational chart, that may be of use to us in understanding the conduct of investigations in your agency.

6. **Comment (Optional):** Please use the following space to provide any additional information about your agency that may be of use in describing its philosophy and operations.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY SUMMARIES FOR FORTY-ONE SITES ELIGIBLE FOR SITE VISITS

The following department summaries were developed from the national survey conducted in the fall of 1997. The information on the summaries, including the name of the agency head and contact person are the ones that were valid at the time of the survey.

The survey was administered to police and sheriffs departments that serve populations of 50,000 or more and have at least 100 sworn personnel. They have at least 30 investigators in the organization. At the time of the survey, these agencies reported having made organizational changes to integrate investigations into their community policing approach at least two years prior to the survey.

ALBUQUERQUE (NM) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	420,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	889
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	372
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	All
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	211
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Emphasis is on problem solving through partnerships with the community.

About ½ of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, sex crimes, white collar, crimes against children, domestic abuse, narcotics, vice) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives work specific types of crime (burglary, auto theft, aggravated assault/battery, larceny) in specific geographic areas. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Joseph M. Polisar

CONTACT: Lieutenant Gene Halliburton
Juvenile Section Commander
PH: 505/761-4060
FAX: 505/761-4058

ARAPAHOE COUNTY (CO) SHERIFF'S OFFICE

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	135,000 (service pop.)
SQUARE MILES IN JURISDICTION:	640
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	365
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	165
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	313
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	31
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1993)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"Patrol officers are assigned to permanent geographic districts for two years at a time, and the same patrol shift for a year at a time. Investigators are assigned to a geographic area and work all types of case assignments. Investigators and patrol deputies assigned to the same geographic areas have scheduled meetings to exchange information and problem solve." (Also several interesting programs.)

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1993)

Investigations are located in investigations division. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. A core of centralized detectives is responsible for fraud and child abuse on county wide basis. Most detectives are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents. All detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol deputies.

"Investigators are generalists who work all types of cases, whereas before they worked either property or persons crimes. They are assigned to work cases by geographic area. The concept of community oriented investigating fits with this agency's overall proactive stance on community oriented policing. The idea of assigning investigators to work all types of cases in their assigned geographic areas, we think expands the investigator knowledge and abilities and creates professional growth. Assignment by geographic area promotes ownership in an area and accountability."

CEO: Sheriff Patrick J. Sullivan, Jr.

CONTACT: Phil Spence
Captain, Investigations Division
PH: 303/795-4960 FAX: 303/794-8721 E-mail: Sullivan@csn.net

ARLINGTON (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	288,592
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	477
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	156
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	All
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	85
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1985)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Emphasis is on problem solving through partnerships with the community.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1996)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, domestic crimes, sex crimes, economic crimes, auto theft, juvenile crimes) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives work specific geographic areas. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation and report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief David M. Kunkle

CONTACT: Deputy Chief A. J. Key
Investigations Division
PH: 817/459-5621
FAX: 817/459-5722

BALTIMORE COUNTY (MD) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	714,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,700
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	586
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	824, including 80 Community Outreach Officers)
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	255 (24 to precincts)
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented n.d.)

Agency-wide philosophy. Eighty Community Outreach Officers work full-time on community policing. All patrol personnel (no mention of detectives) are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Each of nine patrol precincts contains a Community Outreach Unit which focuses on community policing/problem solving and is not driven by calls. However, all patrol officers are trained in community policing and are encouraged (and evaluated) on their involvement in problem solving.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

There is a centralized detective division (CID). Most of its functions are physically located at headquarters; however, a few operations are located at satellite facilities due mainly to lack of space. All of CID's functions come under a single command. CID detectives are specialists.

Each of the nine patrol precincts has an Investigative Services Unit under the command of the precinct commander. These detectives are generalists. They respond to the current crime problems/trends in the respective precinct, regardless of type of crime. Typically, they focus on drugs, burglaries and street robberies. Precinct detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area.

Detectives have a pay rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Terrence B. Sheridan

CONTACT: Lt. Kirk Higdon
PH: 410/887-2201
FAX: 410/887-4958
E-mail: issd@access.digex.net

BOSTON (MA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	572,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	2,236
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	797
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	(No response but previously indicated "all.")
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	347
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol (11 substations) and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented n.d.)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"The Boston Police Department is totally committed to the philosophy of 'Neighborhood Policing.' The operational principles are to form partnerships with communities, solve problems with the help of communities, and prevention programs. The goals are building neighborhoods without fear through training, use of technology, and use of our most valuable resource--our people."

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

Most investigative functions are located in the patrol bureau. Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, sexual assault, banks, domestic violence, etc.) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers. The Boston Police Department uses "Detective Case Management" software.

CEO: Police Commissioner Paul F. Evans

CONTACT: Donald L. Devine
Superintendent, Chief, Bureau of Investigative Services
PH: 617/343-4497
FAX: 617/343-4363

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG (NC) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	596,875
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,386
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	422
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	1,386
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	197 (24 decentralized)
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and detectives
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

The P.D. has undertaken a business process reengineering project intended to facilitate the full implementation of community problem oriented policing.

About ½ of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. A core of detectives are physically centralized and are responsible for specific types of crimes of a citywide nature (murder, serious assault with a deadly weapon, arson, fraud). Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned to specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes (storebreaking, housebreaking, larceny, strong arm robbery w/o serious injury). Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond initial report. Decentralized detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Others report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

They are in process of redesigning investigations to fit COP.

CEO: Police Chief Dennis E. Nowicki

CONTACT: Captain Maurice C. Keith
Captain, Administrative Assistant
PH: 704/336-8395
FAX: 704/336-5714
e-mail: pdmck@mail.charmeck.nc.us

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY (PA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	250,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	396
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	115
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	396
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	67
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

The agency's philosophy and practices regarding community policing are that everyone in the organization is responsible for COP. All personnel have been trained. Supervisors are responsible to see that the tenets of COP are present in all contacts with our customers. The agency has a core of officers who have total community policing duties, and that is all they do.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (person crimes, property crimes, vice and narcotics) of a citywide nature. Most detectives are specialists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

"We have structured the criminal investigation function along district (2) boundaries and incorporated the principles of community policing into detective duties. We insure detectives meet the community policing objectives through supervision and good management practices."

CEO: Colonel Carl R. Baker
CONTACT: Louis W. Moore
Commander, Administrative Support Bureau
PH: 804/796-7041
FAX: 804-748-1239
E-mail: moorel@co.chesterfield.va.us

CHICAGO (IL) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	2,783,726 (1990)
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	13,397
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	3,839
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	13,397
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	786
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1993)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities as are all investigative personnel. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"Although the CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy) philosophy applies to all units and members in the Department, for the most part implementation has focused on the Patrol Division."

About 3/4 of the major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigative division. Some detectives are physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (auto theft and arson) of a citywide nature. Most investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas. Most detectives are generalists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through the investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

"There are 5 geographical detective areas, each covers 5 geographical patrol districts. At the area level, there is a commander responsible for a violent crime unit (homicide, sex crimes, serious assault, and robbery) and a property crime unit (burglary, theft, damage to property and fraud). Auto theft is centralized with city-wide responsibility, as is the bomb and arson unit. Detective Division Headquarters, the Office of the Chief, consists of crime analysis, budget, technical group, and sex offender registration."

CEO: Superintendent (acting) Matt L. Rodriguez
CONTACT: Barbara B. McDonald
Director, Research and Development Division
PH: 312/747-6203
FAX: 312/747-1989

EL PASO (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	596,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,190
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	275
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	1,190
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	220
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol (5 regional stations) and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing are assigned to a special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in the agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (crimes against persons, white collar crimes, traffic investigations, arson, vice, intelligence) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas to work. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Russ Leach

CONTACT: Len Golden Price
Assistant Director, Administrative Services
PH: 915/564-7344
FAX: 915/564-7394

FRESNO COUNTY (CA) SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	200,000 (service pop.)
SQUARE MILES IN JURISDICTION:	6000 (probably total)
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	383
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	400
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	208
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	150
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1982)

Agency-wide philosophy. Specific deputies in special units perform community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished but improvement is on-going.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1996)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative divisions. A core of detectives is responsible for Crimes Against Persons and Vice and Intelligence on a county-wide basis. Certain investigative functions are decentralized and personnel are assigned to work specific crimes (property crimes) in specific geographic areas. Most detectives are specialists. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation and work in teams with patrol deputies. Patrol deputies may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through a patrol commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol deputies.

"Area property crime detectives now work more closely with community policing units."

CEO: Sheriff Steve Magarian

CONTACT: Richard White
Lieutenant, Management Services Division
PH: 209/488-3035
FAX: 209/262-4032

FORT WORTH (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	477,850
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,193
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	318
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	89
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	297
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1985)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers are assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in the agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1985)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, sexual assault, family violence, auto theft, crimes against children, fraud, vice, narcotics, gang) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes to work (burglary, theft, robbery, general assignment, assault). Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Thomas R. Windham

CONTACT: Marty Humphrey
Planner, Research and Planning Unit
PH: 817/877-8057
FAX: 817/877-8270
E-mail: fwpd@startext.net

FULLERTON (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	125,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	147
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	86
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	147
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	40
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"We form partnerships with other groups and organizations to provide better service to the community."

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented n.d.)

Investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but they may work specific geographic areas. A core of centralized detectives are responsible for specific crimes of a citywide nature (homicide, sexual assaults, missing persons). Most detectives are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

Detectives are assigned to a geographic area and work all crimes in that area except for special offenses (homicide, sex crimes, missing persons).

CEO: Police Chief Patrick E. McKinley

CONTACT: Michael Stedman
Lieutenant, Investigations/Administration
PH: 714/738-6747
FAX: 714-738-0961

GARDEN GROVE (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	155,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	187
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	182
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	157
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	32
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1993)

Agency-wide philosophy. Four officers serve specifically as "Neighborhood Officers" in neighborhoods with high call volume. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1993)

Investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, sex crimes, robbery, fraud, child abuse) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions (property crimes investigations) are physically decentralized. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation. All detectives report through the investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

Garden Grove created a "Beat Investigator" position. Each Beat Investigator is responsible for investigating all general crimes (arson, assaults, burglaries, thefts, auto thefts, frauds, embezzlements, stolen property, disorderly conduct, weapons violations and miscellaneous offenses) occurring in the two beats assigned to the investigator. A Beat Investigator Supervisor is responsible for instilling the community policing philosophy and making sure community policing and problem solving methods are used. (An investigations transition plan was attached to the questionnaire.)

CEO: Police Chief Joseph Polisar

CONTACT: Lt. Kevin Raney
Detective Commander
PH: 714/741-5757
FAX: 714/741-5905

GREENVILLE COUNTY (SC) SHERIFF'S OFFICE

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	280,000 (service pop.)
SQUARE MILES IN JURISDICTION:	750
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	302
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	141
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	20 (but all participate)
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	40
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1988)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. (No mention of investigators.) Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of physically centralized detectives is responsible for homicide, violent crimes, fraud, forgery on county wide basis. Certain investigative personnel are physically decentralized and are assigned geographic areas and specific types of crimes (burglary, larceny, armed robbery, "street crimes"). Patrol deputies may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Sheriff Johnny Mack Brown

CONTACT: Dale Doren
Master Deputy--Planning and Research Analyst
PH: 864/467-5418
FAX: 864/467-5299
E-mail: ddoren@bigfoot.com

INDIANAPOLIS (IN) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	373,973
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,007
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	264
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	45
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	253
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol officers are expected to engage in community policing activities (but no mention of investigators), and everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 3/4 of the major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1991)

Investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative divisions. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes (burglary, larceny, auto theft). Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Patrol officers have no investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Chief of Police Michael H. Zunk

CONTACT: Officer Michael A. Jackson
Planning and Research Officer/Special Projects Officer
PH: 317/327-3170
FAX: 317/327-3171

JEFFERSON COUNTY (CO) SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	175,000
SQUARE MILES IN JURISDICTION:	682
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	369
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	186
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	171
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	36
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1993)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented n.d.)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Most detectives are specialists. Certain investigative personnel are physically decentralized and are assigned geographic areas and specific types of crimes (Burglary, Theft, Adult Persons, Juvenile Persons).

Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

"Prior to changes, investigative personnel were specialists, worked specific types of crimes county wide, and were supervised by a sergeant assigned to the team. Investigative personnel are now assigned to geographic teams and work specific crimes within their geographic area. One sergeant supervises all investigators assigned to his team."

CEO: Sheriff Ronald L. Beckham

CONTACT: James Brinson
Captain/Investigation Division
PH: 303/271-5610

KANSAS CITY (MO) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	437,459
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,221
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	648
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	70
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	213
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1995)

Agency-wide philosophy. Specific officers are assigned to community policing and serve in a special unit. All patrol personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. (No mention of investigators.) Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1996)

Investigations located within investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized and have citywide investigative responsibility. Property crimes are worked by investigators assigned to patrol districts. Most detectives are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes. Patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

"The major change occurring is the emphasis on having detectives interact with citizens at community meetings and other types of non-investigatory settings."

CEO: Chief Floyd Bartch

CONTACT: Officer Leslie Cornell
Project Officer, Planning and Research Unit
PH: 816/889-6046
FAX: 816/889-6064

LAKWOOD (CO) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	140,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	234
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	123
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	(No response but previously indicated "all.")
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	52
PHYSICALLY DECENTRALIZED?	No
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented n.d.)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 90-95 community policing/POP projects currently ongoing.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1989)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are centralized, specialized, and have city-wide responsibility and all detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Some detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Charles Johnston

CONTACT: Captain Al Young
Investigations
PH: 303/987-7201
FAX: 303/987-7206

MADISON (WI) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	200,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	350
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	61
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	300
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	50
DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations (2 districts)
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Impl. 1987)

Agency-wide philosophy. Thirteen or so officers serve as Neighborhood Officers. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support community policing approach.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Impl. 1997)

Investigative functions are located in investigative division. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes. Most detectives are specialists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol.

Madison has designed a much more extensive decentralization which is not yet fully implemented.

CEO: Police Chief Richard K. Williams

CONTACT: Ellen J. Schwartz
Captain, Criminal Intelligence and Detectives
PH: 608/267-8643
FAX: 608/267-8648
E-mail: eschwartz@ci.madison.wi.us

MESA (AZ) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	354,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	652
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	387
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	(No response but previously indicated "all.")
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	122
PHYSICALLY DECENTRALIZED?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing and work in a special unit. All patrol personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 1/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigations bureau. Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but they may work specific geographic areas. A core of physically centralized detectives is responsible for document crimes, auto theft, robbery, assaults, homicide, hit and run accidents, recovered property, missing persons, "crime free detectives" (see below) and property crimes. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes to work. Most detectives are specialists. All report through an investigative chain-of-command. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

Detectives are working with six "Crime Free" programs (mini storage program, multi housing program, motel/hotel, mobile home parks, auto theft program) as does patrol. These are in cooperation with the business community. In addition, the detectives of CID use a community policing philosophy in their traditional police investigations. They also take part in several community policing programs in Patrol and Community Relations.

CEO: Chief Janice Strauss

CONTACT: Assistant Chief Ron Poulin
Special Operations
PH: 602/644-2017

CITY OF MIAMI (FL) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	350,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,028
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	407
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WHOSE ASSIGNMENTS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	622
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	164
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1990)

Agency-wide philosophy. Specific officers, working in special units or teams, are assigned to perform community policing. However all patrol officers are expected to engage in community policing, as are investigative personnel to some degree. All department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Neighborhood Enforcement Team (N.E.T.) Officers and Lieutenants have direct responsibility for their designated areas; however, all uniformed Patrol personnel are assigned to specific areas where they patrol and respond to calls. Burglary and robbery investigators are specifically assigned responsibility for given areas.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1990)

Investigative functions are shared between the patrol bureau and investigative unit. A core of detectives are physically centralized and are responsible for specific crimes (homicide, sexual battery, special investigations, auto theft, economic crimes, and career criminals) on a citywide basis. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crime (burglary and robbery) to work. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Sometimes detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers. Burglary and robbery detectives report to precinct commanders through an investigative chain-of-command.

CEO: Chief Donald H. Warshaw

CONTACT: Major Miguel A. Exposito
Commander, Criminal Investigations Section
PH: 305/579-6450
FAX: 305/579-6453

MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD) DEPARTMENT OF POLICE

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	819,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,019
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	417
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WHOSE ASSIGNMENTS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	135
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	170
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes, below rank of sergeant

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Impl. 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol officers are expected to engage in community policing (but no mention of investigators) and all department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1993)

Almost all investigative functions are located within investigative bureau. A core of detectives is physically centralized (major crimes). Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crime on which to work. Most detectives are specialists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers. All detectives report through investigative chain of command.

CEO: Chief of Police Carol A. Mehrling

CONTACT: Sergeant Darin C. Magee
Administrative Sergeant, Investigative Services Bureau
PH: 301/217-4069
FAX: 301/217-4286
E-MAIL: Mageed@co.mo.md.us

ODESSA (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	95,600
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	180
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	82
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	13
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	34
PHYSICALLY DECENTRALIZED?	No
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing work in a special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION:

Almost all investigative functions are located in the investigations bureau. Detectives are physically centralized, specialized, and have city-wide responsibilities. They report through the investigative chain-of-command. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

"The definition of the investigative function remains unchanged; however, it was restructured into self-directed work teams. This restructuring occurred in conjunction with a change in case management philosophy. The result is a much more efficient operation: Morale is higher, case clearance rates are up and individual case loads have decreased."

CEO: Police Chief James H. Jenkins

CONTACT: Kevin J. Begley
Deputy Commander, Criminal Investigations Bureau
PH: 915/335-3309
FAX: 915/335-3384

PASADENA (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	120,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	228
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	57
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	(No response but previously indicated "all.")
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	51
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. "We have implemented a Resident Officer Program, where the Resident Officer lives in a city-owned house in a low socio-economic area and polices this area."

About ½ of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Most detectives are generalists and all report through an investigative chain-of-command. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief T. W. Shane

CONTACT: J. M. Baird
Sergeant, Research and Planning
PH: 713/475-5536
FAX: 713/477-4572

RICHMOND (VA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	203,056
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	747
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	128
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WHOSE ASSIGNMENTS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	747
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	156
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. All department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1992)

Investigative functions are shared between the patrol division and the investigative division. A core of detectives is physically centralized (homicide, violent crimes, economic crimes, vehicle theft, juvenile crimes). Most detectives are specialists. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crime (burglaries and larcenies) on which to work. Each precinct has a detective squad which answers to the Precinct Commander. (When burglary and larceny detectives were first moved to precincts, they continued to report through the investigative chain of command. In 1996 their supervision was transferred to the Precinct Commanders.) Patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Colonel Jerry A. Oliver

CONTACT: Captain Walter B. Howard
Officer-in-charge, Planning and Personnel Services Division
PH: 804/780-6721
FAX: 804/780-7156
E-MAIL: whoward@ci.richmond.va.us

ROCHESTER (NY) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	231,636
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	683
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	158
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	30
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	57
DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Impl. circa 1976)

Agency-wide philosophy. Thirty Neighborhood Empowerment Team officers assigned to NET offices. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support community policing approach.

