

Study Circles on Arbitrary Profiling

Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department

FINAL REPORT

January 31, 2006





Executive Summary

Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD) retained The Lee Institute to organize and carry out a set of study circles across its jurisdiction to:

- Increase community knowledge and understanding of the North Carolina State University (NCSU) Arbitrary Profiling Analyses and the UNC Charlotte Urban Institute Annual Survey questions on arbitrary profiling.
- Engage the community in honest and constructive dialogue on the subject of arbitrary profiling that will build trust among participants.
- Generate a set of recommendations for improving the working relationships between the police and the community especially with respect to arbitrary profiling.
- Improve community-police relations.

A total of seven study circle groups were convened beginning in August 2005. Three were drawn from residents of specific neighborhoods, two consisted of high school students, one consisted of college students, and one consisted of Arbitrary Profiling Advisory Council (APAC) members. Two police officers participated as members of each study circle. Each study circle met five times, with the fifth session on November 17, 2005 being a combined meeting of all seven groups. Each study circle was guided by a written curriculum prepared for this project and facilitated by a pair of trained volunteers. A recorder assigned from the CMPD staff created the “group memory” for each study circle which was transcribed into notes after each meeting.

Collectively, the study circles generated 32 unduplicated recommendations. Twenty-four out of the 32 suggest some form of enhanced communication, education or training. Nearly all of the recommendations require a partnership between the community and the police for implementation. Virtually none of them could be implemented by the police alone, and many would need to be initiated by constituents in the community.

Every study circle completed its work well. The level of engagement by the police officers added tremendous value to the quality of the experience overall. The rapport built among participants is likely to affect in a positive way the quality of interactions the police and community members have with each other outside of the study circle setting. More consistent attendance by study circle participants would have enhanced the overall experience and possibly surfaced even more creative recommendations.



Background and Methods

Definition and Characteristics of Study Circles

A study circle is defined in the following way: *“A study circle is a group of 8-12 people from different backgrounds and viewpoints who meet several times to talk about an issue. In a study circle, everyone has an equal voice, and people try to understand each other's views. They do not have to agree with each other. The idea is to share concerns and look for ways to make things better. A facilitator helps the group focus on different views and makes sure the discussion goes well.”* (Study Circles Resource Center)

Study circles can be used to tackle community issues in a democratic and collaborative way. All study circles share common characteristics:

- Diverse membership
- Eight to twelve participants
- Meet regularly for four to five times over a period of weeks or months
- Use ground rules to guide discussion
- Use an impartial facilitator to guide a structured process
- Follow a progression from personal perspectives to examination of many different points of view to a final session on strategies for action
- Use data to educate and inform the discussion
- In community wide study circles, a large community meeting of all study circle participants is held to share perspectives and possible action steps

Why Study Circles for This Project?

The Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD) has a strong commitment to working collaboratively with citizens on issues of safety. In fact, the mission of the CMPD is "to build problem-solving partnerships with our citizens to prevent the next crime."

The CMPD commissioned from North Carolina State University (NCSU) an analysis of the vehicle and pedestrian stop data occurring within its jurisdiction for 2002 and 2003. From their research of the 2002 data, the researchers concluded, "In general, it is found that [CMPD] stops and searches are largely accounted for by demand for police services and success in finding contraband, and not the demographic characteristics of the citizens." The researchers found that 96.5 percent of the four types of stops studied in 2002 fell within expectations of their model. The NCSU researchers found that there were several factors that could account for the 3.5 percent of the stops studied that fell outside of expectations, including the mobility of drug markets, demand for police service from organized citizen groups, (i.e., Cherry Neighborhood), and crime and traffic collision hotspots.

The primary objective of the 2003 NCSU study was to replicate the methodologies set forth in the 2002 data analysis and to see if the same factors



that were found predictive of stops in 2002 were also predictive in 2003. In general, the results showed that the models developed for the 2002 data on stops and searches were predictive of the 2003 stops and searches. The researchers found that the CMPD officers are consistently justified in the traffic and pedestrian stops made, and that stops are not motivated by the demographic characteristics of residents.

Copies of the 2002 and 2003 stop data analysis reports were posted on the CMPD's website. However, with a topic this significant and emotional, the CMPD determined that presenting the data would only be the first step in working with the community on arbitrary profiling issues.

The CMPD retained The Lee Institute to research the appropriateness of study circles as a means to engage the public in a process of discovery regarding the data on arbitrary profiling and possible responses to improve the relationship between the community and the police. The CMPD decided with The Lee Institute that study circles would provide the perfect vehicle for engaging the public *and* the police because the circles are designed to provide both opportunities for reaction and action, while also using the actual research to inform the conversation.