"The Rochester Police Department's community policing initiatives have existed for over 20 years. The Department continues to be progressive in furthering our continued partnership with the community in projects aimed at the physical and economic improvement of distressed neighborhoods or areas. Partnerships are also aimed at reduction of serious crimes as well as quality of life issues."

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Impl. circa 1976)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative divisions. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, forgery and fraud, child abuse, arson, license and warrants, auto theft, special accident investigations) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. These investigators are assigned to the patrol section, work specific geographic areas, and handle general assignments. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All investigators report through an investigative chain-of-command. Investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol.

Patrol functions are decentralized. General investigative assignments are handled by investigators assigned to each patrol section. They work morning, afternoon and evening platoons. The Central Investigations Division (CID) works days and on 24 hour call.

CEO: Police Chief Robert S. Warshaw

CONTACT: Mark Beaudrault, Officer/Research and Evaluation Section
PH: 716/428-7141 FAX: 716/428-7416

SACRAMENTO (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	400,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	618
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	354
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	70
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	116
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes for patrol; yes for some investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1988)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some officers assigned to community policing work in a special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigative division. Most detectives are physically centralized and have citywide investigative responsibilities. Most are specialists. Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through the investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

Attached to the questionnaire is a 10 year strategic plan for the department and a 5 year plan (beginning 1994) for investigations. Key elements include adding "10 community service officers to the Office of Investigations so that the Property Crimes Section may transition to area Investigative Teams. Community service officers assisting detectives with many of the time consuming 'paper driven' tasks will allow detectives to work with neighborhoods and patrol officers. If problem solving strategies are to be successful, then time must be allocated to solve and prevent neighborhood problems. Move the Crime Analysis Unit into the Office of Investigations from the Office of Administrative Services. That all property crime investigative units begin assigning cases by sector for investigation, using the patrol sector boundaries."

CEO: Police Chief Arturo Venegas, Jr.

CONTACT: Lieutenant Jim Hyde
Major Crime Investigations
PH: 916/264-5488
FAX: 916/264-7826

Lt. Jeff Gibson
PH: 916/264-8174

SAN DIEGO (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	1,190,200
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	2,007
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	616
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	2,007
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	400
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. The emphasis is on neighborhoods.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1992-94)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, sex crimes, gangs, financial crimes, domestic violence, child abuse, narcotics, vice, etc.) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and specific types of crimes to work. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation and report to an area patrol commander. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

Have implemented some major changes but are still in the process of planning additional changes.

CEO: Police Chief Jerry Sanders

CONTACT: Sergeant Gary Jaus
PH: 619/531-2715
FAX: 619/531-2909

SANTA ANA (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	315,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	405
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	282
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	All
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	88
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1976)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"COP is a continual process of implementation."

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1993)

Investigations are located in investigative division. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. A core of physically centralized detectives is responsible for specific crimes (fraud, homicide, gangs, juvenile, child abuse) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most detectives are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers and report through an investigative chain-of-command.

"We have recently considered assigning District Investigation to the Field Operations division. Investigative teams could work directly with uniform directed patrols in problem solving efforts."

CEO: Chief Paul Walters

CONTACT: Captain Daniel McCoy
Investigation Division Commander
PH: 714/245-8304
FAX: 714/245-8007

SEATTLE (WA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	536,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	1,260
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	648
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	1,260
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	276
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1990)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Strong problem oriented policing approach is foundation of Seattle's effort.

About 3/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Most investigative functions are located in two investigative bureaus. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, robberies, fraud, bomb calls, sex crimes, child abuse, domestic violence, checks/forges, auto thefts, vice, narcotics, criminal intelligence, pawnshop inspections) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives work specific geographic areas and specific types of crime (burglary, juvenile). Most detectives are specialists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Norm Stamper

CONTACT: Dan Fleissner
Manager, Research and Grants Services
PH: 206/684-5758
FAX: 206/386-0053

SPOKANE COUNTY (WA) SHERIFF'S OFFICE

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	219,000 (service pop.)
SQUARE MILES IN JURISDICTION:	1,758 (probably total)
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	196
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	96
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	Not specified
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	43
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Not exactly (storefronts)
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol personnel and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. "Community policing is part of our management philosophy. It is being implemented department wide with all personnel adding to the overall effort."

About 1/2 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1996)

Investigations are located in investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized. There are 5 decentralized property crime detectives. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Detectives sometimes work in teams with patrol deputies who may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank (detective/corporal) or pay scale above patrol officers.

"We currently have 5 decentralized detectives working out of S.C.O.P.E. stations. These stations are operated by citizens in their neighborhood. We intend to decentralize 4 more property detectives in 1998 as S.C.O.P.E. stations and trained detectives become available."

"In the past year we have moved away from the process of supervisors reading and assigning cases and now have detectives assigning their own cases. The property detectives are responsible for a geographic area. They work on P.O.P. issues in their area with the assistance of their sergeant and the investigative management. Detectives are considered the coordinator for P.O.P. issues because they have more flexibility of their time."

CEO: Sheriff John A. Goldman

CONTACT: Captain Douglas W. Silver
Investigative Division Commander
PH: 509/458-6606
FAX: 509/458-2573
E-mail: silver01@aol.com

SPOKANE (WA) CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	190,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	290
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	125
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	31
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	53
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1987)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some officers assigned to community policing work in special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Although there are specialty units, they have now completed department-wide in-service training in problem solving.

About ½ of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1992)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigations division. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Most detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank (equal to patrol corporal) or pay scale above patrol officers.

"In 1992 some detectives were assigned as team members with patrol in specific neighborhoods. This led to detectives being assigned to areas that encompass several neighborhoods. Specialities, except homicide, have disappeared, and consequently we have lost expertise in critical areas (e.g., fraud and auto theft)."

Changes have been implemented in only a few geographic areas.

CEO: Police Chief Terry Mangan

CONTACT: Lieutenant Glenn Winkey
Special Projects
PH: 509/625-4003
FAX: 509/625-4066

SPRINGFIELD (MO) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	150,604
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	261
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	73
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	32
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	45
PHYSICALLY DECENTRALIZED?	Yes, patrol (5 substations)
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing and work in special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"All areas of the city are assigned to an individual with responsibility for solving problems in that area."

About 1/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Most investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most detectives are specialists. Some centralized detectives are assigned to specific geographic areas and work in teams with patrol officers and patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives have a rank (corporal) or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Lynn S. Rowe

CONTACT: Sue Schofield
Supervisor, Research and Development Services
PH: 417/864-1722
FAX: 417/864-1455
E-mail: SueSchofield@ci.springfield.mo.us

STOCKTON (CA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	236,500
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	390
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	184
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	280
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	75
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some officers are designated as Neighborhood Community Policing Officers for specific settings (esp. public housing). All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Approach includes school resource officers, 2 police-probation co-ops, truancy center and curfew program.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1994)

All investigative functions are located in the investigations division. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (homicide, auto theft, vice, narcotics, gangs). Narcotics officers have been assigned district responsibility for certain follow-up cases from patrol-initiated activities. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

Prior to 1994 most investigators were sergeants or above. In 1994 the department transitioned 32 officers into investigations and put 32 sergeants in other roles, mostly as field supervisors to facilitate the redeployment/restructuring of Field Operations to reflect the community policing philosophy. The traditional 17-beat configuration was redefined to 4 policing districts, each managed by a Police Lieutenant. Most officers in investigations have been assigned to investigate general crimes within specific geographic areas. They coordinate closely with the District Lieutenant and work closely with Patrol Officers in the same districts. It is not exactly the same as the Rochester Plan (team policing) but, eventually, it will be close.

CEO: Police Chief Edward J. Chavez

CONTACT: Robert Marconi
Police Planning Analyst, Planning and Research
PH: 209/937-8651

SAINT PAUL (MN) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	275,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	578
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	211
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	All
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	97
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Impl. 1970 & 1992)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. "Community Policing in our agency can best be described as a philosophy of service. We consider this a partnership with the community and look to the community for support and guidance."

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1993)

Most investigative functions are located in the patrol bureau. A core of detectives is physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (fraud/forgery, auto theft, sex crimes, homicide, arson, youth services) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned to specific geographic areas. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation and report to an area commander who is responsible for patrol operations in a specific geographic area. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers. "Our department emphasizes cooperation between units to resolve the issues which are important to our citizens. If a task force or other structure needs to be developed to best address the issue, that is a possible solution."

CEO: Police Commissioner William K. Finney

CONTACT: Commander Richard N. Ekwall
Commander, Executive Officer of the Operations Division
PH: 612/292-3587
FAX: 612/292-3542
E-mail: William.Finney@St.Paul.Gov

ST. PETERSBURG (FL) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	240,318
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	512
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	199
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	75
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	108
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1990)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"For the past 5 years, we have been guided by a community 'problem-oriented' policing philosophy. Two years ago, we added 'geographic deployment,' although this aspect is currently under review and may be modified."

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

All investigative functions are located in the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Most detectives are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that go beyond the initial report. All detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

"Have implemented some initial changes"—detectives are assigned geographic areas of responsibility along with patrol officers and community policing officers.

CEO: Police Chief Goliath J. Davis, III

CONTACT: William Proffitt
Major, Criminal Investigations Section
PH: 813/892-5584
FAX: 813/893-7192

TOLEDO (OH) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	323,972
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	735
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	72
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WHOSE ASSIGNMENTS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	7
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	51
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol officers and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities, and all department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 3/4 of the way toward accomplishment of major objectives.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Almost all investigative functions are located within investigative bureau. Certain investigative functions (person and property crimes) are physically decentralized and detectives are assigned specific geographic areas and types of crimes. Centralized investigative functions include the Check Unit, Arson Unit, and Child Abuse Unit. These three units are each handled by one or two detectives. All other investigations are handled within the three districts. The intent is to have almost all investigations at the same level as patrol. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers. Most detectives are specialists. Patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area.

CEO: Chief Gerald Galvin

CONTACT: Captain Louise Eggert
Captain of Planning and Research
PH: 419/245-3231
FAX: 419/245-3149

TYLER (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	79,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	173
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	60
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	173
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	37
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations (1 substation operational, 2nd soon)
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION:

Agency-wide philosophy. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but may work specific geographic areas. Major crimes are centralized. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized. Most detectives are generalists. Detectives with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation and report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

"Each district has three investigators. Some are physically centralized and others are decentralized."

CEO: Chief William A. Young

CONTACT: Greg Grigg
Captain, Investigative/Tactical Services
PH: 903/531-1021
FAX: 903/531-1069

WACO (TX) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	104,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	220
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	70
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	30
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	50
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes, patrol and investigations
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1991)

Agency-wide philosophy. Some specialist officers assigned to community policing. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

"All employees have had community policing training. All are expected to participate but a unit called the Neighborhood Services Section has been formed to lead the remainder of the units to Community Policing. It consists of a Housing Unit, Neighborhood Teams and Neighborhood Investigators."

About 1/4 of major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigations are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus. Some detectives are physically centralized and responsible for specific types of crimes (crimes against children, domestic violence and narcotics) of a citywide nature. Certain investigative functions are physically decentralized; decentralized detectives work specific geographic areas. All detectives report through an investigative chain of command. Most centralized detectives are specialists while most decentralized detectives are generalists. Plans are for detectives to work in teams with patrol officers and for patrol officers to have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief Gilbert Miller

CONTACT: Chief Gilbert Miller
PH: 817/750-7501
FAX: 817/754-3541

WICHITA (KS) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	323,259
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	614
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	212
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WITH ASSIGNMENTS THAT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	50
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	123
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	Yes for patrol; No for investigations
UNION?	Yes

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1994)

Agency-wide philosophy. Specific officers assigned to perform community policing are in a special unit. All patrol and investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. Everyone in agency is expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Most major objectives have been accomplished.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1995)

Investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized and have citywide investigative responsibilities but they may work specific geographic areas. Most detectives are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents. A core of centralized detectives is responsible for Crimes Against Persons. Patrol officers may have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives report through an investigative chain-of-command. Detectives have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers.

CEO: Police Chief William M. Watson

CONTACT: Officer Jeff Piper
Planning and Research
PH: 316/268-4149
FAX: 316/337-9030
E-mail: wpdpr@feist.com

WINSTON-SALEM (NC) POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION:	170,000
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL:	474
NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL:	141
NUMBER OF SWORN PERSONNEL WHOSE ASSIGNMENTS SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES:	474
NUMBER OF DETECTIVES:	72
PHYSICAL DECENTRALIZATION?	No
UNION?	No

STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IMPLEMENTATION: (Implemented 1989)

Agency-wide philosophy. Specific officers are assigned to perform community policing. All patrol officers and all investigative personnel are expected to engage in community policing activities. All department employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

About 3/4 of the way toward accomplishment of major objectives.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION: (Implemented 1989)

Investigative functions are shared between the patrol bureau and the investigative bureau. Most investigative personnel are physically centralized with citywide investigative responsibilities. Most detectives are specialists. Patrol officers may have investigative responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report. Detectives have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers. All investigative personnel report through the investigative chain-of-command

Although the structure of the investigations in Winston-Salem looks fairly traditional on paper, the Department's 1997-98 discussion of Key Work Items for the Investigative Services Bureau emphasizes the need to stress the community policing philosophy in all aspects of work. Community policing efforts are to be increased through proactive prevention and investigation of crimes against the elderly, involvement with youth groups, and increased interaction with Crime Prevention, COPS Officers, Domestic Violence Response Unit, and community groups/meetings.

CEO: Chief George L. Sweat

CONTACT: Sergeant Ronnie Abernathy
Sergeant, Administrative Support Division/Planning and Research
PH: 910/773-7778
FAX: 910/773-7996
E-MAIL: ronniea@ci.winston-salem.nc.us

APPENDIX C: REPORTS FOR SEVEN SITES

Contents

Arapahoe County Colorado Sheriffs Office	1
Arlington, Texas Police Department	9
Boston, Massachusetts Police Department	17
Mesa, Arizona Police Department	24
Sacramento, California Police Department	44
San Diego California Police Department	52
Spokane County, Washington Sheriffs Office	59

Note: These seven cases were based on the same protocol and the authors used similar outlines to produce the reports. The reader will find, however, that reports vary in length and the detail of information provided. Rather than try to make the reports uniform, we have chosen to leave them essentially as they were written by the site team, thus preserving all of the information that was collected.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Conducted by Craig Huneycutt and Mary Ann Wycoff

July 8-9, 1998

Reported by Mary Ann Wycoff

The Community

Arapahoe County is a large urbanized county in the southeastern part of the Denver Metroplex. At one time, the county included Denver until that city became its own county. Arapahoe County includes a total of 864 square miles, 640 of which are unincorporated. The total population is 453,000, of which 135,000 live in unincorporated areas. Approximately 86 percent of the residents are white, 6 percent are black, 5 percent are Hispanic and 3 percent are Asian.

Three of the largest cities in Arapahoe County are Aurora, Englewood and Littleton. Aurora contains approximately 50 percent of the county's population. Since World War II, the military has heavily influenced Aurora's economic development. Buckley Air National Guard Base and Fitzsimmons Army Medical Center are the largest employers. The county's second largest city, Englewood, has a strong concentration of biomedical/biotechnology companies. Littleton, the county's third largest city, has suffered because of workforce reductions by its largest employer, Lockheed Martin.

In 1997, the Arapahoe Sheriff's Office handled 54,523 calls for service, an increase of 7 percent over the previous year. Part 1 crimes in 1997 included:

Criminal homicide	1
Sexual assault	16
Robbery	51
Assault	536
Burglary	834
Theft	2476
Motor Vehicle Theft	225
Arson	77

The Sheriff's Office

The Sheriff's Office, headed by Sheriff Patrick J. Sullivan, Jr., has 365 sworn personnel of whom 25 are part-time. There are 165 civilian personnel, five of whom

are part-time. In addition, there are 20 auxiliary personnel and 50 rescue personnel. Personnel are not represented by a union. The agency has a relatively flat structure: there is one undersheriff and four captains, one each for administrative services, detention, patrol and investigation. The 17 field investigators in the Investigations Division have one lieutenant and two sergeants. The agency was accredited by CALEA for the third time in 1997.

There is a close working relationship between the Sheriff's Office and other police agencies in the Denver metro area. Mutual aid agreements mean that any of them have additional personnel available in the event of an emergency or major case.

In 1990 the organization adopted community policing as a philosophy that is intended to guide most of the agency's policies, management practices and operations. All agency employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

Patrol officers are assigned to one of eight permanent geographic districts for two years at a time and to the same patrol shift for a year. Patrol officers take the lead in community policing/problem solving efforts through the use of Community Action Plans in which they identify problems and propose solutions. The department is beginning to physically decentralize patrol operations. There currently are three district substations with more planned as funding permits. There is one foot patrol assignment in a housing complex.

Junior high and high schools are served by deputies assigned as School Resource Officers.

Detention deputies work under the concept of "Direct Supervision" which provides for direct, team-like involvement with inmates as opposed to more traditional separation of staff and inmate population.

The Sheriff's Office is currently involved in a strategic planning process to prepare the organization for the future. The goal is to determine where the organization should be, philosophically and operationally, seven or eight years from now when they have a new facility. They will develop new mission and value statements. There are two citizen members of the strategic planning group. Officer and citizen surveys are being used for input.

Motivations for Changes in Investigations

The department had made a strong move toward community policing and problem solving approximately 18 months before changes were introduced in investigations. The motivation for these changes appears to have been two-fold: to bring

investigations into the community policing approach and to balance the active caseload among investigators. Prior to the change, personal crimes detectives might have carried five to eight active cases while property detectives might have had 33 to 35 cases open at any one time. Management also had a concern about the second class status of property detectives and about the lack of communication between patrol deputies and investigators. The integration of detectives into community policing was both an end in itself and a solution to other problems.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Most investigative personnel are physically centralized but are assigned to specific geographic areas. (Fraud and Child Abuse investigators continue to function as specialists.) For investigative purposes, the city has been divided into four areas, each of which encompasses one or more of the eight patrol districts. Investigative Areas 1 and 4 (which cover Patrol Districts 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8) are served by nine investigators and one sergeant and Areas 2 and 3 (Patrol Districts 3, 4 and 5) are served by eight investigators and one sergeant. The number of investigators assigned to an area is determined by the level of crime in each area; as conditions change, the number of assigned investigators is adjusted. Within the areas, patrol officers are familiar with "their" investigators and the investigators know patrol officers by name.

Since 1992 investigators have been generalists who investigate all types of crime. In 1992, two investigators experimented with being generalists assigned to a geographic area. Response was so positive that, after six months, the approach was adopted department-wide. All investigators have been extensively cross-trained. The investigations captain, Phil Spence, reports a training budget of \$20,000 a year for this purpose. Initially, property investigators were paired with persons investigators for on-the-job training.

Some older investigators initially believed the loss of expertise with generalization would be a serious problem. In 1993, there were twelve homicides/suspicious deaths in the county. The agency solved them all. After that, investigators thought they could do anything. To address this issue of expertise, investigations managers held brainstorming sessions to get everyone involved in important cases. This worked so well that they continue to do it on big cases.

In addition to being cross-trained for crime types, all investigators have received training in community policing and problem solving.

The Investigations Division has three training officers whose job it is to oversee the training of new investigators and the in-service training of experienced ones.

Training for new investigators lasts from three to six months and is sufficiently rigorous that not everyone is able to complete it.