Purpose and Proposed Outcomes

The purpose of conducting study circles on arbitrary profiling in Charlotte Mecklenburg was to build greater trust and collaboration between the CMPD and the citizens of its jurisdiction through a structured, democratic process.

Specifically, the outcomes of this project were to:

- Increase community knowledge and understanding of the NCSU Arbitrary Profiling Analyses and the UNC Charlotte Annual Survey questions on arbitrary profiling.
- Engage the community in honest and constructive dialogue on the subject of arbitrary profiling that will build trust among participants.
- Generate a set of recommendations for improving the working relationships between the police and the community especially with respect to arbitrary profiling.
- Improve community-police relations.

The Lee Institute and the CMPD prepared a reference sheet (Appendix 1) for study circle participants regarding these outcomes in order to help the study circles stay focused.



Study Circles Composition

The Lee Institute recommended to the CMPD that each study circle consist of up to twelve participants, and that members commit to consistent attendance in order for trust and creative thinking to take place. In addition, The Lee Institute suggested that the CMPD find out if anyone needed special support to participate effectively, such as an interpreter or a handicapped accessible location. Holding meetings where the participants were, rather than bringing participants to a central location convenient for the organizers, was recommended to assure a more comfortable and convenient setting for participants.

The Lee Institute suggested that the CMPD launch its first study circle with the Arbitrary Profiling Advisory Council (APAC). The CMPD would then begin six additional study circles, three consisting of youth and three of adults. More specifically, the CMPD, The Lee Institute, and Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools agreed to the mix represented in the table below.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Age	Adults	College Students	High School Students	High School Students	Adults	Adults	Adults
Affiliation	APAC	JC Smith University	Garinger High School	Olympic High School	Commonwealth / Morningside neighborhood	The Plaza / Milton Rd.	West Blvd.



prospective participants. The CMPD staff placed reminder phone calls to those who signed up before at least the first and last study circle meetings. Johnson C. Smith University faculty and high school administration recruited student participants.

Recruiters for study circle participants were encouraged to include in their pitch the following points:

- “The Police Department will be active participants in this process and will be in the role of ‘partner’”
- “Citizens will have opportunities in a ‘safe’ environment to talk about arbitrary profiling”
- “Citizens will have opportunities to hear what police think about this concern—not just in the abstract, but face-to-face”
- “Your neighborhood will be a better place as a result of these study circles”
- “Study circles have been used with great success in other parts of the country on similar issues”
- “This is what democracy was designed to do”

All participants were encouraged at the first meetings to recruit their friends and neighbors for subsequent meetings in order for the groups to reach the optimal size. After the second study circle meetings, the groups were generally closed to new participants.

As it turned out, individuals joined the study circles regardless of their prior experience being stopped by the police. Maintaining an adequate number of participants generally became more important than the diversity within the group. In terms of race and ethnicity, Commonwealth was represented by more Caucasian participants than would be expected by their neighborhood. JCSU and Garinger participants were predominantly African American. There was not necessarily a representative racial or ethnic mix *within* a given study circle. However, taking all study circles together, Caucasians and African Americans were well-represented, with a small representation by Hispanics/Latinos. Males and females were fairly evenly represented within most study circles; overall, there were more slightly female than male participants, excluding the police officers. In addition, not every participant attended every study circle session.

Each study circle included two police officers who work in the geographic area represented. The police officers reflected, as a group, the gender and race/ethnic mix of the CMPD as a whole. These officers participated as members on an equal footing with other members and attended in street clothes, no uniforms.

Facilitators and Recorders

The facilitator role was crucial to successful study circles. The facilitator is an impartial leader who helps to manage the process, but is not an expert or teacher in the traditional sense. The facilitator helps the group focus on



different views and makes sure that everyone has an equal voice. The facilitator sets the tone of mutual respect and keeps the group on task. It is also the facilitator's responsibility to make sure that the ideas and decisions of the group are captured on paper. He/she might ask for help with this from group members.

For these study circles, The Lee Institute sent out a call for facilitators to professional contacts locally. (See Appendix 2.) It was important that the facilitators were not police officers and did not have a member of their household who was a police officer. Neither the facilitator nor his/her family members should have had a personal experience with arbitrary profiling. The Lee Institute suggested that the facilitators for the college and high school-age groups had experience working with youth. The facilitators could be Mecklenburg County residents.