The sergeants read and assign cases. Although investigators report that their sergeants pretty much just "deal the cases out as they come," sergeants can assign cases to investigators with particular expertise in a certain crime or can assign cases occurring in one neighborhood to one investigator.

Investigators have the option of working "45 Day Plans" that allow them to be freed from their regular case load in order to work on issues that may require concentration; it may be a research project, an unsolved case, or an identified problem. While one investigator is working a 45 Day Plan, other investigators in his or her area pick up the additional cases.

Investigators have experienced a change in function as well as changes in the structure of their work. While some of the changes have allowed them to do the same things in different ways, the development in 1997 of Operation Home Check by the Arapahoe Sheriff's Office allows investigators to do different things. Operation Home Check gives investigators a much stronger prevention role by providing an alternative to putting young offenders and "at risk" youth into the system. "At Risk" youths include juveniles who: are suspects in active cases, have active warrants, are identified as repeat runaways, are identified as "wannabe" gang associates, are habitually truant, or meet the criteria for Serious Habitual Offenders Directed Intervention. Despite the fact that there may be fileable cases on these youths, the court has granted the Sheriff's Office the latitude to place youths in the Home Check program rather than in the criminal justice system.

When youths have been identified for the program, teams of detectives visit their homes during evening hours. With these "cold call" contacts, they confront the youths and their families with their situations, offering counseling, referrals, and community service in lieu of criminal processing. Because the investigators believe kids work in loose associations, they make the associates part of the focus of the home check. The intent is to convey a message of "caring intervention" and participating investigators feel that many of the parents and their children who have been involved in the program have been grateful for the contacts and the alternatives. Arapahoe County Social Services, County Probation and the District Attorney's Office participate in the program. The Sheriff's Office feels a much better working relationship has been established with Social Services since the development of this program.

The Home Check Program is a prevention effort, one result of which is a decline in arrest statistics for the investigators. By this measure, they don't look as good as surrounding agencies, but sergeants are not putting pressure on investigators to "make more stats." Investigators report feeling that it is safe to make decisions and to make mistakes. If a decision turns out to have been wrong or to have gone wrong, the

supervisor will review it with the investigator to see whether an error could have been avoided, but the review is not punitive. Investigators know that their supervisors follow the statistics, but there is no pressure. There might be if clearance rates for Part I and Part II crimes had not increased by 6 percent since 1993.

Sergeants occasionally give investigators summary sheets showing the status of their cases and ask investigators to let them know whether the information is correct. Investigators see this as a way of preventing cases from falling through the cracks. It also keeps them aware that their sergeants know what is going on.

There currently is considerable internal discussion about ways of measuring performance that do not depend on arrests.

Everyone in the department has ten hours of training each month, and investigators and patrol officers who work the same areas attend training together. An effort is made to set aside time at the end of each training day for area team meetings at which officers and investigators are encouraged to discuss conditions and problems in their area. Even when specific information is not exchanged, the conversations are reported to contribute to team building.

In addition to these meetings, all members of the Investigations Division meet together for four hours each month. This is a pattern followed throughout the agency. All sergeants meet once a month and all lieutenants meet once a month. The idea extends beyond the department. Patrol and investigations commanders from the various policing agencies in the South Denver area meet monthly. The meeting may include a training program but there is always time allotted for a round-robin of information sharing.

Information sharing is supported by technical means as well as by meetings. The use of voice mail, pagers and cell phones is now common. Investigators and supervisors have pagers. It was also reported that deputies and investigators now make more frequent use of personal phones, as well. When investigators know deputies well and know their schedules, they feel they can call them at home to get or give information. Deputies have the option of leaving voice mail or pages for investigators.

People we interviewed anticipate that communication will improve even more when the new computer system is installed. It will provide a new CAD system that will give them the option of stacking calls. The department has a COPS technology grant that soon will make this possible.

Internal Assessment of the Changes

Everyone we spoke with was enthusiastic. Both patrol deputies and investigators report a great increase in quantity and quality of communication between deputies and investigators and the demise of the antagonism between the two divisions. Now people share responsibility for "their area" and have common concerns and problems. Deputies and investigators are more likely to see each other as resources and partners.

Managers have done internal surveys that indicate personnel like the changes. Investigators like the diversity of cases. Patrol deputies and investigators like the fact that barriers have gone down between the two divisions. The Home Check program is popular with investigators; they like having the discretion with these cases. They like the sense of ownership of an area.

Investigators have gone to community meetings to introduce themselves and provide information to the community. Community surveys indicate that citizens like the changes.

Investigators and their supervisors report that the focus on geographic area rather than crime type has allowed investigators to identify offenders who were committing multiple types of crimes. Investigators are more familiar with offenders in an area.

Because of the extensive cross training, managers like the availability of personnel whenever there is a big case. They can call in large numbers of trained people initially (an advantage in a homicide, for example) and then reduce the number of people as the focus of the case narrows.

Generalization caused some problems initially in working with other agencies who were accustomed to knowing whom to contact on a specific type of case. The sheriff's office dealt with this by assigning people to attend various regional investigative meetings (e.g., robbery investigators, burglary investigators, etc.). These became the contact people. Other than for these assignments, the Arapahoe investigators are free to attend any of the meetings they choose.

Arapahoe investigators report that, in the beginning, they were the laughing stock of surrounding departments. It was commonly believed that you couldn't work cases without specialists. But Arapahoe investigators have talked about the benefits of their system and some other local departments are beginning to move in the same direction.

Implementation

Several things appear to have been key to successful implementation:

1. Clear, strong message all the way down the chain of command that this was to be the organization's direction;
2. Substantial preparation through training and provision of reading materials;
3. Training of supervisors and managers so they knew how to empower;
4. Statement by Sheriff Sullivan that people had a certain time in which to accept the approach or be left behind;
5. Assurance, at least to investigators, that if the new approach did not work, it would be changed.

Several tactics were used to support the transition, among them:

1. "Sliding" investigators into the change. Community policing and problem solving were implemented in the patrol division 18 months before investigations was included. But during this time, investigators were given things to read and sent to training. Some of them were beginning to speculate about how they might fit in.
2. Joint training of patrol officers and investigators assigned to the same area, with training days structured to provide time for area team meetings.
3. Job sharing. Everyone in patrol worked a week to 10 days in investigations. It took a year to cycle everyone through. Investigators were told to ride with patrol officers.
4. Requirement that investigators attend roll calls. This is no longer required because informal contacts and processes took over, but it was useful in the beginning.
5. Initial requirement that investigators attend community meetings.
6. The assurance of experienced persons crimes investigators that their expertise would be needed and used and, related to this, the brainstorming sessions on major cases.
7. Initially the department sponsored quarterly lunches for deputies and investigators in an area. They socialized but then had to be prepared, as a group, to identify their six biggest problems in their area. They were given a list of the locations in their area that had 20 or more calls and were told that by the next quarterly meeting they were to have met several times and to have come up with responses.

Some of these tactics, such as required attendance at roll calls and community meetings and the quarterly luncheon meetings, were used in the early months of the transition and have now been replaced by informal contacts.

When respondents were asked how expectations were communicated to investigators--both in the early stages of change and at present--we were told that statements by leaders, policies, procedures, meetings, training, investigative training officers and supervisors were all important.

Especially Interesting Features

There are many things to take away from Arapahoe County. The entire implementation process with the emphasis on clear, strong messages and the heavy commitment to training and other preparation is impressive as are all of the start-up strategies (e.g., job sharing, team lunches, team meetings on training days, investigator presence at roll calls and community meetings). Decentralization with its area "ownership" and generalization of investigators obviously are key elements of the Arapahoe approach. Cross-training of all investigators is critical to the success of generalization. The teaming of patrol deputies and investigators for training is noteworthy. The use of the 45 Day Plan to encourage problem solving by investigators is a new idea to us. Operation Home Check is an innovative, crime prevention approach for investigators. The agency developed index cards carried by district investigators and deputies that, on one side, contain information about how to contact the patrol division, investigations division or school resource officer. All the deputies and investigators working the area are identified. The emergency number, crime hotline number, and the department's e-mail address and web page address are provided. On the back is a map of the district showing the location of fire stations and schools. These are distributed to citizens.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON THE ARLINGTON, TEXAS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Conducted by Mary Ann Wycoff and Don Jones
November 22-23, 1999
Reported by Don Jones

The Community

Arlington is third largest city in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex with a population of over 302,000. It is a diverse community which sprawls across 99 square miles. Approximately 80 percent are white, 9 percent are Hispanic, 8 percent are black, and 4 percent are Asian.

At one time a bedroom community, Arlington has become a manufacturing and distribution center that boasts big city attributes. The University of Texas at Arlington, General Motors and National Semiconductor are some of the major employers serving the area. Arlington is the home of the Texas Rangers baseball team, Six Flags amusement park, and Hurricane Harbor theme park.

The city is led by a mayor, an eight person council, and a city manager. The city has begun a process of "sector planning" in which citizens, community leaders and government representatives meet to identify priorities for problem solving in different parts of the community.

The Arlington Police Department handled 159,542 calls for service in 1998. Part I crimes in 1998 included:

Criminal homicide	16
Sexual assault	127
Robbery	506
Assault	1,202
Burglary	2,974
Theft	12,703
Motor vehicle theft	1,984

The Police Department

The Police Department is currently headed by Chief Theron Bowman. Bowman was recently appointed after David Kunkle accepted the position of Assistant City Manager with the city. There have been a number of recent changes in the upper management positions as a result.

There are 493 sworn personnel and 149 civilian personnel. Sworn personnel are represented by an "association", not a union. The association is much less powerful than a traditional police union and is not considered to be a barrier to management. Arlington is one of the few agencies in the country to require a four-year degree at the time of hiring.

Arlington has flattened its organizational structure in recent years with elimination through attrition of the captain's rank. There are one assistant chief and seven deputy chiefs. The next lowest rank is lieutenant. A deputy chief is in charge of field service delivery in each of the three geographic districts, as well as the Investigations Division. There is a total of 85 sworn personnel assigned to investigative functions, with 28 of these personnel divided among the three geographic districts.

The agency is accredited by CALEA.

Arlington began the implementation of community policing in 1985. They have adopted community policing as an organizational philosophy and expect all department members to be involved with or support community policing and problem solving. However, the hallmark of their community policing approach--geographic policing--was not accomplished until 1996. Department patrol operations were decentralized into three geographic districts: North, East and West. In general, each district is divided into three sectors. Each sector is divided into three beats. Each sector is headed by a lieutenant who has 24-hour responsibility. The lieutenant works a flexible schedule in order to provide leadership and guidance across all shifts. Generalist detectives were assigned initially only to the East District on an experimental basis. Success with this strategy has resulted in generalist detectives being assigned to the other two districts.

Field sergeants play a critical role in Arlington's delivery of service to the community. Each sergeant is assigned to a patrol beat. The sergeant has 24 hour responsibility for that beat. While the sergeant has a broader supervisory responsibility for officers working in surrounding beats and sectors while on duty, he or she is expected to communicate with officers working the same beat on other shifts. The sergeant is also expected to coordinate problem solving efforts and attend community meetings. Essentially, the sergeant's role is similar to that of a CPO or POP officer. All patrol officers are assigned to a beat in either a primary or secondary role. Ideally calls for service will be handled by the appropriate beat officer; however officers report that they often must leave their beat to handle calls in other beats. Nevertheless, they understand their primary focus for problem solving and community issues is with their assigned beat.

Arlington has received national recognition for their community policing approach. At the recent POP conference in San Diego they gave four presentations.

Motivations for Changes in Investigations

It appears there was never any doubt among top leaders in the department that investigations would be a critical component of the geographic policing approach. This would require significant changes in the organizational structure, function and role of investigations in the new model. They realized that community-based investigation would require the detectives to be physically located in the communities they serve. They wanted to create a new attitude of ownership among detectives. Equally, if not more importantly, detectives would share work space with patrol officers serving the same community. The facilitation of communication, cooperation and comradery among detectives and patrol officers was considered a major benefit to the organization and the community, and a significant improvement over the previously centralized model.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Detectives are assigned to each of the geographic districts. There are nine detectives for each of the North and East Districts and seven detectives for the West district. A detective sergeant is assigned to each of the districts. Investigations handled at the district level include: Burglary, Theft, Criminal Mischief, Assault, Trespass and the like. All other investigations are handled by a centralized and specialized core of detectives assigned to the Investigation Division at the headquarters building. The Central Investigations Division (CID) contains the following units: Crimes Against Persons (homicide, robbery, serious assaults), Auto Theft, Economic Crimes, Domestic and Sex Crimes, Juvenile, Crime Scene, Victim Assistance, Vice, Covert operations (narcotics) and Fugitive.

Each district detective is an area specialist and crime generalist who handles a multitude of different crime types. Each detective is assigned to a patrol beat. The detective handles all investigations arising out of that beat which are of a local or general nature. The attitude instilled in these detectives is that they are to "investigate themselves out of a job." (We heard this phrase many times.) Essentially, this is their incentive to be a creative problem solver. The theory is that they can reduce their caseload through their own effectiveness. However, they also understand that reality dictates that each detective may have to help another detective who has become overburdened with cases or may have to pitch in to assist with a big case in another beat.

District detective sergeants find themselves in a unique position. They report directly to the district commander, a deputy chief. They have the responsibility for supervising the day to day activity of the district detectives and actually have authority over them. This requires the detective sergeants to have a less controlling relationship with their detectives. The relationship becomes more collegial, with the detective sergeant acting more in the role of a subject matter expert for advice and counsel. Detective sergeants are expected to attend community meetings just like patrol sergeants.

Communication between detectives and patrol officers is a major strength of the geographic policing model. District detectives work a 10-hour day to facilitate their attendance at a majority of the patrol briefings. One detective in each district works an evening shift to accommodate attendance at the graveyard shift briefing. Face to face contact between patrol officers and detectives is commonplace. Patrol officers report that they are very comfortable walking into the detective's office to chat and share information before they go out into the field. They enjoy having a "designated ear to bend" regarding investigative issues in their beat. These detectives often monitor their radio while they are at their desks. Patrol officers become accustomed to this. They feel free to call detectives over the radio and expect them to answer. Detectives routinely self-dispatch to scenes based on monitored radio traffic.

The working relationship which has developed between the district investigators and the patrol officers seems to be mutually beneficial. Detectives report that they receive better reports from the officers. Officers report that they become better investigators because of the coaching they receive from detectives. While difficult to quantify, the result of this relationship seems to be enhanced effectiveness for each group – a synergistic effect.

Arlington detectives typically do not remain detectives for the duration of their career, as do detectives from many other agencies across the country. The Department provides incentives which cause many of them to rotate to patrol or other assignments. The promotional process provides preference for officers with varied experience. The detective position carries no additional pay or rank. Night shift pay differential and field training officer pay induces some detectives to voluntarily leave their positions. A training officer in patrol on a night shift will make 11 percent more than a detective. The result is the infusion of a wealth of investigative experience into the patrol ranks.

The career path for district detectives is from patrol officers in the same district. A detective could be selected from another area in the department, but that selection would require significant justification. Clearly the preference is for candidates from the same district. Candidates for positions in centralized investigations come from district investigations.

Internal Assessment of the Changes

Arlington personnel are positive about the changes they have made in investigations. They are excited about the productive and cooperative relationships that have developed between patrol officers and the geographic detectives. They do recognize that there are still issues to be dealt with. One problem they face is an imbalance in the workload among the various beats. They are not comfortable in reconfiguring the beats since the boundaries were drawn to keep neighborhoods intact. Detectives handle this problem informally by helping each other out when necessary.

Although they admit there is some loss of expertise in the geographic investigation model, Arlington detectives report that they like having variety in their caseload. Some also report enjoying their proximity to "the action." While in the district station, they listen to the radio and may go immediately to the scene of a crime rather than wait to receive a report from a patrol officer. They also feel they have fewer cases than they did in the decentralized model. This is due to increased staff, possibly to increased effectiveness, and perhaps to greater involvement of patrol officers in investigative work.

Detectives talked about the greater efficiency of decentralization and the resulting teamwork. One said that patrol officers now respond so rapidly to a detective's request to help find someone that the detective had better be prepared to act. They should have a warrant in hand or be able to tell the officer exactly what they need in the way of prints or photos.

In the initial stages of the transition some investigators and sergeants felt threatened by the potential for reduction in their status. This was a concern especially for detective sergeants. Now that the model has been in place this concern seems to have vanished. One seasoned detective was asked if any district investigators would go back to the old way of doing business if it were possible. He reported that few, if any, would want to revert to the previous centralized model.

Juvenile investigations remain centralized. There is currently some debate over whether it should be decentralized to the district investigators.

Detectives and managers reported good cooperation between centralized and decentralized detectives. The importance of cooperation was emphasized in training and in all the early discussions about decentralization. Initially, centralized and decentralized detectives met together weekly. Soon meetings will occur only every other week since it is felt that technology is making the face to face interaction less important. The fact that many of the centralized

detectives have previously been decentralized probably increases cooperation. It may also help that the detective job is not viewed as a "tenured" position in Arlington. The fact that detectives may move back into patrol in order to increase promotional chances probably contributes to cooperation across all positions.

Arlington has undergone major changes in the past three years. Top leaders feel that it is time to slow down for a period of time in order to assess their progress and fine tune their model. They recently have completed a five-year strategic plan. One of the main focuses for the near future will be to increase the level of accountability throughout the organization.

Implementation

Although implementation of significant internal changes is never easy for any organization, Arlington appears to have accomplished a major restructuring with relative ease. Morale seems high. Everyone we spoke to had positive comments about the changes. We were impressed with the understanding of department goals at the line level. Clearly, executive officers were articulate and convincing in touting their department's strategies of service delivery. Arlington has been able to communicate a clear sense of direction and purpose throughout the organization. Since all sworn personnel are required to have college degrees, it is possible that broader thinking has aided the transition.

Arlington incorporated input from line and supervisory staff in the planning process. Great care was taken in making the decisions regarding which investigative units to decentralize. They looked at other department's strategies as well. There was serious debate among many before decisions were made. Some department members put the department and community ahead of their own personal comfort. One robbery sergeant argued strenuously that robbery investigation should remain centralized. After the final decision was made that robbery would remain centralized, he chose to take a position as a district detective sergeant in the new model to lend credibility to the decision and show others he was not just protecting his "kingdom." This ability to see "the big picture" and put personal bias aside has likely contributed to a smooth transition.

Arlington began the move into geographic policing in 1996 with the East District; a similar concept to the Madison (WI) Experimental District of several years past. Arlington provided a number of incentives to induce officers to work there. First, they provided a new facility. They offered the 4-10 schedule for both detectives and patrol officers. Patrol officers have gone back to the 5-8 schedule due to staffing concerns, while detectives have retained the 4-10 to accommodate their attendance at a majority of patrol briefings. The original East District detectives

were all volunteers and hand picked for their “free-thinking” abilities. Top Arlington leaders knew that the rest of the department, which remained unchanged, would be looking on with interest at the “experimental” East District. Prior to the transition, Arlington provided training to the officers coming into the new district. The training provided the historical and philosophical perspectives which supported the transition. They were also trained in problem solving and the SARA model. Successful results in the East District caused the transition to continue throughout the rest of the department. East district officers and detectives are still considered the pioneers of geographic policing in the Arlington Police Department.

The fact that the detectives in the first decentralized district were hand picked volunteers meant that the East District probably got a disproportionate share of the detectives who were interested in trying something new. As a result, implementation in the other two districts has been somewhat different than in the East District, perhaps requiring more direction from the deputy chief and sergeants.

Another difference between the East and West districts provided a useful object lesson about physical decentralization. The East District facility has sufficient space to house detectives and patrol officers in the same building. This is not yet the case for West District where two different buildings are used. The assignment of patrol officers and detectives is the same; each has a primary beat and patrol officers know who “their” detective is. However, there is much less opportunity for face to face contact, and personnel at West have to rely more frequently on telephone contact. The site observers sensed a much closer working relationship among patrol and investigations at East than at West and a higher level of enthusiasm for teamwork. Eventually, the West District will have the better space arrangements. The new offices are being designed so that detectives and officers responsible for the same beat will work in the same space. In the East District, detectives and patrol officers have relatively easy access to each other but are in separate offices.

Technology

Arlington is in the process (they would say the “throes”) of implementing a new information system. They have experienced setbacks, delays and redesigns as they have struggled with their provider (Tiburon) to get the system they want. They are excited about what they will be able to do once the system is working smoothly. Individual officers will be able to access geographic specific information about beats, choosing and controlling access to information.

There currently are three geographic analysts and one intelligence analyst. The geographic analysts will move to the three district stations when space becomes

available. Although they look forward to the advantages of face to face interaction with detectives and patrol officers, they will lose the easy communication among themselves that they consider important both for mastering the technology and for thinking through analysis issues. They will meet once a week as a group. A fourth analyst will soon be hired who will have responsibility for community-wide analysis rather than district analysis.

The department appears to make effective use of more traditional technologies. A detective sergeant spoke of using the radio, e-mail, the phone, pagers, and cell phones to maintain contact with detectives. Group e-mailings are common means of communicating messages to the entire shift. One sergeant talked about monitoring e-mail exchanges as an indicator of the level of contact between officers and detectives.

Especially Interesting Features

Arlington leaders are adept at the use of incentives to induce change rather than the use of authority or power. This was evident in the opening of the East District. They touted the new facility as a nice place to work compared to their older and less desirable buildings elsewhere. They dangled the carrot of the coveted compressed 4-10 schedule. In the same vein, but in a more general sense, Arlington offers incentives for all personnel to do a good job. An example of this is the "On the Spot Award." A limited number of 20 dollar certificates are budgeted for each year and given to command staff. They can give these certificates to employees "on the spot" for a job well done. The employee can redeem the certificate for a dinner out or some other gift.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON BOSTON (MA) POLICE DEPARTMENT

Conducted by Craig Huneycutt, George L. Kelling, and William Sousa
September 24, 1998

The Community

Boston is the capitol and largest city of the State of Massachusetts. It has a land area of 48.5 square miles and a population of approximately 572,000 residents of which approximately 60 percent are white, 25 percent are black, 11 percent are Hispanic and 5 percent are Asian.

Boston is an old seaboard city; however, in contrast to many other eastern cities, it has retained a good portion of its late 19th and early 20th century housing stock. Boston is a city of historic and strong neighborhoods: the South End, Dorchester, Roxbury, Back Bay, Mattapan, Southie, Charlestown, Roslindale, Hyde Park, East Boston, West Roxbury, Jamaica Plain, and Beacon Hill.

Although economic life is diverse, banking, insurance, and investment management are the key segments of Boston's economy. Printing and publishing businesses are leading manufacturing employers. Boston is also noteworthy as a city of higher education with numerous and prestigious universities and colleges including Boston College, Boston University, Brandeis, Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Massachusetts, Northeastern, and Tufts in its immediate environment. In addition to its economic and cultural assets, Boston has two professional sports facilities that serve as homes to the Red Sox, Celtics and Bruins.

Boston has a strong mayor-council form of government. The Commissioner of Police technically serves for a fixed contract, ostensibly to give her/him independence from the Mayor who appoints the Commissioner. However, for all practical purposes, s/he serves at the pleasure of the mayor. In recent memory, only one Commissioner attempted to serve his complete term but he ultimately was driven from office.

Part I crimes in 1997 included:

Criminal homicide	43
Rape	350
Robbery	2,728
Aggravated Assault	4,765
Burglary	4,301
Larceny	17,920
Arson	573

The Boston Police Department

The Boston Police Department is one of the most closely studied police departments in the United States. A variety of factors explains this: it is an old American police department; the devastating strike of 1919, the impact of which has been felt in the department in the form of virulent antagonism between the police union and management (at least until the current administration); the department's struggle with corruption (largely attributable to the strike, at least during the first several decades after the strike); and, the strife associated with the inauguration of court-ordered bussing – an order, for good or ill, that struck at the heart of neighborhood life in Boston.

The contemporary era of policing was inaugurated by Robert Di Grazia in the 1970s. Di Grazia, in the name of reform, closed district police stations (heretofore closely aligned with neighborhoods), ended foot patrol, abandoned services such as the harbor patrol, civilianized administrative positions, and centralized special and investigative units. The business of the BPD would be "fighting crime" by having police ride around in cars and rapidly responding to calls for service. Demand for police services was centralized when 911 and computer aided dispatch (CAD) was installed and, if citizens preferred to call their remaining area stations, their calls were routed to centralized dispatch. Some district stations changed their telephone number in their zeal to get citizens to call 911.

The 1970s and 1980s were fitful decades for the BPD. "Reform" policing did not sit well in Boston. Attempts to restore foot patrol and implement community policing, often announced with great enthusiasm, uniformly failed. Management/union relationships festered. Budgetary cuts reduced the department to unprecedented low levels of personnel and destroyed morale. The relationship with minority communities worsened. Serious crime and homicides, especially of and by youths, skyrocketed.

Finally, after a rash of exposes of alleged bungled investigations, racism, and brutality Mayor Raymond Flynn created the St. Clair Commission (named after its chairman, James D. St. Clair, a prestigious Boston attorney) in May of 1991. The St. Clair Commission had two basic charges: to review police procedures and to review the basic management and supervision systems and practices of the Boston Police Department.¹

The St. Clair report was highly critical of the department and its leadership:

"Commissioner Roache and his command staff . . . have failed to provide effective leadership."

"The Department has adopted a reactive posture, merely drifting from crisis to crisis."

"We found that the Department actually operates as many separate and nearly autonomous police departments, each with its own priorities and informal rules."

"A substantial majority of the citizens and police officers we spoke with believe that Commissioner Roache and his command staff lack the necessary managerial skills and experience to run the department effectively. We agree."

"The Department has been unable to implement new programs or effectively manage many existing programs."

"Perhaps most striking is the near total lack of accountability within the department."

Regarding citizen complaints—"our study revealed an investigative and hearing process characterized by shoddy, halfhearted investigations, lengthy delays, and inadequate documentation and record-keeping."²

While the St. Clair report documented many other specific problems, its central concern was that community policing needed to be implemented but that the department seemed unable to do so.

¹ Letter from Mayor Raymond L. Flynn to James St. Clair, Appendix A. "Report of the Boston Police Department Management Review Committee," January 14 1992.

² "Report of the Boston Police Department Management Review Committee," January 14 1992, pp. 4-8.

One result of the St. Clair report was to give urgency for the need for new leadership. William Bratton was recruited, first, as Chief of the department and, later, as Commissioner. (When Bratton became Commissioner in New York City, Paul Evans, the current Commissioner, replaced him.)

The turnaround in the BPD has been dramatic. It not only has received national attention for efforts like Operation Ceasefire (a gun violence reduction effort) and Night Light (a joint probation/police tactic), but also has restructured its relationship with its neighborhoods and has developed impressive collaborative efforts with the faith community, the private social service sector, and with other criminal justice agencies. Police services are now delivered from 11 district stations, all of which coincide with historic neighborhood boundaries. The BPD's annual report embodies this decentralization. Each district identifies its own goals and achievements which, in turn, are derived from its interaction with neighborhood residents, community institutions, and commerce.

To plan activities, coordinate activities among districts, and maintain accountability, weekly Crime Analysis Meetings (CAM) (a somewhat more relaxed version of New York City's Compstat) are held in central headquarters. This process is now "rolling down" to the district levels and two districts are now experimenting with local CAMs.

Motivations for Changes in Criminal Investigation

During the early 1990s, the BPD was an organization in crisis. Crime was spiraling upwards almost literally out of control. One newspaper conducted a daily murder tally. Complicating the department's problem, the minority community was outraged by bungled raids, excessive street interrogations of youth, and other forms of abusive police behavior. Even departmental personnel were beginning to talk of their sense of shame over what had happened to their relationship to the community and their inability to stem violence, especially youth violence. "Tough old cops" began to say that they had thought for a long time that arrests and more arrests would solve the problem; now, they were admitting they had to do other things. Patrol officers were incensed by the practices of special and investigative units that operated on the basis of providing information to officers only on the basis of "need to know" – effectively cutting officers from important neighborhood information. Officers referred to the name of the Intelligence Unit as an oxymoron and spoke of the dangers when centralized plain-clothes officers conducted unannounced operations in their neighborhoods. As one administrator characterized the relationship between patrol and investigative units: "It was all take and no give." District

commanders were frustrated as independent centralized units established their own priorities without consideration of local or neighborhood priorities. Prior to decentralization, patrol commanders complained that they did not know whether detectives were investigating cases in their districts or not. Moreover, cases were assigned to detectives randomly. Consequently, different detectives who might not be aware might investigate side by side or similar crimes without knowing of a parallel or similar investigation.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Currently the BPD has approximately 340 investigators with about 60 percent of them assigned to centralized units and 40% to decentralized units. Specialized units include: Homicide, Major Case Unit, License Premises Unit, Fugitive, Auto Theft, Intelligence, Fraud, Drug Control, Federal Task Forces, Youth Violence Strike Force, Domestic Violence, and Sexual Assaults. District detectives “team” with homicide detectives on all homicides in their districts and they attend and participate in all CAM meetings.

Although all investigators are administratively accountable to the Bureau of Investigation, operationally, the decentralized generalist detectives are accountable to the district commander. This includes drug units. Investigators are evaluated by both the district commanders and the head of the investigative bureau. District commanders now establish investigative priorities in their areas; as one district commander put it: “Detectives no longer can go over my head.” Investigators and patrol officers now receive joint in-service training and investigators attend community meetings with patrol officers and district staff. Moreover, detectives now have relatively frequent contact with assistant district attorneys and state probation and parole staff. (Boston has a decentralized court system. Consequently, assistant district attorneys and patrol officers have had regular contact. This has been extended now to detectives as well.)

Internal Assessment of the Changes

The patrol commanders with whom we spoke had nothing but praise for the decentralization of investigations. Moreover, no opposition was sensed among the administrators and detectives we interviewed. Asked if there were any “down sides” to the current circumstances, patrol commanders saw few. They were quick to point out that investigations had been strengthened in ways other than decentralization: improved training, better equipment, and clearer lines of responsibility. Indeed, during our site visit new investigative “kits” were about to be distributed to all detectives. Also, many investigators now have rotated out of the Youth Violence Strike Force – a unit that has collaborated extensively with

other police and service agencies, as well as Harvard academics. This experience and the national recognition it has received have been invaluable for training investigators and improving their self worth. The only “down side” mentioned was the need to concentrate on coordinating information and activities between centralized and decentralized personnel. This coordination is achieved through regularly scheduled meetings among supervisory personnel. This mechanism is reported to work well.

The positive experience with “cold cases” (homicides that were closed) and the national recognition that investigators have received for this effort, also have given detectives new confidence in their abilities. Not only have investigators been able to identify and arrest the perpetrators of many cold homicides, they have managed to get convictions (over 50) in every case that has gone to court. The success of these investigations is credited to the department’s improved technology, the skill of investigators *and* to the department’s improved relationship with the community. As one investigator stated: “The improved relationship has opened communications with citizens.” Additionally, in solving these cold cases, the passage of time has given the investigators the opportunity to exploit relationships that have “gone sour” – that is, some “friends” have fallen out and are prepared to give information they would not have earlier. Finally, the overall decline in crime in Boston has substantially reduced the investigatory workload and given the department the “luxury” of going back to earlier unsolved homicides.

Implementation

The implementation of decentralized investigations was part of a basic overhauling of the BPD. That is, the BPD returned to its pre-1960s structure – neighborhood based police districts that were congruent with Boston’s neighborhoods. This transition can be described as both easy and difficult. As the St. Clair Commission report indicated, the BPD had struggled unsuccessfully for decades to implement foot patrol and community policing. Internal strife and unhappiness were endemic throughout this era. Once, however, Mayor Menino, Chief and later Commissioner William Bratton, and his successor and current Commissioner, Paul Evans, provided strong leadership and a decentralized strategic planning process, the department just seemed to “snap” into place. Moreover, as Captain Robert Dunford (Dorchester) said: “The genie is out of the bottle. Once this department went back to its neighborhood structure, there was no going back.”

In sum, successful implementation appeared to depend on:

1. Strong leadership including that from the mayor;
2. The "fit" between the structure of the community and the decentralization of the police department;
3. The sense of crisis and shame in the department as a consequence of its inability to deal with its own and the communities' problems.
4. The "fit" between the structure of the courts, the prosecutor's office, and the decentralized BPD;
5. A rigorous and thorough decentralized strategic planning process;
6. Attention to training and equipment;
7. The evolution of CAM as a planning and accountability mechanism; and
8. The accumulation of highly publicized "wins" that gave the department renewed self confidence and optimism about itself.

Especially Interesting Features

1. CAM and the integration of investigators into it;
2. Strong geographical decentralization;
3. Department's new confidence in itself;
4. "Cold" case program;
5. Integration of investigations into the strong district commander system;
6. Nobody seems to believe that they will return to old system; and
7. Reliance on training, equipment, and technology.

Observer's Comments

George Kelling has worked in one fashion or another with the BPD since 1980 and often despaired at the inability of the department to "get itself together" despite an abundance of talent and ideas. It is a delight to go into the department at the present time. It is a friendly, confident, and open place. The institutional response to any reasonable request is generally "I don't see why we can't do that." More than anything, it seems that the BPD again "fits" Boston: it is oriented around neighborhoods and integrated into them, yet has a clear vision of itself as a totality with centralized mechanisms of accountability (e.g., CAM).

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON MESA, ARIZONA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Conducted by Donald S. Quire and Alix Olson

October 1-2, 1998

Reported by Donald S. Quire and Alix Olson

The Community

Mesa, Arizona is in Maricopa County, south central Arizona, in the Phoenix-Mesa metropolitan region. Mesa covers a land area of 123 square miles with a mean elevation of 1234 feet. The population in 1980 was 152,453 and in 1990 and 1994 (estimated), 288,091 and 313,649, respectively. According to the 1990 census, whites are approximately 85 percent of the population, blacks 2 percent, Asians and Pacific Islanders 1 percent, and Native Americans 1 percent. The remainder are of mixed heritage or did not report ethnicity. Hispanics, who may be of any race, are 11 percent of the people.

It is a commercial, manufacturing, agricultural, and tourist center; products include electronic equipment, processed food, aerospace equipment, automobile airbags, and heavy machinery. Several of the nation's largest firms have headquarters in Mesa. Each year thousands of people take up temporary residence in the city, escaping winter weather in northern states and Canada.

Cultural institutions include the Mesa Southwest Museum, with cultural displays on Native American civilizations; the Arizona Museum for Youth; and Champlin Fighter Museum, with displays of military aircraft. The west campus of Arizona State University (1885) is in the city at the site of the former Williams Air Force Base, and the city has a community college and junior college. The Mormon Temple is a principal landmark, and its annual display of Christmas lights is a noted attraction. Dominating the skyline to the east are the Superstition Mountains, in the Tonto National Forest.

The Hohokam people for centuries farmed the region around Mesa, developing an extensive irrigation system. The city's modern history began with the arrival in 1878 of Mormon settlers from Utah and Idaho, who employed the irrigation system earlier abandoned by the Hokokam. The Spanish name for "table" was chosen as the community's name because of its location on a plateau

overlooking the Salt River valley. Mesa incorporated in 1883. Long an agricultural community, the city's economy diversified with tourism and industry beginning in the 1960s, and in the 1980s and 1990s Mesa was among the fastest growing in the nation.

Today it is a commercial, manufacturing, agricultural, and tourist center; products include electronic equipment, processed food, aerospace equipment, automobile airbags, and heavy machinery. Several of the nation's largest firms have headquarters in Mesa. Each year thousands of people take up temporary residence in the city, escaping winter weather in northern states and Canada.

UCR Profile

Interestingly, the Mesa Police Department reports UCR in the form of a Crime Clock. The information is also contained in the department's web page at <http://www.ci.mesa.az.us/police/index.html>.

The Crime Clock depicts the average frequency with which Part I Crimes occur in the City of Mesa:

- * One Major Crime every 19 minutes/19 seconds
- * One Violent Crime every 3 hours/26 minutes
- * One Aggravated Assault every 4 hours/27 minutes
- * One Robbery every 19 hours/28 minutes
- * One Rape every 2 days/22 hours
- * One Homicide every 26 days/2 hours
- * One Property Crime every 21 minutes/19 seconds
- * One Burglary every 2 hours/3 minutes
- * One Theft every 31 minutes/14 seconds
- * One Auto Theft every 2 hours/32 minutes
- * One Arson every 3 days/9 hours

(Of course, this Crime Clock should not be taken to imply a regularity in the commission of crimes, but rather it represents the annual ratio of crimes to affixed time intervals.)

The Department

The Mesa Police Department has 675 sworn positions and 393 non-sworn positions. The City of Mesa is divided into geographic divisions, based on distributions of calls for service, as well as neighborhood and geographic

boundaries. In 1997, a fourth division was added to three existing patrol divisions. The boundaries for the divisions were reapportioned, to ensure equal distribution of calls for service. These four districts are: Dobson, the oldest and smallest; Falcon, the second oldest and second smallest; Central Superstition, the newest.

Most districts have seven beats each. Patrol and Community Action Team (CAT) officers work together more often than not. Patrol officers are expected to be COP oriented, although CAT officers have primary responsibility for problem solving.

The Superstition District is currently the only one with decentralized detectives. There are five Property Crimes Detectives and a sergeant assigned to CID, who supervises them. The sergeant and these five detectives all report through a centralized chain of command in CID. While the detectives are decentralized, the sergeant is not. This was reported as a problem by the sergeant because of the inconvenience of distance and travel time. The area covered by this sub-station is further divided up geographically. Future plans include the enlargement of Dobson and Falcon sub-stations to make room for decentralized Property Crimes detectives.

Community Oriented Policing (COP) got started in Mesa PD in 1990-91, under then Chief Meek who put together a team to study the COP concept. A research team visited other police agencies (Portland, San Diego, Madison), and presented their findings to Chief Meek, who endorsed COP as a viable option for Mesa. He envisioned the whole COP transformation taking from 10 to 15 years to accomplish, but, wanting faster action, established the Community Policing Division, which consisted of hiring, training, community relations, and crime prevention. COP took hold in Patrol first, and then the challenge was to make it happen in the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) also. Mesa Police Department philosophy encourages all its employees, sworn and civilian, to be COP oriented.

The reason this transformation worked in Mesa PD is because the staff here is open to ideas from all members of the department. Everyone gets to present ideas to the command staff with the possibility that the idea will be selected for a trial run. The staff has an open door policy. This is a very progressive department, which empowers its officers and civilians to help make change happen.