The CMPD and The Lee Institute distributed a set of responsibilities for facilitators and their recorders, as shown in Appendix 3. The CMPD used staff members from their Research, Planning and Analysis Division as recorders. Recorders documented key points and decisions made in each study circle meeting on flip chart paper in order to create a group memory. The CMPD staff subsequently transcribed recorders' flip charts and distributed them as notes of each session.

Curriculum

There are usually five meetings for each study circle. The CMPD and The Lee Institute agreed that each study circle session would contain the following basic elements:

Session 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Completion of pre-survey on knowledge and attitudes regarding arbitrary profiling○ Setting ground rules○ Understanding stereotyping○ Sharing personal experiences that have shaped community/police relationships
Session 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Examining the 2002 and 2003 stop data analysis reports and the phone survey data on perceptions about profiling○ Identifying the positive findings and challenges from the data
Session 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Identifying what the police and community expect from each other○ Discussing how we know if each is doing a good job and what support the police and community need from each other to address possible root causes of problems
Session 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Brainstorming different ways to sustain or improve working relationships between the police and the community



Session 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Presenting ideas from each study circle to the combined group of attendees○ Voting on the ideas of all seven study circles to identify top ideas for improving the relationship between the community and the police

The fifth session was conducted as a combined session with all study circles together in order for each group to benefit from the thinking of the others and for the community as a whole to arrive at an agreed upon set of action steps. The final session was held at the Charlotte Fire Department/Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Training Academy located on Shopton Road. Dinner was provided before the meeting and transportation to and from the meeting was arranged by the CMPD for those who needed it. Together, the combined group of about 55 attendees considered ways to sustain the relationships and progress made within each group and celebrated the successes of each group and the collective whole.

Key Dates

Planning for the study circles began in March 2005. Key dates for implementation included the following:

- June - developed draft guides for facilitators and for participants; established dates and locations for each study circle meeting; began recruitment of participants from neighborhoods
- July - recruited facilitators for the study circles
- August 2 and 9 - held two facilitator orientations
- August - completed facilitator and participant guides
- August 18 - first study circle session
- September - recruited high school and JC Smith University student participants
- November 7 - last study circle session before the combined final session
- November 10 - planning meeting with facilitators for combined final session
- November 17 - combined final session



Results and Discussion

There were a total of 29 study circle meetings: four separate meetings for seven study circles plus one combined final session.

Overview: Session One

Each of the groups clarified the meaning and impact of stereotyping. Some relied on impersonal examples of profiling or stereotyping, while other groups shared their personal experiences. Groups that focused on the relationship between the police and citizens generally agreed that this relationship can be strained due to a variety of factors, including negative images portrayed by the media, personal negative experiences, and race relations challenges throughout society. Most of the dialogue focused on issues related to African Americans and Caucasians, with a smaller amount of attention given to problems faced by the Hispanic/Latino population. This is not surprising given that most study circles did not contain members from groups outside African Americans and Caucasians.

There was concern in several of the groups about the lack of diversity and attendance. Some study circles spent time making plans for recruiting additional members.

Overview: Session Two

At the second session, representatives from the CMPD's Research Planning and Analysis Division presented the stop data analysis from 2002 and 2003, and the results of a survey administered by the UNC Charlotte Urban Institute for the CMPD. As in the first session, the negative influence of the media on stereotyping was a concern shared by several study circles reacting to the data. Some groups expressed concern about the accuracy of the data due to the race of the researchers and possible limitations of the telephone survey. Other points of conversation included the power differential between police and citizens, the difficulty that officers have at times in being able to see the person they are about to stop well enough to know their race or ethnicity, and the need for officers to be more forthcoming about the reasoning and rationale behind their practices when they stop a pedestrian or motorist.

Overview: Session Three

At some of the study circles, the media resurfaced as both a vehicle for constructive community- building and for perpetuating negativity and stereotypes, depending on the context. Generally speaking, the groups identified opportunities for positive interactions and growth of personal or informal relationships between police officers and other community members as an effective means to combat stereotypes and improve mutual understanding.



Overview: Session Four

This was the session when participants brainstormed ideas for improving relationships between the police and the community. Most of the recommendations centered on opportunities for communication and informal interaction to build trust between the police and the community. The groups were encouraged to make their recommendations very specific and actionable. This proved difficult in some cases; the facilitators were relied upon after the meetings to help to shape their group's recommendations into language specific enough to be shared with the other study groups at the subsequent fifth study circle session. A complete list of the recommendations as reported by each study circle (with facilitator assistance in a few cases) is presented in Appendix 4.