Mesa PD has seen dramatic changes over the past eight years, largely due to training given employees by the department. Mesa PD's philosophy on training is that it leads to greater credibility in court. The Department used to be turf

oriented, but now staff cooperates. There has been more emphasis on consensus decision-making in the last 8 to 10 years. Also, it was reported that the City Manager and City Council are highly supportive of protective services (both police and fire). The Mesa PD's budget and innovations have been greatly assisted by this support. Interestingly, the city of Mesa has no property tax.

Community Action Teams (CAT) in Patrol are made up of officers who work on neighborhood issues using a POP approach. Each CAT has its own phone line to enable it to get specific call routing to its office. There are four CATs, one in each Patrol District. All CAT members have the rank of officer. CAT members are also teamed with bike officers. Each CAT consists of one sergeant who reports to the district lieutenant and of between four to six officers. Bike teams are separate from CAT but, in two divisions, are led by the CAT sergeants. CAT and bike officers are not call-driven, unless absolutely necessary. They do the problem-solving and do research with Criminal Intelligence and Crime Analysis first, then apply the SARA model to the problem. Only in the Superstition substation do CAT officers and detectives work together. As mentioned above, other substations don't yet have the physical room for detectives

The Center Against Family Violence (CAFV) detectives work closely with CAT officers in reference to prostitution, sex offender notifications, and other CAFV related investigations.

Within each division, each beat has a sergeant assigned across all shifts who is also responsible for the CAT and bike officers in those beats. The beat sergeant holds meetings with all of her/his officers, and is responsible for the beat 24 hours a day. Beats are bid for by officers and sergeants and assignments are for one year. Shift picks are by seniority. As a result, an officer might stay in the same beat for several years, although sergeants may have some discretion as to which officers acquire which beats. With seniority, an officer may be able to maintain a Monday through Thursday, day-hours-only shift and beat. Mesa PD Patrol works four (4), 10-hour days or nights. Detectives work four (4) 10-hour day shifts only (7 am to 5 pm), and may be subject to call-in at night, or weekend on-call status.

A new division has just been created for Communications (dispatch) and information systems, which should facilitate communication between Mesa PD and other agencies for which it dispatches. Because of the enormous growth in Mesa and the surrounding area, this division has become necessary.

Mesa PD has no formalized, collective bargaining unit, but does have connections to the FOP and Mesa PD Association.

Description of Detective Division

The Criminal Investigations Division is divided into three sections: the Crimes against persons Section; Property Crimes Section; and the Center Against Family Violence.

The only geographically decentralized detectives at this time are those assigned to the Superstition substation. Homicide detectives are centralized, and work citywide. So far in 1998, there have been nine homicides in the City of Mesa, eight of which have been cleared. Because of the low homicide rate it was felt it wouldn't be worthwhile to decentralize homicide detectives.

An example of community policing in action related to a recent homicide. In the area where the homicide occurred, there was a meeting which included the mayor, homicide detectives, CAT officers, the Division Commander along with neighborhood groups, and City officials responsible for street lighting and other safety features. Following this particular crisis, community meetings continued in the affected neighborhood and developed into a Neighborhood Watch program.

Most robbery detectives are centralized, but some have geographic assignments.

It was reported that older detectives are now more accepting of the COP/POP Program than they were before.

The CAFV detectives are divided geographically between north side and south side. Within the north side, crimes such as sexual assault are not divided up geographically; however, crimes such as indecent exposures are.

Property crime detectives have geographic assignments but have a centralized command; this is also true of the decentralized detectives at the Superstition substation. Superstition is linked to the central station via computer, but the Superstition detectives report directly to the sub-station to start their shifts. Superstition detectives go to community meetings, along with CAT, Patrol, bike officers and their Sergeants.

Detectives are expected to use POP principles in their case assignments. This met with some resistance, but detectives now work more closely with

victim/witness workers and try to explain to citizens why a case may not be investigated.

Detective cases used to be organized, assigned, and managed via a "points" system, but that was found unworkable, and in the last few years, a list of criteria is used instead. Some crimes will always be assigned. The dollar amount of property needed before a case would be assigned was eliminated. Solvability factors now play a larger role. Some cases still get assigned if the complainant is sufficiently vocal. A sergeant reviews all cases and assigns them to a detective. Within 15 days, the detective has to write a supplemental report, detailing the status of the case. Most sexual assault cases are assigned, even though there may be no solvability factors present, because the CAFV gives all other services to victims of sexual crimes, not just the investigative portion. Case management is all computerized, including the case status updates prepared by the detectives.

All misdemeanors are prosecuted by the City prosecutors; all felonies by the County prosecutors.

Three and one-half years ago, undercover detectives split from the traditional CID structure and formed Special Operations Division (SID) which is a division separate from CID. SID includes narcotics and gangs detectives, intelligence and Special Crimes Apprehension Team (SCAT).

Mesa PD has a Major Incident Response Team (MIRT). These are detectives assigned to work together on homicides, assaults, officer-involved shootings, and violent sexual assaults. MIRT teams respond to serious crimes, such as homicides, officer-involved shootings, other "public outcry" situations. MIRT also has a dedicated (civilian) victims' advocate who responds to the scenes with the team.

For the future, the department anticipates rotating officers through CID, but currently there is little movement. Approximately 60 to 70 percent of all detectives are new to their assignments. All sergeants, with two exceptions, are new within the last three years. Approximately 75 percent of patrol officers have less than two years street experience. This is primarily due to attrition and new growth. Patrol officers and detectives are on the same pay scale. Detectives get no clothing allowance.

Detectives are expected to promote and practice the department's community policing philosophy. Often, they go with CAT members or the Special Enforcement Team (SET) member--assigned to patrol--to work "special

problems." The CAT and SET teams also espouse the COP philosophy. SET is only assigned to Central Division, the "inner city" area, and can be a tactical team, do surveillance, or address crimes in progress and street crimes. SET consists of six uniformed officers and one sergeant. They report to an Operations Commander (who is also the Tactical Team Commander).

Mesa PD detectives are COP/POP active in other ways as well: they send suspect bulletins out to the Public Information Officer, CAT, SET, and Patrol Divisions; and they use the Crime free programs, especially hotel-motel and FAXNET 1, to locate suspects. A new program is FILE STOP which targets suspects detectives are looking for. The targeted suspect's name comes up in the CAD system when the suspect is run, with an indicator that a particular detective wishes to contact the suspect.

Additionally, detectives work on the Repeat Offender Program (ROPE). This has one detective dedicated to targeting repeat offenders. There are 30 to 40 ROPE offenders currently in the program. With other agencies, Mesa PD has developed a list of criteria for ROPE offenders. These offenders receive enhanced penalties, based on their conviction records, and are prosecuted by a specific County Attorney. The ROPE program started first in property crimes, with bank robbers and has expanded to include other categories of repeat offenders.

Mesa PD first decentralized its detectives in the mid-80s. At that time there were only two districts -- Dobson and Falcon. These decentralized detectives worked property crimes. Two detectives worked nights then. Information turnaround was quick, but it was a confusing chain of command. After only about two years, the decentralized detectives were brought back to the main station because two floors had just been added to the main station. The Detective Captain and Lieutenant at the time wanted the control and could justify the move because two floors had been added to the main station, providing more room. Space already was tight at both Dobson and Falcon sub-stations.

The detective bureau has grown over the years. The CAFV Unit took some detective positions away from the detective bureau, and grants were needed to get Domestic Violence (DV) detectives, so that the main station could replace the detectives (and pay for them). There's been no increase in robbery detectives (four since 1986), so homicide detectives sometimes fill in for robbery detectives, since there's a low homicide rate in Mesa.

Mesa PD has been working with convenience stores to reduce robbery potential. Circle K bought the PD 50 surveillance cameras, which the PD maintains. Mesa

PD recently hosted a robbery conference, after having problems with Mobil gas stations. They provided Mobil managers with a seminar about security and robbery-related police issues, which was conducted by the robbery detectives. Robbery detectives have talked about the concept of a "robbery-free zone" to fit in with the numerous Crime-Free Programs currently existing. Seven-Eleven Stores have offered to donate office space and phones in their stores for patrol officers.

A cold case squad just started in 1997, taking on 34 unsolved homicides dating back to 1978. One detective works these cases and also works as the fugitive detective liaison with other agencies.

In the future, Mesa detectives are expected to have more interaction with victims and to be more involved in advocacy for victims. It is expected that they will have better communication with patrol officers (as decentralization is expanded) and that they will begin to consider quality of life issues in their investigations. It is planned that detectives will become more involved in crime prevention and public information (through training and community activities).

It was reported that detectives don't do much problem-solving themselves, but communicate with the CAT and SET officers, letting them know what the detectives need or what they're finding out. Detectives are now developing strategies with other components of the Department drawing on other resources to help out, and are slowly evolving in the use of SARA and POP.

Mesa PD Crime Lab personnel are mostly civilians, who can respond to crime scenes. They deal with forensic evidence and also with identification process. Eventually, these civilians will do almost all crime scene processing.

Center Against Family Violence (CAFV)

The CAFV was started by two detectives, Detective Heckl and Detective Huber, who had heard about advocacy centers across the country. They believed that Mesa PD's response to sex crimes was not focused. Investigators used three different hospitals, brought victims to central station where the environment was very intimidating for children, and had to separately transport victims to Child Protective Services. Twelve-hour investigations were common. Now, with CAFV, the average time is three hours, with reduced money, time, and trauma to victims. Heckl and Huber found that other similar centers only contained 1 to 2 other components. They did research on their own time, and came up with the

ideas for CAFV. In November of 1995, Mesa PD went to City Council Police subcommittee, after getting buy-in from all the other agencies who would ultimately become involved with the CAFV. Their presentation only took 10 minutes to convince the Council, and in 20 minutes, they were told that \$320,000 was available to them from the contingency fund. Currently, the CAFV is paid for out of the Mesa PD budget - \$12,000/month.

CAV became operational in February of 1996. The majority of the cases come from Patrol. CAFV handles physical and sexual abuse, domestic violence (DV), and some elder abuse cases. CAFV is an aggressive, proactive unit. It was reported that prosecutors attest that CAFV cases are the best in court: the conviction rate is high and defendants do major prison time.

CAV consists of the following:

- One lieutenant and two sergeants
- 11 decentralized detectives (three DV detectives, one Internet sex investigator, two sex offender notification investigators, and the rest handle sex/abuse cases)
- Six civilian victim services personnel (funded by both the Mesa PD and a grant), who provide immediate, on-scene intervention and long-term counseling
- A pediatrician on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, who performs all victim exams at the CAFV. She used to work at Maricopa County Hospital, but left there and now works at the CAFV full-time, with 2 other doctors, with whom she incorporated a business. These doctors are paid for by Maricopa County Attorney's office, for each exam they perform, as long as that exam is accompanied by a police report.
- Representatives from the County Attorney's office
- Representatives from the City prosecutor's office, for DV cases, indecent exposures, and all misdemeanors
- A child psychologist who interviews children who witness violent crimes. She also helps with reunification of children and parents and conducts some forensic interviews with child victims of molestation (detectives, however, handle most of these interviews).
- the Center Against Sexual Abuse (CASA), a private program, that provides long-term counseling and which maintains an office downstairs separate from investigative function in same building as CAFV, due to confidentiality issues,
- Child Protective Services-State agency.

CAFV does immediate follow-up on all cases reported within 72 hours, and all in-home cases. The goal is to have a friend, not the police, bring victims to the CAFV. Two detectives are assigned to each case. The detectives go to work on the cases right away. Patrol doesn't interview victims (there is not enough time or training, and audio/video equipment is needed for these interviews anyway). All the different agency representatives working in CAFV can view and listen to the interviews at the Center by means of a separate sound and viewing room which is adjacent to the interview room. This room has audio links via earphones to the interviewing detectives so that other agency representatives can communicate with these detectives to ask questions. This avoids multi-agency interviews.

Post-interview exams are conducted at the Center's medical facility, with the doctors already knowing the story, and thus having the understanding of what evidence to search for and collect. No exams can be done without a police report. No suspects ever come to the CAFV. CAFV is off-site but close to central station. The center is stocked with food coupons, diapers, blankets, clothes, etc.

The domestic violence side of CAFV has three detectives. CAFV is trying to proactively react to DV cases. The CAFV provides up to six free one-on-one private DV counseling sessions and on-going support groups (also free) for all victims.

CAFV uses monitored confrontation phone calls between victims and offenders to solidify their investigations. Calls are made from the CAFV on a phone which shows a neighboring pay phone number on the offender's caller ID. Calls are taped for evidence. (Arizona has one-party consent.) These calls often lead to admissions and convictions. CAFV moves very quickly on its cases.

The average case-load for CAFV detectives is 12 cases a month for sex crimes detectives and 32.5 cases a month for DV detectives (mandatory arrest/victimless prosecution).

CAFV takes all DV cases and also all DV cases relating to children, such as interference with custody, order violations, parental kidnappings, and so forth. DV cases have increased overall, but there's been a drop in families with DV repetitive histories.

CAFV holds monthly staff briefings of all its components, to discuss training, case issues, new law, and so forth.

CAFV Victim Services

The program is five years old and has six civilian employees. The unit is supervised by a civilian. The program services the entire City of Mesa. CAFV Victim Services extensively utilizes volunteers (45 volunteers), and represents one of "the best examples of community policing." Volunteers who are subjected to background checks and polygraphs and receive 40 hours of training are placed on call 24 hours, seven days a week. Volunteers work one shift every two weeks and carry pagers and police radios so they can respond directly to scene. They provide on-scene crisis intervention for all crime victims and use CAFV vehicles to transport victims/families. Additionally, they go on all calls, and coordinate for long-term advocacy and counseling with victims and their families. Volunteers are recruited via newspaper, TV and radio ads, and from senior citizens centers. Mesa Community College students who volunteer receive college credits for their service. Volunteers are asked to make a one year commitment. About one-half of what these volunteers do is assisting officers with death notifications and working with the three chaplains available to the Mesa PD.

Description of Technology Applications

Mesa PD does not have one data base system, which is a problem. The department has tailor-made specific data bases for different information systems. Data entry is a major problem. The Crime Analysis unit is located in Staff Resources under a Community Policing Commander. It was reported that Crime Analysis would rather work directly for an Assistant Chief for a more unified chain of command. Crime Analysis works primarily with Patrol and detectives. The unit is working on becoming fully automated/computerized and is exploring Geographic Information Systems (GIS) applications. The unit is also trying to focus on criminal intelligence and less on administrative duties.

Patrol reports are typed by the officers on lap-tops, which most officers have; however, lap tops are not in squad cars yet. The contemplated installation in the cars will combine laptop and MDT connections, so that the officers can directly access the CAD system. CAFV detectives type their own reports, and have their own computers. All their interviews are taped; sexual assault and juvenile cases are video-taped as well. The central detectives' computers are on order. At present, computers are only used as word processors, to produce a hard copies of reports. Software problems have kept computerized reports from becoming reality in Mesa up until now.

Patrol officers carry the Fujitsu Stylistic 500 Pentop Computer. Officers have been trained in the use of the computer, as well as WordPerfect, for the writing of police narratives. Finishing touches are currently being made to a mobile report writing software system called POLARIS, for gathering information on accidents, incidents, and field interview reports, to automatically populate the PIMS record management system.

Not only will report writing become automated, but officers will have current up-to-date information on General and Operations Orders, ARS Statutes, and City Codes easily accessible from their pentop computer.

A Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) software is being acquired for the tracking of all evidence as it flows through the Crime Lab, Identification, and into Evidence storage. Installation of hardware and software, as well as training, will take place this winter and this system is expected to be on-line in the fall of next year. It will provide instant accessibility of evidence information during the processing cycle.

Current projects include

- POLARIS-Automatic Report Writing Software System
- Criminal Laboratory Information Management System
- Computer Aided Dispatch
- Utilization of Civilians

Mesa PD's civilian employees work under the COP Division. There are two support people for every one officer. As of August 1998, there were 392 non-sworn employees, such as Police Aides or Police Service Officers, who work with sworn officers and perform such tasks as attending community meetings, helping out at crime scenes, or rendering victim's assistance. From departmental secretaries on up, these volunteers and civilian employees donate their own time to help crime victims for a given amount of time each month. Civilians also work in the Mesa PD Crime Lab (which accepts cases from other agencies as well) where they work closely with detectives. Civilians work in community relations, crime prevention, and Neighborhood Watch programs.

Additionally, there are civilian investigators, such as the three (soon to be four) who deal with missing persons, two who deal with bad check cases, and others who act as traffic investigators. The missing persons civilians meet with the families of the victims and make referrals to the victim's assistance program at the CAFV.

Description of Gang Programs

An OJJDP grant has made a Mesa PD gang intervention group possible. This group holds community meetings; provides tutoring, intervention, and PAL activities; and maintains night and weekend hours for juvenile gang offenders and their families. It is housed in a storefront center with Arizona State Parole and Probation, juvenile officers, court officers, and has a literacy computer lab. Gang unit detectives are assigned to this center. The center is part of a new tracking program utilized by the Mesa PD gang unit to track targeted gang youth from their first arrest up to the present. The gang unit makes home visits to gang members.

In 1992, Mesa looked at its gang resources via an interagency steering committee. As a result a community action plan was developed. Four detectives started out and grew to twelve in a program called Positive Alternatives for Youth (PAY), which drew up behavior contracts with junior high kids and taught life skills, anger management, and so forth.

After this, Mesa PD looked for more proactive methods to help gang members. OJJDP gave the department money for a gang program. Mesa PD is a demonstration project--one of five sites around the country which are testing this model with social and economic community strategies.

Agency participants are co-located (the only demonstration site where this is the case). Participants include: Adult Probation, two Mesa gang detectives, Juvenile Probation, a neighborhood development specialist who provides a liaison with the community (through United Way), a outreach worker, and a Youth Intervention Specialist (a Mesa PD employee, who deals with gang members' younger siblings). At one time there was a family services therapist here also. The facility is located close to the highest gang concentration area, with a citizen population of 40 to 45,000 people. It is estimated that there are approximately 1,200 documented gang members and associates (independent agents who belong to community gangs). It was reported that there are no turf lines in Mesa--that the gang problem is more like a neighborhood gang orientation.

The program has over 80 participants now and dysfunctional families raise this number higher. Almost all participants have alcohol or drug addiction issues. Most participants are 15 to 22 years old, live in the target area, are gang documented members, associates, or seriously at risk youth. Some participants come voluntarily and some are court-ordered. Most are Hispanic, from single

family homes which are very dysfunctional. Most challenge authority at home, in schools, and on the street. The program focuses on prevention and intervention. The majority of the kids are hard core, very active gang members, and already adjudicated. The goal of the program is to reduce gang violence through intervention and prevention.

The program has a cognitive class two times per week for 10 weeks. Participants are given assignments related to acquiring skills to combat their dysfunctional thinking patterns. The facility has a Literacy lab with a teacher available 3 days per week. Individual tutoring is provided and there is an intern Mural program—a mobile mural that integrates Hispanic culture and art.

The detectives assigned here support the gang unit and focus in the target area. They investigate gang members or their family members, collect intelligence, and provide intelligence to Mesa's centralized gang unit. The detectives assigned to the project have also developed relationships with the gang members' parents. Detectives assigned to the project rely on the gang unit detectives to notify them of gang trends and so forth. Communication problems have limited this exchange. Attitudes may be an issue as well. It was reported that the centralized gang unit is into suppression/enforcement and perceives that the project may be too soft on crime.

Detectives assigned to the project self-assign their cases. There is one detective from the gang unit and one from patrol, funded with grant money. It was reported that it is difficult to recruit detectives from the gang unit to work here. There is a bifurcated chain of command which causes some communication problems. The gang detectives working here also report to a probation supervisor, who manages/supervises the entire project. Detectives assigned to the project work 8am to 5pm.

Mesa PD has a civilian police investigator who is assigned to the gang unit and works independently on intervention with gang members in the schools. It was reported that was the best example of POP in the gang unit.

The Gang Prevention Steering Committee, made up of 35 agencies, oversees the project. The Steering Committee is in the process of developing a mentoring program for officers to work with gang members. Fourteen areas will be developed based on junior high school boundaries (Mesa has one school district, and 73 schools). Each of these 14 areas will recruit adult mentors to mentor the gang kids in their specific area. Targeted kids will be 10 to 15 years old. Funding

may come from the Governor's office in order to get three of the areas started (20 kids to each area) and will be under contract with the YMCA.

Two other priorities for the Steering Committee are:

- after school programs with junior high kids (United Way will develop this).
- increased parenting/preventative parenting opportunities, especially for Spanish speakers. The target population will be teen mothers. The focus will be on life skills and teaching them how to nurture through parenting classes, support groups, etc.

To times per month, the case of each participant is reviewed in a meeting involving case managers, detectives, and probation and parole.

It was reported that the biggest problem with the project is the lack of participation of the gang detectives assigned there. It appears that their comfort zone is back in the gang unit, even though they are supposed to be working out of the project office. The feeling among detectives is that they have to "do time" out here.

Crime Free Programs

The Crime Free (CF) program started from the Block Watch program. Since people moved so much, there were more month-to-month lessors, with all their attendant problems versus more stable 30-year mortgage holders. The Mesa PD had to tailor a program to meet these new needs, and Block Watch led to Crime Free programming. Research was conducted around the country to find information on crime prevention programs in multi-unit properties. The department studied other cities' landlord training programs and realized that a successful program needed follow-through, not just a Block Watch approach, where interest, and therefore, the program, dies over time. Crime free was developed with follow-through, by use of training (i.e., in CPTED principles, drug and gang prevention from a police perspective) and having one person from Mesa PD designated as a full-time, 24-hour contact for the CF program.

There are three phases to the CF programs:

1. Free training, provided by the PD, for building owners, managers, etc, (i.e., CPTED). After the first one and half years of the CF Multi-Housing program in Mesa, 300 property owners or managers had been trained (out of approximately 600).

2. Security upgrades - mandatory use of larger peepholes; mailboxes in central, easily visible locations; security grade window looks, metal doors and dead bolts; signage which identifies the properties as CF participants; physical environment changes to conform to CPTED requirements, etc.
3. Safety socials - puts tenants on notice by means of a Crime Free Lease Addendum (started in 1992), prohibiting drugs, gang activity, prostitution, and any other criminal activity. Landlords lobbied the Legislature, and this was made law in 1993. Provides easy means to evict tenants who have signed the addendum, but who don't abide by it. Safety socials are held once a year, when the property must pass inspection by the CF program in Mesa PD. Passage means renewal of a certificate.

CF Multi-Unit Housing has its own data-base for Mesa, not yet integrated with CAD.

The CF Multi-Housing has been very successful. One and half years later, it has expanded into the CF Mini-Storage program, to combat a serious burglary and drug manufacturing problem. The mini-storage program was planned by CID detectives, and signaled the introduction of COP principles into CID. Detectives and officers formed teams by Divisions. Training was provided to these teams about CPTED so that the teams could go and teach the same information to mini-storage managers and owners. In the first year of the CF mini-storage program, burglaries dropped 66 percent.

Other CF programs were then piloted for retail properties (hotel-motel, mobile homes).

In the summer of 1996, all CF programs moved up to CID. Property Crimes detectives started investigating these crimes in their own areas of CF expertise. The detectives investigate and teach crime prevention and crime trends to property managers, and share information with them about investigations. Only detectives in the CF programs have received CPTED training.

Maricopa County is the fastest growing county in the US. Mesa PD CF programs work directly with developers and builders to institute CPTED principles in new buildings and homes. The CF unit is centralized and is housed with auto theft detectives.

Monthly meetings are held with managers and detectives for informal information exchange about tenants.

CF principles are used extensively in Mesa public housing. An example is the use of the CF lease addendum to evict renters for any behavior that jeopardizes health, safety, and public welfare. The eviction occurs within 12 to 24 hours; that is, there is no 30-day waiting period. Eviction from public housing means the person is removed from the approved list for future public housing openings. This was accomplished by legislative change. Ninety percent of those evicted leave within 24 hours or don't show in court. Evictions are upheld for 90% of the 10% who do come to court. There are nuisance abatement laws, and the PD is very aggressive with them. Mesa PD is very proactive with landlords and convince them about the value in participation in CF programs.

A TRIAD program (elder abuse, fraud schemes) is just getting underway here. Fifty percent of Mesa's population is elderly.

Mesa PD has taken a proactive approach to auto theft. They have LOJAC and Watch Your Car programs monitored by a detective in auto theft. Maricopa County is number one in the country for auto thefts.

Crime Free Mini-Warehouse Program

Mesa has 55 mini-warehouse facilities in Mesa, with between 200 to 2000 units per facility. This program offers quarterly training to managers, since they have a high turnover rate. This program gives the public an opportunity to see how police work, educate them as to what to look for with regard to potential criminal activity, and chance to exchange information with other managers.

Patrol officers are assigned to the mini-warehouse program and contact the warehouse managers in their spare time. Also they meet with other officers in the district to obtain reports regarding mini-warehouse crimes. These officers also help with the training and do CPTED inspections of the properties. Most of these officers are from the CAT team as they have more time than patrol officers for such activities.

Crime Free Hotel/Motel Program

The Crime Free Hotel/Motel Program like all the CF programs, has the three-phase approach to crime prevention.

One of the main problems with hotel/motels was stolen TVs from rooms. Simple solutions such as bolting TV's and engraving the serial number and model number on the back significantly reduced the crime problem. Another problem was with credit card frauds. The program has now trained the hotels to ask for positive photo ID which are photo copied and attached to the registration card. Mesa is part of the FAXNET1 program that lets detective send one fax to a central number, and 74 faxes are sent from there to all the hotels which participate.

Hotel training also includes information about clandestine drug labs. Mesa PD has developed a Knock and Talk squad of drug detectives (undercover/surveillance/swoops, etc) for hotel interdiction. Each squad is responsible for 4 to 6 hotels in their area. The squads train hotel staff.

Description of Decentralized Investigative Function

Superstition District has had four decentralized property crimes detectives working there since July, 1997. This is currently the only district with decentralized detectives. The following information was derived from talking with two of the property detectives assigned there. Both detectives reported more benefits than losses for decentralization.

Positives:

- Work with Patrol and the CAT officers all the time.
- Lots of new officers at the Superstition District. As a result of being together they get to know the Superstition detectives well.
- Officers give detectives reports to follow-up on right away.

Negatives:

- Lack of detective expertise.
- Lack of access to more experienced, centralized detectives.
- Left out of things downtown--"out of sight, out of mind".
- Less communication with downtown (Superstition is a 20 minute drive from downtown).
- Overlooked for training opportunities.

Superstition detectives' caseload is 15 to 20 per month. It was reported that the sergeant does a good job of weeding out cases not fit for follow-up. It was the feeling that there are enough detectives at Superstition currently to deal with the caseload.

Detectives type all their own reports; hard copies go to central records. No other copies are kept at Superstition except for detectives' work copy. Reports are sent by interdepartmental mail or are faxed to downtown. Detectives do not dictate reports. One-third of detectives' time is spent writing reports.

The detectives advised that crime scene technicians were needed at Superstition.

It was reported that more resources are needed at Superstition, such as photos for lineups, crime lab and identification services, and pawn computer records (all downtown). Superstition detectives don't have real meetings with downtown detectives for communication. They tend to pass information informally and less than regularly.

How do downtown detectives view Superstition detectives? The detectives felt that as new and young detectives, the senior detectives don't really know them and senior detectives don't ask for their help. The decentralized detectives felt it would be better for new detectives to start downtown, not at Superstition, to get some expertise first.

Description of Community Action Teams (CAT)

CAT members are non-call status officers, assigned to a beat within a district and are the lead for community policing/problem-solving initiatives. Dobson District is viewed as the best and oldest CAT and was started in 1995. As a result of the success at Dobson the CAT program was integrated into the other substations. The Dobson District CAT officers facilitate training for other CAT team members. Every month CAT officers get a list of the highest CFS areas, then act with POP to solved these area problems. Superstition, for example, has 8 beats. There are two CAT officers who have 2 beats each, and the rest of have 1 beat.

CAT officers have flexible schedules. Each district has POP projects and each CAT has its own sergeant.

Bike team officers (which is a separate group of officers from CAT) work with CAT as needed. The bike teams vary from district to district. Bike teams don't take calls, but patrol parks, malls, etc.

Officers need three years of street experience before they can join CAT and also need the recommendation of their supervisor. Officer's proactive experience is scrutinized for entry into CAT.

CAT earns credibility with Patrol by taking calls from time to time, keeping channels of communication open, showing videos about how CAT and Patrol, as well as other components of Mesa PD, can and do work together. CAT's are very diversified in the use of external resources and work with all other City agencies (e.g., zoning, utilities). It was reported that 60 to 70 percent of Superstition CAT's POP projects are in low-income areas.

Summary/Impressions

Mesa Police Department is one of the finest Police Departments we have seen. They have institutionalized and operationalized crime prevention and education in their day to day operations. Their Crime Free Programs are national models of how a community policing philosophy can work in action. This is especially true in the investigative function. Mesa specifically assigns detectives to various Crime Free Programs to ensure compliance and maintenance so that the impact is long term.

The department's commitment to crime prevention/education and its application as a problem-solving tool is extraordinary. Mesa PD is developing a new program called Crime Free Lifestyle that will take crime prevention/education to a higher level with a focus on every member of a family's involvement/responsibility in crime prevention/detection. These type programs and initiatives clearly demonstrate Mesa PD's understanding of citizen/business responsibility in dealing with crime issues.

Additionally, the Center Against Family Violence is an excellent example of collaborative problem-solving that was born out of the care and empathy of two detectives who put their ideas into action. The spirit and pride of Mesa Police Department was found to be exciting and contagious. It appears that empowerment is a reality at this department.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Conducted by Rod Beard and Mary Ann Wycoff
July 16-17, 1998
Reported by Rod Beard

The Community

Sacramento is the capitol of the State of California. It has a population of approximately 400,000 people. There are several cities nearby of similar size or somewhat smaller, including Stockton and Chico.

The City's government is a Council-Manager form with eight Council Members elected by districts and a Mayor who is elected at large. The city manager appoints all exempt employees (ranks of captain and above for the police) with input from the Chief of Police. A simple majority of the City Council appoints the city manager. A super majority is required to fire the city manager. The last city manager lasted eighteen years. The present city manager and the current chief were appointed around January 1993.

In 1993-1994, the police department developed area management, dividing the city into four sections with a captain responsible for each. The city followed suit, assigning an assistant manager to each of four city areas. The assistant city manager and the captain assigned to an area are responsible for promoting problem solving. Each section has an advisory group of citizens who work with the manager and captain. The captain or lieutenant assesses the complaints and takes the necessary information back to the department.

In addition to the advisory groups, there are organized neighborhood associations. Also, there is a victims assistance program provided by local churches. Approximately sixty pastors are involved.

A problem noted with the structure of government was that elected council members concentrated on their particular districts and did not see the larger picture.

At times a lieutenant, rather than the captain, may work with the section manager. A few years ago, a lieutenant would not have been permitted to speak

with the city council. Chief Venegas wanted everyone to become better communicators, so he encouraged the lieutenants to speak to the council.

The Department

There are 618 sworn and 354 non-sworn employees at this agency.

The transition to Community Policing started in 1988. Community Policing is an agency wide philosophy. Some officers (COP/POP Officers) work in special units assigned to community projects. However all personnel are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach. Chief Venegas sees detectives as a resource for COP/POP Officers.

In practice, the community policing philosophy means problem oriented policing. In other words, the department is interested in crime prevention as well as the resolution of crimes already committed. One method used is crime prevention through environmental design or CPTED. Other methods of crime prevention include neighborhood surveys, canvases and notifications to neighbors of criminal activity that may affect them.

The department also began to address neighborhood livability issues. The narcotics unit began to focus not only on the major cases but also other, less serious cases that impacted the community adversely. Many times the bigger problem for citizens is the street level drug dealer and or user. This is the person most visible. The street level criminal commits many of the minor crimes that negatively impact quality of life in a community.

Detectives in the Special Investigations Unit now work many of the minor cases to improve neighborhood livability. Detectives are teaching street officers how to write search warrants. Investigators attend neighborhood meetings to hear which drug houses are of greatest concern. A special detail called the Falcon Unit works drug houses that citizens complain about. This unit will take some action within twenty-four hours of receiving a complaint. At a minimum, the unit will perform a highly visible knock-and-talk operation to let the community (including violators) know the police are aware of the problem.

There is also a nuisance abatement program that allows the city to seek civil remedies at problem residences. There is a program that teaches landlords to manage their properties more responsibly. A renters association works with new landlords in the same manner.

The Drug and Alcohol Advisory Board is made of citizens recommended by council members. The Board is diversified to include members of all ethnic, gender and sexual preferences. The group includes a minister and the Captain of Special Investigations. The purpose of this board is to reach out to addicted persons and get them into treatment programs. This board also reviews grants for outreach and rehabilitation programs. The board reports to the County Board of Supervisors.

The Special Investigations Team is divided into North and South teams. The purpose of this geographic assignment is for detectives to get to know better the citizens, including criminals, in their area of responsibility.

There is also a major crimes committee. This committee consists of the two deputy chiefs (from operations and investigations), the patrol lieutenants and captains and Criminal Intelligence. The committee meets once a week to assess crime patterns and assist detectives.

A monthly meeting of agency heads or representatives is chaired by the police chief. The participants are the District Attorney, managers of parole and probation, and the County Sheriff.

This year the department is going to revisit their strategic plan. They will not be able to recreate what was done before due to the amount of time and resources required.

Motivations for Making Changes to Investigations

The Sacramento Police Department developed a five-year strategic plan to improve and personalize police services to the community. The changes in Investigations (discussed below) were made to create a partnership with the community for the purpose of addressing mutually identified crime problems. The ultimate goal is to enhance the safety and quality of life of the citizens.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Detectives are of the same pay scale and rank as an officer. The majority of detectives are still centralized specialists. There is a detective sergeant and four detectives at the North station with plans to decentralize a similar group to the South station. The decentralized detectives are generalists in that they work

both robbery and property crimes. These detectives continue to report through an investigative chain of command. Detectives do not attend community meetings and are not directly involved in problem solving.

The decentralized detectives report being inconvenienced by physical decentralization. When they need reports or pictures, etc. they have to drive downtown. This takes approximately an hour that could be used on working cases.

The decentralized detectives have not seen an increase in citizen contacts since moving from downtown. They did see an improvement in their contacts with officers. The detectives who had been decentralized did not see a need to support or work with the precinct officers since they still reported to a supervisor downtown. One stated that it was necessary to be on guard lest the area captain try to use them for "his own purposes." It does not appear that decentralization has yet resulted in a unified vision or sense of organizational purpose for the area served.

The Crime Analysis Unit has been moved to the detective division in order to improve the efficiency of investigations. This unit is staffed with a sergeant, an officer, a police clerk and an administrative assistant. The unit provides information about potential crime trends for discussion at the major crimes meetings. At the major crimes meeting, the problem is identified and classified and a decision is made as to what needs to be done to solve the problem. The Crime Analyst also provides detectives and POP officers with information about series of crimes and crime patterns within districts. The analyst develops "crime alerts" which are media spots offering rewards for information leading to the capture of suspects. The analyst also provides fliers on recently released parolees and high risk sex offender registrants. The analyst provides the captain with a monthly breakdown of burglaries and robberies and publishes a newsletter called *The Bullet* which provides crime information and commends officers who have done good work. The analyst provides information regarding crime statistics to neighborhood associations and businesses. There is a department web page that allows citizens to view suspect alerts and crime statistics as well as other department information. Citizens can use the web page to compare crime statistics from year to year.

There is a gang unit. At this time the gang unit just gathers intelligence.

There currently is no rotation policy for detectives, although the department is exploring one. However, people are now using their detective assignment as a

stepping stone towards promotions. Detectives generally stay three to five years as opposed to an entire career.

Standout Features of this Site

The most innovative aspect of change for this department is the Special Investigations Unit. This unit deals primarily with narcotics. Special Investigations has changed their emphasis to deal with neighborhood livability issues as well as the larger cases. This is the only unit that appears to work with the community as well as train officers in ways that will help the officers work their districts. Investigators from this unit attend neighborhood meetings to learn which drug houses are priorities for the residents. A team of officers called the Falcon Team is tasked to take some action within twenty-four hours of receiving a drug complaint. This action may be as minimal as doing a knock-and-talk or as much as a search warrant. The purpose is to let the neighbors know that the police department is concerned about their complaints and let the drug dealers know the police are aware of them.

Sacramento has a nuisance abatement program with which the city seeks civil penalties to resolve problems with drug houses. There are training programs to assist landlords in becoming better property managers.

The department also works with the Drug and Alcohol Advisory Board. The board consists of a group of citizens appointed by council members, a captain from the Sheriff's Office and the Captain of Special Investigations. The main purpose of the board is to get persons addicted to drugs or alcohol into treatment programs. These are people who usually fall through the cracks because they do not have insurance. The board also reviews and makes recommendations as to whether or not certain outreach and rehabilitation programs receive grants.

Detectives also teach officers how to write search warrants. In the past only detectives were allowed to write warrants. Now officers who have received training are able to write search warrants.

Internal Assessment of Changes

Management's perception was that the changes have been beneficial to the department, detectives and the community. Management believes that there is

adequate training and resources to do the job. Also at this level there is belief that the detectives are more responsive to the community and officer concerns.

Some detectives and patrol officers believe that there has been little change in their working relationship with the community. Detectives and officers who were good about communicating still are; those who were not communicating are still not communicating. The prevailing attitude was that decentralization improved detective communication with patrol officers while decreasing communication with other detectives.

The decentralized detectives did not participate in many neighborhood meetings. They also said there was no increase in citizen contacts. These detectives said that they felt they were a small unit in someone else's house, occupying space that was only grudgingly shared by patrol. These detectives felt they did not have adequate resources to do the job. They had to drive downtown for reports, mugshots and other items they frequently needed. The drive could take an hour or more from their workday.

Training for detectives was cost prohibitive because they had to pay for their own travel, food and lodging. The department only paid tuition. The detectives also believed that the administrators did not understand what detectives did. Some detectives believed the decision to decentralize was made by someone high in the chain of command and shoved down everybody's throats.

Observers' Perceptions

The most obvious issues for this department are the newness of the changes, the lack of supportive technology, the problems with decentralization when a department maintains a separate investigative chain of command, and the importance of the first line supervisor when implementing change.