Overview: Session Five

The desired outcomes for the fifth and final meeting were:

- A set of recommendations for our community to improve the working relationships between the police and the community especially with respect to arbitrary profiling.
- Celebration of participants' good work

About 55 people were in attendance, including ten of the 14 facilitators, four Lee Institute staff, four CMPD staff, and Deputy Chief David Stephens, who opened the meeting. After brief introductory and "ice breaker" activities, each study circle presented its group's recommendations to the others. Time was budgeted for clarifying questions (no critiques of others' work), generation of new ideas, and combining duplicate recommendations across study circles. The result was an updated listing of recommendations posted on flip charts.

Each participant, excluding CMPD staff, Lee Institute staff and facilitators, was given eight dots to place in any number across any of the recommendations. Police officers who were part of the study circles voted alongside their community member counterparts. No efforts were made to separate police officers' votes from the whole. While that would have been interesting, it would have symbolized a divide between the two groups at a time when the CMPD and The Lee Institute preferred to accentuate the unity between the two groups. Participants were encouraged but not required to spread their votes across multiple items. The list of the unduplicated recommendations in descending order according to the number of votes is shown in the table below. The recommendations in *italics* are those that were voiced for the first time at the final meeting and added to the list.



Votes	Recommendation
35	Better pay for officers
20	More positive communication from media (i.e. positive stories, etc.)
19	<i>Stricter rules for obtaining weapons - new on 17th</i>
18	Begin education about police/public safety at earliest age
17	Increase high school job shadowing program
16	Informal interactions with people in neighborhood
14	Teach/explain police procedures in schools and at community meetings
13	<i>Have officers be more public problem driven than productivity driven</i>
11	Balance enforcement with community activities
11	Reinstate DARE program
8	Diversity training
7	Increase police visibility at community events
7	Create "catchy" public service announcements for community
6	Have community take stock of needs and determine what police and community will do
5	Pay incentives for learning languages
5	Police communicate more positive stories to media/community
4	More effective use of technology to help officers
4	Increase number of multi-language officers
2	<i>Distribute community newsletter</i>
2	Promote crime watch as a partnership
2	Create a security bulletin board in schools
2	Ensure procedures are understood in English
2	Use local celebrities to bridge gaps
1	Hold structured meetings between police and community
1	Have a public safety high school elective
1	Self-awareness/personal development for police officers
1	Improve communication between Latin American community and others
1	Expand media coverage of Latin American community
0	Continue community/police activities with more structure
0	Annual community policing report mailed out
0	Ensure access to all languages in police communication
0	Invite media for ride-alongs

Before the final list of recommendations was prepared, The Lee Institute and the CMPD were anticipating that most of the ideas would focus on what would be the responsibility of the *police* to initiate or do differently. It was also expected that the top vote-getters would be those items that would fall on the shoulders of the police to implement. However, neither was the case. Nearly all of the recommendations require a partnership between the community and the police



for implementation. Virtually none of them could be implemented by the police alone, and many would need to be initiated by constituents in the community.

The themes that emerged in the conversations earlier in the study circle sessions played out in the final recommendations. Twenty-four out of the 32 recommendations involve some form of enhanced communication, education or training. It's possible that the relationships developed among the participants during the study circles and what they learned from each other set the tone for the collaborative nature of the recommendations. If the participants had not spent the time together listening to each other's experiences and perspectives, the recommendations might have been more adversarial or policy driven.

At the end of the final session, each person, including facilitators and staff, was asked to share with the group their own personal commitments for what they intend to do differently as a result of the study circle experience. Each comment is captured in Appendix 5. About half the comments revolve around people's commitment to improve their communication with the police, such as acknowledging an officer when they see them or networking with police officers in their neighborhood groups. The other half were commitments to get more involved or to take something they learned back to their workplace or school, such as getting the media involved in their community meetings or "shutting down rumors when I hear them in school." Participants were not told in advance that they would be asked to make a personal commitment. Given the lack of advance notice, the quality and breadth of commitments is a testament to the fact that the study circle process touched people's lives.

Participant Surveys

The CMPD administered a pre-survey during the first study circle meeting of each group, and a post-survey and evaluation questionnaire during the combined final meeting of the study circles. The pre- and post-surveys asked study circle participants about their beliefs regarding arbitrary profiling in order to find out whether the study circle experience may have shifted participants' perspectives. However, while it's likely that many of the same study circle participants completed both surveys, it's impossible to confirm that the respondents to the post-survey also completed the pre-survey. Therefore, only tentative observations can be made:

- After completion of the study circles, 54% reported that they do not believe the CMPD arbitrarily stops vehicles based on any arbitrary stereotype compared to 29% in the pre-survey.
- Respondents to both surveys also consistently named "suspicious behavior" as the most prevalent reason police officers stop pedestrians and motorists in high crime areas.