This department still appeared to be experiencing the pains and turmoil most departments go through in the transition to community policing. Leadership at the top is strong. The managers seem to have a clear focus and direction for change. The front line officers and detectives seem to believe they lack time to do the problem solving that management expects. The front line personnel did not seem to understand that by problem solving, calls for service and caseloads decrease.

The department went through budget cuts at the beginning of strategic planning. Both detectives and officers indicated there were too few people to do

their respective jobs. Part of the problem, according to some officers, was that there are too many specialty units. This, in their belief, exacerbated the shortage of personnel.

In general, one senses that there are several people in the agency who embrace the philosophy of community policing and understand the need for organizational changes to support it. However, these attitudes are not yet broadly or deeply engrained in the organization. There is the feeling that the organization is in the initial stages of its transition with substantial leadership advocacy and training still needed to establish commitment to the changes.

The lack of advanced technology is a problem. The decentralized detectives complained about driving downtown to get certain items to do their jobs. The items could be readily available with the purchase of minor equipment. An X-Image machine would allow them to obtain photos of suspects, etc. Reports could be faxed to detectives and in some cases reports could be obtained from computer LAN systems. There was a concern about not having enough cars as there would be a need to travel downtown to the booking facility, etc. Perhaps the department could review ways to obtain additional vehicles through seizures or the use of lease vehicles.

There seems to be a division between the decentralized detectives and the precinct they work in. The detective sergeant stated that the Precinct Captain thought the decentralized detectives reported to him. The advantage of having decentralized detectives is to bring the detectives closer to the citizens in a specific geographical area to assist in problem solving. These detectives would become more familiar with the citizens, officers and problems in the area. This would lead to more accountability. These objectives have not yet been instilled in the decentralized detectives.

If a separate investigative chain of command is maintained, two problems may occur. The first problem is that decentralized detectives have no local command person to go to bat for them. There would be no person of influence to obtain space, use of office equipment and other resources that would enhance their ability to do their jobs. The detectives in turn may feel isolated and resentful. The second problem would be accountability. Generally, when citizens are frustrated by a problem, they turn to the precinct commander or they call the chief or mayor who then calls the precinct commander. In Sacramento, the precinct commander has no direct control over the local investigators. This limits the resources available to the commander to resolve the problem and it defeats the purpose of decentralizing detectives.

First line supervision has always been critical to police work. The first line supervisor carries the message of management to the people who actually will implement the change. If the front line supervisor filters the message or does not work to ensure management's philosophy is carried out, the job will not be accomplished in the manner management desires. When an agency is attempting to implement change, front line supervision becomes even more important. People in general are resistant to change. The first line supervisor can either sell the change in philosophy as fun and challenging or demean the change as not worthwhile. Any time there is a major organizational change, there will be issues that need to be worked out. Some fine tuning of ideas will be necessary. A supervisor can accept this challenge and look at ways to adjust the system or use every opportunity to tell the officers/detectives why the changes will not work.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Conducted by Donald Quire and Mary Ann Wycoff

October 7-8, 1998

Reported by Mary Ann Wycoff

The Community

San Diego is the second largest city in California, located on the coast just thirty minutes north of the Mexican border. With an area of 324 square miles, the city is home to 1,190,200 people of whom approximately 57 percent are white, 21 percent are Hispanic, 12 percent are Asian, and 9 percent are black.

Under the direction of a mayor, a nine-member city council, and city manager, San Diego is a manufacturing and agricultural trade center and transportation hub for southern California, parts of Arizona and New Mexico, and northwestern Mexico. Contributing to the economic growth of the area are the city's shipbuilding industry and aerospace and electronic equipment manufacturing. Aside from these businesses, there are several entertainment attractions that draw millions of tourists annually and increase economic development. They include Balboa Park (which contains the San Diego Zoo), Old Globe Theater (a reproduction of Shakespeare's theater in England), and the historic Old Town and Gaslamp Quarter districts. In addition, the San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium is the home of the Chargers and the Padres, professional football and baseball teams.

Part I Crimes in 1997 were as follows:

Criminal homicide	67
Rape	384
Robbery	2,604
Aggravated assault	6,734
Burglary	8,159
Arson	227

The Department

The Police Department, headed by Chief Jerry Sanders, has 2,007 sworn personnel and 616 civilian personnel, 500 of whom are part-time. Personnel are represented by a union. The department is accredited.

In 1991 the organization adopted community policing as a philosophy that is intended to guide most of the agency's policies, management practices and operations. All agency employees are expected to carry out or support the community policing approach.

The city is divided into eight area commands, each headed by a captain. There are two or more service areas within each area command; each service area is headed by a lieutenant who has 24-hour responsibility for the area. Service areas correspond with neighborhood boundaries, the designations of which were determined in numerous community meetings. This restructuring was begun in 1994 and completed in 1996.

Service areas are worked by teams of six officers and one sergeant. Generalist area detectives are not assigned to the service teams but are expected to work with them. A detective may have responsibility for more than one service area. The area investigators are supervised by a sergeant who reports to the service area lieutenant. The decentralized detectives handle burglaries, thefts, grand theft, auto theft and certain violent crimes (batteries, assaults, attempted murders and street robberies).

The department has developed Juvenile Services Teams. D.A.R.E. officers, school resource officers and juvenile investigators work together as a team and are housed at the area stations.

Motivations for Changes in Investigations

The stated goal is to make detectives responsive to the community and get them involved in problem solving.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Of the approximately 400 detectives, about 120 are physically decentralized generalists who investigate a wide range of crimes. The remaining detectives are centralized specialists who investigate homicides, sex crimes, gangs, vice,

financial crimes, domestic violence, narcotics and child abuse. There also are centralized units for criminal intelligence and special investigations.

The decentralized generalists are supervised by a detective sergeant who, in turn, reports to the service area lieutenant. Although the decentralized detectives are expected to function as part of the service area team, this is still an evolving concept. Some detective sergeants are more committed to teamwork than others. (Once again, sergeants are critical.) The patrol lieutenant, who is in charge of the service area, does not really have the time to supervise teams, as such. There is not a supervisor who is responsible for the joint functioning of patrol officers and service area detectives.

There currently is discussion in the organization of whether to decentralize other types of investigations in order to make detectives (particularly specialized units like street narcotics and gang enforcement) more responsive to area commands.

Centralized robbery detectives already have a closer working relationship with the area commands; they are required to attend area line-ups at least once a week.

Homicide has established a closer relationship by having the homicide sergeants attend the area supervisors meetings.

Sex Crimes, Child Sex Abuse, and Domestic Violence detectives were said to be more likely to go into the community to do education and prevention--more multidisciplinary efforts. They also have more options than just arrest.

Implementation

Like many other agencies, the San Diego PD began its move into community policing and problem solving with an emphasis on the patrol division. Even within patrol, from 1990-1995, each area had a team of Neighborhood Service Officers who were to be the non-call-driven problem solvers for the area. When the later decision was made that everyone should be involved in problem solving, "everyone" seemed to mean patrol. One person we interviewed regretted that detectives had not had the orientation and training for community policing and problem solving at the same time patrol officers received it. There now is some sense of playing "catch up" for detectives, although this will be less of a problem as, with time, more detectives will have been patrol officers who were involved in these approaches. There continues to be an on-going

discussion in the organization about the extent to which detectives should be involved in problem solving: Should they be resource people or partners in problem solving?

Communication

Patrol officers have phone numbers and pager numbers for their area detectives. Everyone--patrol officers and detectives--soon will be on e-mail. Everyone will have a laptop computer which they will take home. By the end of next year, everyone will have computers and be trained.

Some centralized detectives spoke of the need for better communication equipment. Many of them do not have radios in their cars and report that the hand-held radios often run dead. They have cell phones only if they provide their own.

Technology and Crime Analysis

Like several other agencies, the San Diego PD is on the brink of a technological explosion. Universal computer access soon will be a reality. Automated field reporting is coming and all personnel will have access to GIS and ARCVIEW mapping. Photo booking will be possible. All the code books and other information that officers now carry will be computerized. Daily investigative supplementals will be available.

The San Diego PD has long had a strong commitment to a crime analysis unit. Each analyst is responsible for a geographic area. However, historically their function seems to have been more as a mapping unit than an analysis unit. With the new technology, officers and detectives will be able to communicate more easily, have immediate access to data and be able to do more of their own analysis.

Although analysts get more and more requests for information from the field, they do not think it would be useful for them to be physically decentralized. There are so many changes in software and other technology that they feel they need to be together so they can continuously help each other learn the new applications and serve as resources among themselves.

The department has 25 people working on hardware and software issues. In the near future, the San Diego PD is going to have a tremendous crime analysis capacity.

Internal Assessment of Changes

The decentralized detectives we met with were very enthusiastic about their work; they report better working relationships between detectives and patrol than in the past and report having more equitable workloads. They have an opportunity to really learn their areas and often find that the same person commits both property and persons crimes--something they would not be likely to know if they were specialist investigators. (This is the same thing they told us in Arapahoe County.) They feel that having a wider variety of cases to work helps them become better investigators.

They report undertaking problem solving efforts: for example, a project to reduce early morning burglaries from construction sites and another to prevent a gang from taking over a community park.

Detectives see their organizational status having improved since becoming generalists. When they were centralized property detectives, they were viewed as second class; one supervisor even referred to property detectives as "clerks."

Patrol officers, too, talked about the much improved working relationships with detectives since decentralization.

Centralized detectives, particularly those who have never worked as decentralized detectives, are more critical of decentralization, emphasizing the loss of contact and information. They are afraid that additional specialities may be decentralized. They argue that, when a detective becomes a generalist, there will be a tendency to focus on the more glamorous crimes to the detriment of more routine cases such as burglaries. Centralized detectives who previously were decentralized were less likely to express these concerns. One talked about the importance of working the "smaller" crimes as an important way of gathering information about the community and possible suspects. As retirements occur and more of the centralized detectives have had decentralized work experience, the opposition of centralized detectives to decentralization probably will decrease.

The attitudes among detectives about decentralized investigations divides, to some visible extent, along age lines. Older detectives tend to oppose further decentralization; younger ones--especially those young centralized detectives who previously have worked as decentralized detectives--seem more open to the idea.

Regardless of age, centralized detectives seem likely to agree that area generalists are a good source of information for specialists who are centralized. They have area-specific knowledge that specialists need. Some, however, questions whether anyone now is in a position to see a "big picture" of property crimes or violent street crimes. They also suspect that generalists are likely to pursue the more exciting, high profile cases and to let burglaries slide. The question was posed whether any detective wouldn't rather work on a serious crime than on a broken car window case.

One centralized detective who had worked as a decentralized generalist saw the value of investigating car prowls. She had known about every single one in her area. "If you are out there investigating a person's crime, you are making lots of face-to-face contacts and getting other information about the types of problems in the area." If this detective picked up information that specialist units could use, she passed it on. She reported the specialist units as being in the area stations frequently.

Some centralized detectives saw the value of generalists as being able to spot crime series early. They know everything going on in their area. By the time crime analysis spots a series, several more crimes may be committed. Area investigators may be able to spot them first.

The area managers (captains) we spoke with were very enthusiastic about the decentralization of detectives. They see the greater cooperation between patrol officers and detectives and they appreciate the greater resources they now have for dealing with area problems.

Especially Interesting Features

The Juvenile Services Teams, located in the area stations, are an interesting innovation. They seem to be based more on a problem model than an incident model.

Also, the decentralized generalists investigate a wider range of crimes than is true in some other agencies that use decentralized investigators.

The planned technological improvements are very exciting and ultimately may serve to eliminate many of the concerns about loss of information and contact as a result of decentralization. Everyone will have immediate access to data rather than having to wait days or weeks for crime pattern reports. Universal e-mail will be a major contribution to communication.

San Diego has an extensive volunteer program and some area commanders use them for investigative tasks. They may perform witness checks on burglary cases and are used to take prints from automobiles in car prowls cases. Some years ago, the San Diego PD decided to respond to car prowls cases by phone but, with many cases occurring, it was later decided to use volunteers to take prints. The volunteer will take the phone report and then decide whether the victim should bring the car to the station so the volunteer can take prints. In 1997, a 24 percent reduction in car prowls was reported, despite population growth and no increase in the number of sworn personnel.

Observers' Perceptions

San Diego has a well developed team approach to policing designated areas, and decentralized detectives seem to have good working relationships with their teams.

This is an exciting, innovative, thoughtful organization. This does not mean that everyone is enthusiastic about the changes; many centralized detectives still would like for all detectives to be centralized. What it does mean is that the San Diego PD will probably always look like an obvious "work in progress" because there seems to be a very real spirit of listening to employee concerns and trying to respond with better ways of organizing resources. At the time of this visit, careful consideration was being given to further decentralization of investigative specialities. With eight area stations, there is the tendency and opportunity to try a new approach in one station (the central station, for example, is the only one that had a decentralized street narcotics unit) and see how well the change works before moving it into other stations.

You will hear both officers and managers in the San Diego PD say, "we don't have this all figured out yet; we're still trying to decide just how this should work." We expect this refrain will always be heard in San Diego; it is the sound of an organization constantly seeking a better way of working.

INVESTIGATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING CONTEXT REPORT ON SPOKANE COUNTY, WASHINGTON SITE VISIT

Conducted by Rod Beard, Alix Olson and Mary Ann Wycoff
August 10-11, 1998
Alix Olson, Reporter

The Community

Spokane County is located on the eastern edge of Washington State, about 40 miles from the Idaho border. It includes approximately 1750 square miles of both sprawling urban areas and rural farmlands. The city of Spokane, where the Sheriff's Office is located, has traditionally been isolated from Seattle, Tacoma and the west coast cities of the state, but has served as the center of the eastern region of Washington and of Spokane County. The county has experienced significant growth in the last few years.

The total population is 404,640 of which approximately 219,000 are serviced by the Sheriff's Office, either because they live in unincorporated areas or because they are in communities that contract with the Sheriff's Office for services. Of the total population, approximately 92 percent are white, 2 percent are Asian, 2 percent are Hispanic, and 2 percent are black. The majority of the population is between 25 and 44 years of age.

In recent decades, Spokane County's economy has diversified and moved from natural resources industries (timber, agriculture, mining) to high-tech service companies. Some of the major employers in the region include Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation, Hewlett-Packard and Johnson Matthey. Fairchild Air Force Base is a major employer in the region and contributes significantly to the county's economy. With its vast resources, many refer to Spokane County as the capital of the "Inland Northwest." As the major metropolitan area in the region, it serves as a retail trade and services hub. It is also a regional center for arts and entertainment.

In 1997, the Spokane County Sheriff's Office (SCSO) handled calls for service that represented an increase of 40 percent over the past four years. Part 1 crimes in 1997 included:

Criminal homicide	11
Rape	75
Robbery	117
Aggravated Assault	408
Burglary	2,546
Larceny	5,870
Arson	34

The Sheriff's Office

The Sheriff's Office (SO), headed by Sheriff John Goldman, has 196 sworn personnel and 96 civilian personnel. In addition, there are 35 auxiliary personnel and 150 rescue personnel. Personnel are represented by a union. The agency has two undersheriffs, one in charge of operations and the other in charge of the jail and support services. Operations is divided into Investigative Operations and Uniform Operations. A captain in charge of Investigations commands four units: Crimes/Persons; Crimes/Property; Drugs/Gangs/Vice/Organized Crime and the Identification Unit. The first three are headed by lieutenants; the Identification Unit is headed by an Identification Supervisor. The agency was accredited by the State.

The SCSO is located in the City of Spokane, physically and operationally isolated from the rest of the county. According to Sheriff Goldman, the SO has, in the past, relied on its tradition and reputation to serve the community. But in the early 1990s the SO perceived a need to better respond to the rapidly changing conditions of the county and began to develop a model that would be driven by the needs and desires of the community.

In 1993, then newly elected Sheriff Goldman and the SCSO began implementing the first of many major organizational changes. A total, philosophic commitment to community oriented policing (COP) was adopted, setting in motion the move from a highly compartmentalized and centralized command structure to a decentralized form of command. Individual employees were encouraged to participate in problem solving and decision making and to share responsibility for outcomes and decisions. The SCSO went out to the "communities" it served and asked how it could cooperate better with them. These changes were implemented first at the patrol level.

"Community policing" is a problematic concept when you don't serve readily identifiable communities as is the case in Spokane County where the population is not organized along geographic lines. Within the county, organization--insofar

as it exists--tends to be around land use issues and schools. Consequently, the SCSO worked to build stronger partnerships with the schools and to use school support groups as a basis for organizing the Sheriff's Community Oriented Policing Effort (SCOPE) to identify and address community problems. This initiative was begun in 1994. The community was encouraged to organize into individual SCOPE groups, each of which has its own officers and its own operating funds. The SCOPE groups began to locate, rent and staff storefront offices modeled after the City of Spokane Police Department's COPSHOPS. By 1996, the first two of eight eventual SCOPE offices had been opened. These offices are opened at citizens' request and are facilitated by a civilian liaison between the SCSO and SCOPE who helps decide where the SCOPE office should be located. SCOPE usually is housed in small offices, apartments or houses. While SCOPE works in semi-independence of the Sheriff's Office, space is always made available for the use of SCSO detectives.

Motivations for Changes in Investigations

There were two major motivations for changing the structure and function of investigations in the SCSO. One had to do with the traditional rift between patrol and investigations. They had little interaction and managers believed the work of both could be more effective if they worked more closely together. The second had to do with the realization that problem solving was difficult for patrol officers to manage in their call-driven operational mode. It occurred to the sheriff and his team that detectives are the ones who have the greatest latitude to flex their schedule and may, therefore, be the best people in the organization to take primary responsibility for problem solving. Decentralization was seen as the means of increasing the capacity of detectives to know the problems of an area and to know the people and other resources available for addressing the problems.

Current Structure and Function of Investigations

Forty-two detectives are assigned to the Investigations Division; 13 of these are property detectives. At present, all Persons Crimes detectives are centralized and are specialized by crime type. Property detectives (who work burglary, theft, fraud and bad checks) are in the process of being decentralized to the scattered SCOPE offices where they function as generalists. They are responsible for all property crimes that occur in their areas. More significantly,

they have the lead responsibility for identifying and responding to problems in their assigned areas.

All property detectives self-assign their cases. The goal is to become increasingly community oriented and problem oriented in their prioritization of cases as opposed to being driven by the occurrence of a case or by its solvability factors. This may mean that a detective gives lower priority to some cases if they are isolated incidents rather than part of a pattern or problem. Certain cases may be given higher priority because they are of greater concern to the community. Because detectives self-assign cases, they read all property crime incident reports for their assigned areas and, in so doing, have a better idea of what is going on in the area than they would have if a sergeant were reading, selecting and assigning cases.

Self-assignment was undertaken for this reason and also because there was a need to free sergeants from what was largely a clerical task and its related followup work (e.g., answering citizens' inquiries about cases). Sergeants need to spend more time supervising and training young detectives. Since 1996, 21 new people have joined the Investigative Division and all but seven have been transferred to new or different positions within the Division. The average length of experience for property detectives is currently only two years. Because property detectives are being decentralized and are assuming problem solving responsibility, their supervisors feel the need to spend more time in the field with them and more time monitoring and facilitating their problem solving efforts. Sergeants need to do more supervisory work and less secretarial work.

The relative youth of the new detectives made them seem good candidates for the problem solving role. Many had worked in patrol during the introduction of community policing and had adopted the philosophy before moving to Investigations. They had not spent several years working in the isolation of the old detective office and so were not as reluctant to consider decentralization as were some of the older detectives.

Initially, only two detectives were willing to move to SCOPE offices but, as others witnessed the positive effects of interacting with the community in a neighborhood office setting, more were willing to make the change. The ultimate goal is to decentralize all property crime detectives to SCOPE offices. At present, there are some decentralized property detectives. Although they receive more COP/POP training than their centralized counterparts, SCOPE detectives are still learning to manage their time as they strive to become community oriented. The initial tendency is to self-assign too many cases in an

attempt to do as much for the community as possible. Case assignments are increasingly community driven, as the SCOPE citizen volunteers become involved in reviewing reports to help advise detectives about case priorities by calling attention to neighborhood hot spots and concerns. SCOPE volunteers may perform call backs to complainants or victims to inform them of the status of their cases or to seek additional information. In addition, they also talk to drop-in citizens, attend community meetings and work on citizen surveys. They can assist detectives with specific record-keeping functions, lift prints in "car prowls" cases, and make follow-up phone calls when appropriate. They raise funds for their individual offices and act as the point of contact between the community and the SCSO. SCOPE volunteers have background checks performed on them, and the amount of responsibility they are given is in proportion to the outcomes of those checks. As a general rule, people are not summarily excluded as volunteers because of issues in their backgrounds unless there are other mitigating circumstances. As one SCOPE detective puts it, "SCOPE volunteers come to us; we don't choose them."

At the beginning of 1998, COP implementation was being planned for centralized homicide, sex crimes, and drug/gang detectives; however, it was meeting with some initial resistance due to lack of knowledge on the part of these detectives about COP/POP issues. There was the perception on the part of some that COP was a "soft" approach to policing. Nevertheless, by mid-year sex crimes and drug/gang detectives had begun to self-assign cases by geographic area and, shortly thereafter, major crimes detectives followed suit. While there have been mixed reactions by detectives to the idea of decentralizing homicide to SCOPE offices, one homicide detective may soon volunteer to try this approach.

The next step in decentralization will be to house community corrections officers in the SCOPE offices. SCOPE citizen volunteers will be used to monitor probation and parole clients' conditions. Additionally, with patrol deputies stopping by their district SCOPE offices more frequently to complete reports, run records checks, or exchange information with the SCOPE detective or volunteer, the SCOPE stations are beginning to function as decentralized offices for them, too. The time may come when deputies will have to go downtown only to book a prisoner or secure evidence in the property room.

Integration of patrol and investigations is increased by officer participation in investigations. Officers may elect to continue an investigation past the initial, information-gathering process, if calls for service allow. Officers are also assigned investigative follow-up by geographic regions on misdemeanor crimes, the most promising of which have been screened and sent on to them by

detective sergeants. Both detectives and detective sergeants report better communication between officers and detectives. Officers fill out intelligence logbooks in the SCOPE offices and share information informally but directly with SCOPE detectives instead of going through sergeants. They also are starting to communicate more regularly with the SCOPE volunteers in their assigned districts.

One of the SCOPE offices is located in Edgecliff, a district of less than one square mile, which once had the highest burglary rate in the country. It is an area characterized by older, lower income residents, many of whom live in rental housing. The area has been victimized by drugs and prostitution and their attendant crimes. In mid-1977, the Edgecliff SCOPE office was started in response to a school-related traffic problem. There also was a drug house across from the school. Citizens felt that neither the school district nor the SCSO were sufficiently responsive to their concerns and they formed a site council with the school to react to the traffic problems. The newly assigned Edgecliff SCOPE detective attended these council meetings and taught the citizens to use the SARA model to address their concerns. The entire process of scanning, analyzing, responding to, and assessing the traffic problem was conducted by the citizens themselves, with some technical assistance from the SCSO. The Edgecliff SCOPE detective stated, "We show people how to solve their own problems and the SCSO figures out where it fits in. We help people change their habits so that the SCSO is *part* of the solution, not *the* solution. We teach the citizens to do for themselves."

The Edgecliff SCOPE office is unique in having a Neighborhood Oriented Prosecuting Attorney (NOPA) assigned to it, the result of a COPS Problem Solving Partnership Grant. The prosecutor works out of the SCOPE office, sharing an office with the detective and working closely with him and the citizen volunteers to identify and focus prosecution on neighborhood troublemakers. Washington State has a point system for determining sentencing to prison. A total of 9 points will send an offender to prison and more serious crimes are assigned a higher number of points. It is often more difficult and time consuming to get an offender for one or two major crimes than to get the same person for a few smaller ones that total the same nine points. The Edgecliff prosecutor and detective are working to "max out" some of the problem burglars in the neighborhood to see what difference it makes in the community to get them off the street. Not only do they seek to imprison offenders; they use the point count to attempt to deter some of them, trying to encourage them to change their ways before accumulating the final points for imprisonment.

There are two problems for this experiment: (1) the outcome data for evaluation will not be available for four or five years and (2) the Spokane County court system is backed up three to five years, due primarily to an overload of civil cases. It can take as long as a year for detectives to obtain a property crime arrest warrant. Even with the diligence and cooperation of the prosecutor and detective, it is difficult in this kind of system to remove burglars from the street.

The SCOPE offices are slated to get additional prosecutorial staff; two prosecutors soon will be based in SCOPE offices to focus on family violence cases.

Another SCOPE station is located in Fairwood, a neighborhood that is much more affluent than Edgecliff and one where there are fewer citizen volunteers. A smaller number of volunteers results in a higher rate of burn-out among them. Fairwood has a relatively low crime rate, although domestic violence is one of its bigger issues. The Fairwood SCOPE detective has citizen volunteers who take fingerprints in some misdemeanor cases, photograph graffiti, and maintain a pin map of burglaries, car prowls, vandalism, etc. The Fairwood SCOPE detective has begun to meet weekly with other detectives working, as he does, in the northern part of the county. Occasionally, they assist each other in investigations and problem solving. The SCOPE detective talks to downtown detectives by phone on a daily basis and drives downtown every other day. He reports that day shift officers assigned to his district come to the SCOPE station regularly and that they work closely with him to problem solve issues in the neighborhood. However, he does not see much of the swing or graveyard shift officers. This detective reports that he is starting to self assign cases based on community concern and impact, instead of being strictly incident driven. He reads all reports, as do the SCOPE volunteers, to learn what seems significant from a community perspective.

Supervision

The role of detective sergeants has evolved considerably, and sergeants now work closely with detectives to help develop POP solutions for cases using the SARA model. They also assist detectives by attending community meetings, where gripe sessions are usually followed by joint problem-solving brainstorming, leading to a stronger partnership between the police and community. Detective sergeants have been given wide latitude by their chain of command so that decentralization can be implemented, tested and assessed. One new step is the self-assignment of cases by detectives whom sergeants say

they trust completely to perform this function. Self-assignment has freed sergeants from what they described as "glorified secretarial work"--clerical duties which kept them at their desks. They now can spend more time assisting detectives with problem solving and coordinating work with the Patrol Division. Citizen complaints, which previously went to sergeants, now are routed to the appropriate detective who explains to the citizen why a particular case is investigated or not and what progress has been made. Sergeants may help detectives with workload prioritization or assist in obtaining additional resources (e.g., from patrol) for problem solving.

In order to do physical supervision, sergeants have to visit the SCOPE offices. Although they do not always know when their detectives come to work or go home, they feel that the community is their best indicator of detective performance. If a detective was not working as expected, sergeants believe they would hear from the community. Sergeants indicated that "you have to treat employees with the respect they deserve."

A *patrol* sergeant suggested that SCOPE detectives and their sergeants had lost contact with each other. When SCOPE detectives moved out into their geographic locations, it became more difficult and time-consuming for the detective sergeants to track them down and determine their case statuses. Formerly, sergeants had read all reports and were familiar with the big picture of crime patterns, repeat victimization and area hotspots. Decentralization has caused those data to be lost since reports (at least those pertaining to property crimes) are shipped directly to the SCOPE offices, creating a potentially embarrassing situation for uniformed sergeants who still are handling complainants' questions and concerns.

This concern was not voiced by detective sergeants.

Communication

The SCSO is very concerned about communication between SCOPE detectives and centralized detectives. Monthly meetings for all detectives have been established. Additionally, twice-monthly meetings of all SCOPE detectives are planned. As the budget allows, SCOPE offices have come on-line with the rest of the SCSO and are now able to access most of the records necessary to function outside the main station.

Communication is facilitated by an Investigations newsletter that is published regularly and distributed throughout the department. It includes information and queries about specific cases and crime patterns as well as more general news about the organization.

Cooperation and communication between Patrol and Investigations is being supported by the creation of a new Directed Patrol Unit (DPU) that is charged with combating street-level crime. The DPU will consist of one patrol sergeant and five officers and its mission is to assist district officers and detectives with specific problems that need more resources, after the problems have been analyzed with the SARA process. Problems will be prioritized by violence level and by means of a written neighborhood assessment form received from citizens. The DPU is to foster a team policing approach to problem solving. The unit sergeant sees this as an opportunity to pull different SCSO units together in an ad hoc team building structure and to promote increased flexibility and teamwork between Patrol and Investigations. The DPU will also serve as a training mechanism for patrol officers interested in learning more about the detective function.

Technology

Spokane County has just implemented the Geographic Information System (GIS) and is in the process of learning its capacity and utility. In the SCOPE offices, crime analysis remains at the level of pin maps with monthly overlays of plastic pages. The department is on the brink of a technology explosion that has not yet impacted decentralized investigations in the way it will in the next year or two.

Internal Assessment of the Changes

Self-assignment of cases and geographic assignment are viewed as having helped several areas within the investigative division, including sex crimes and the drug/gang unit. Until recently, sex crimes detectives and detective sergeants were inundated by sex offender registration duties; they had no secretarial support. Some cases were not being assigned because the sex crimes detective sergeant was too busy answering phone calls and doing paperwork. Since the sex crimes detectives began self-assigning their cases, the problem has eased somewhat because they now share the telephone call load. In the drug unit, cases are not actually self-assigned. The detectives are assigned geographically

(although not yet decentralized) and have changed their focus to cases that are a problem to the community, as opposed to being case or informant driven. The drug unit also meets with school personnel, presents training and information to businesses and assists the Homicide Task Force with surveillance in targeted neighborhoods.

Voices from patrol speak from several different perspectives. One officer characterized the pre-SCOPE era of officer/detective interaction as resembling "a black hole" and asserted that he never saw detectives then unless a major crime occurred at which time detectives arrived to take over the crime scene. With the advent of SCOPE stations and the decentralization of property crimes detectives, this officer reported seeing detectives "quite a bit more" as they perform follow-up on the street and "not just on the phone." He reported that he is contacting detectives more frequently, that he is now receiving more information from detectives than from Crime Analysis, and that he enjoys reading the newly established detective newsletter. What he is learning from detectives is encouraging him to be more of an advocate of citizen involvement, COP/POP, and SCOPE methodologies himself. He expressed the desire for greater cross-training opportunities for patrol officers with detectives.

A uniformed sergeant, who previously had been a detective, suggested that Patrol--rather than Investigations--should provide the backbone for COP "because people identify with Patrol more." Detectives should be housed together centrally but should provide more support for patrol. Detective-Patrol communication could be enhanced though detectives attending patrol roll calls. Communication between detectives and patrol officers had begun to improve prior to detective decentralization as a result of "long term districting" in which patrol officers were assigned to the same district for 1 to 1.5 years at a time. This made it possible for them to create working relationships with specific detectives.

Implementation

In 1994, the SCSO set out to implement POP and began by providing training, conducted by Washington State University, for all personnel. The expectation was that Patrol would take the lead on POP and Investigations would provide support. For both political and operational reasons, implementation in Patrol proved difficult; a high call load made it difficult for patrol officers to practice POP principles effectively or routinely. Because of these setbacks and because

they had the ability to flex their time, detectives were given the primary responsibility for POP and have achieved some immediate successes.

One officer spoke of having had some COP/POP training "maybe four years ago." Successful implementation will probably depend on repeated POP training as hiring, promotion and retirement change the face of the SCSO. On-going training for citizen volunteers also will remain important.

One respondent suggested that Patrol rotation through the Investigative Division--for training and a first-hand view of POP in action--might lead to heightened interest in POP on the part of Patrol.

Especially Interesting Features

There are several remarkable features about the Spokane approach which make it unique among the sites in this project. It is a model unto itself. Unusual features include:

- self-assignment of cases by most detectives
- geographic assignment of most detectives
- physical decentralization of property detectives to neighborhood storefront offices managed and staffed by civilians
- Each SCOPE office is its own experiment. Decentralized detectives are developing their own approaches to neighborhood involvement and investigations. Managers seem confident in watching each and learning from the "best practices" that evolve.
- civilian participation in investigative work (e.g., follow-up calls, taking prints, photographing graffiti, etc.)
- problem solving responsibility for decentralized detectives
- investigative priorities set through problem identification with citizen participation.

Observers' Perceptions

It was exciting to see this organization. It is an unusually innovative department in which managers have the confidence in their personnel to allow experimentation and loose supervision. There will be many lessons to be learned from this organization if the experiments survive the next election. Sheriff Goldman will not be seeking another term.

There is a potential for self-assigned caseload burn-out until alternate methods can be developed to decrease the report load (e.g., a citizen self-reporting system, a CAD prioritization of calls, training for citizens about the capacities of the department). Once the community becomes more uniformly involved, calls for service may decline. Ultimately, the level of service will rest on community participation.

As detectives strive to become problem-oriented, cases that do not achieve problem status may fall between the cracks. In any department, large numbers of cases always go unworked, for one reason or another. Whether the community will be aware, and accepting of, the problem orientation to case prioritization remains to be seen.

Table 1. Extent of Implementation of Community Policing (N=547)						
	Municipal		Sheriffs		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Planning	4	1.0	4	2.5	8	1.5
Early Phase	29	7.5	30	18.9	59	10.8
One Quarter	47	12.1	23	14.5	70	12.8
Half Way	83	21.4	38	23.9	121	22.1
Three Quarters	75	19.3	16	10.0	91	16.6
Most Objectives Accomplished	128	33.0	38	23.9	166	30.4
Other	22	5.7	6	3.8	28	5.1
Missing	0	0.0	4	2.5	4	0.7
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

Table 2. Summary of Responses on Features of Community Policing (n=547)			
Questions	Municipal % (N)	Sheriff % (N)	Total % (N)
Philosophy that guides most department activities	71.6% (278)	58.2% (92)	67.8% (370)
Primarily a program	20.9% (81)	34.8% (55)	24.9% (136)
Implemented only in a section	22.9% (89)	20.9% (33)	22.3% (122)
Specific officers assigned to community policing	58.2% (226)	62.7% (99)	59.5% (325)
Community policing officers assigned to a unit	46.9% (182)	44.3% (70)	46.2% (252)
All officers expected to engage in community policing	74% (287)	70.3% (111)	72.9% (398)
Investigative personnel expected to engage in community policing	55.2% (214)	49.4% (78)	53.5% (292)
All personnel expected to engage in community policing	80.2% (311)	74.7% (118)	78.6% (429)

Note: This table provides data only for departments that indicated that they had implemented community policing.

Table 3. Department Status Regarding Redefining Roles of Detectives/Investigators (N=547)						
	Municipal		Sheriff		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The matter has <i>not yet been considered</i>	87	22.4	40	25.2	127	23.2
We <i>currently are considering</i> this matter	67	17.3	38	23.9	105	19.2
We are in the process of <i>actively planning</i> the redefinition or restructuring	27	7.0	10	6.3	37	6.8
We have implemented some <i>initial changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	78	20.1	22	13.8	100	18.3
we have implemented some <i>major changes</i> in the definition or structure of the function	56	14.4	12	7.5	68	12.4
We have considered this issue and concluded that the investigative function as currently defined and structured supports the organization's community policing goal	69	17.8	30	18.9	99	18.1
Missing	4	1.0	7	4.4	11	2.0
Total	388	100.0	159	100.0	547	100.0

Table 4. Organization of the Investigative Function in Community Policing Departments			
	Municipal (N=388) % (N)	Sheriffs (N=158) % (N)	Total (N=546) % (N)
Organizational Structure			
Almost all investigative functions are located within the investigative bureau/division	76.8% (298)	69.6% (110)	74.7% (408)
Most investigative functions are located within the patrol division	4.9% (19)	5.7% (9)	5.1% (28)
Investigative functions are shared between patrol and investigative bureaus/divisions	25.5% (99)	40.5% (64)	29.9% (163)
Location and Assignment			
Most investigative personnel are <i>physically centralized</i>	39.4% (153)	47.5% (75)	41.8% (228)
Most are <i>physically centralized</i> and have <i>citywide</i> responsibilities	47.2% (183)	30.4% (48)	42.3% (231)
Most investigators are <i>physically centralized</i> , but they may work <i>specific geographic areas</i>	24.5% (95)	25.3% (40)	24.7% (135)
A core of investigators is <i>physically centralized</i> , and is responsible for <i>specific types of crimes</i> of a <i>citywide nature</i>	51.3% (199)	41.1% (65)	48.4% (264)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i>	22.2% (86)	26.6% (42)	23.4% (128)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i>	11.6% (45)	23.4% (37)	15% (82)
Certain investigative functions are <i>physically decentralized</i> , and investigators are assigned <i>specific geographic areas</i> and <i>specific types of crimes</i>	21.1% (82)	32.9% (52)	24.5% (134)
Specialization			
Most detectives/investigators are generalists and investigate a variety of incidents	39.4% (153)	50.6% (80)	42.7% (233)
Most detectives/investigators are specialists and investigate specific types of crimes within their area of expertise	52.6% (204)	39.2% (62)	48.7% (266)
Most <i>centralized</i> investigators are specialists, while most <i>decentralized</i> investigators are generalists	14.2% (55)	16.5% (26)	14.8% (81)

Rank			
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale equivalent to patrol officers	60.6% (235)	49.4% (78)	57.3% (313)
Detectives/investigators have a rank or pay scale above patrol officers	41% (159)	52.5% (83)	44.3% (242)
Relationship with Patrol			
Patrol officers have <i>no</i> investigative responsibility other than taking the initial report	15.7% (61)	8.9% (14)	13.7% (75)
Patrol officers <i>may</i> have investigative or follow-up responsibilities that extend beyond the initial report	82.2% (319)	89.2% (141)	84.2% (460)
Detectives/investigators work in teams with patrol officers	14.7% (57)	16.5% (26)	15.2% (83)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments function as part of the patrol operation	8.5% (33)	10.8% (17)	9.2% (50)
Chain of Command			
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander (e.g., precinct or division commander) who is responsible for <i>patrol</i> operations in a specific geographic area	6.2% (24)	13.3% (21)	8.2% (45)
Detectives/investigators report to an area commander who is responsible for all police operations in a specific geographic area	3.6% (14)	14.6% (23)	6.8% (37)
Detectives/investigators with specific geographic assignments report through an investigative chain of command	17.3% (67)	17.1% (27)	17.2% (94)
All detectives/investigators, regardless of geographic location, report through an investigative chain-of-command	83.8% (325)	74.7% (118)	81.1% (443)