The CMPD also administered an evaluation of the study circle experience to solicit feedback from participants on the study circle design and effectiveness. The questions asked participants to rate the study circles on a scale from 1-10, 1 being "not at all effective" and 10 being "very effective".



- Just over half of respondents (52%) indicated that the study circles were effective at building a shared knowledge of the 2002-2003 arbitrary profiling data and the 2004 UNCC survey, providing a response of 8, 9, or 10.
- When asked how effective the study circles were in building trust in police officers, nearly half (46%) thought the process was effective, answering 8, 9, or 10.
- Nearly two-thirds of respondents (64%) believed that the study circle process helped generate ideas on how to improve relationships between the CMPD and the community; all participants rated this item between 5 and 10 on the scale.
- Most study circle participants who completed the evaluation questionnaire reported that they most liked the open environment and the exchange of information that occurred during the study circle meetings. They also suggested that more participation, more time, and more diversity would have added to the study circle experience.
- Almost all respondents (96%) reported that their facilitators provided good leadership, rating the facilitators between 8 and 10.

Suggestions for Future Work

Prior to the final meeting, the facilitators were asked for their critique of the study circle process. The facilitators appreciated the level of organization and communication to support their work as volunteers in this process. Frustrations surrounding attendance and diversity of attendees were also voiced. While the discussions among attendees were typically rich and revealing, the number and consistency of participants was disappointing for most of the study circles. A challenge for future study circles will be attracting and sustaining involvement, especially when the community has not undergone a recent “crisis” or bad publicity regarding arbitrary profiling.

In addition to the critique offered by the facilitators, the following observations may guide future work.

- While having the police officers who work in the respective neighborhoods recruit study circle participants may have been more effective than a more anonymous approach, it is likely to have encouraged participation by people who are generally more comfortable with the police. In order to attract a broader cross-section of participants, it may be useful next time to publicize the study circles through the media, including neighborhood newsletters, and posters. Better yet, a combination of the personal and anonymous approaches might be tried.
- The division of labor between The Lee Institute and the CMPD worked well. The CMPD’s attention to detail and conscientious approach allowed for a smooth project, making good use of volunteer facilitators’ and participants’ time. The recorders supplied by the CMPD added to the efficiency of the project. However, if this work were to be repeated The Lee Institute staff recommend that they spend a little time training the recorders in advance of the study circle meetings. Training would have



- enabled them to be better prepared to capture the content of the sessions and to ask the facilitators to clarify, paraphrase or slow down when the main points became difficult to track.
- Overall, attendance was a disappointment relative to expectations of eight to twelve participants. Each study circle completed its work well and was represented at the final meeting. However, the impact of the whole process would have been even greater if every study circle had had consistent attendance of eight to twelve, instead of an average of six, excluding the facilitators and staff. Using a variety of recruiting approaches instead of relying so heavily on the officers who work in the respective neighborhoods may have yielded more participants. JCSU's study circle had the largest and most consistent attendance. This is likely attributable to the fact that JCSU participants were earning community service credit by attending, and all of them were criminal justice majors, for whom the topic has inherent interest. Therefore, tying participation to an academic or campus requirement is a strategy worth considering for student groups in the future.
 - If the CMPD initiates a second set of study circles in the future, special efforts should be taken to assure that the same people respond to both the pre- and post-surveys in order for comparisons to be made.
 - Our community was very fortunate to have attracted two high quality facilitators per study circle. They made the completion of 29 separate study circle meetings possible within existing resources and assured that the ideas generated within their groups were communicated clearly at the final meeting.
 - The level of engagement by the officers, in addition to their physical presence, added tremendous value to the quality of the experience overall. In several situations, the officers could have become defensive in response to some of the comments by other participants. Their willingness to listen and their thoughtful self-disclosures contributed greatly to the richness of the conversation and, eventually, to the constructive tone of the recommendations.
 - Youth engagement in civic affairs is becoming more and more standard in Mecklenburg County. Youth add a valuable dimension and a fresh perspective to community dialogue concerning issues that affect them. Holding two study circles at high schools and one on a college campus gave youth a real voice in this project. Their active participation in the final meeting provided an authentic example of youth as resources.
 - Deputy Chief Stephens' presence and his comments at the final meeting signified the CMPD's sincere interest in the recommendations of study circle members. His final comment that police officers must act in a way that is worthy of the public trust shown by participants at the final study circle meeting was a notable recognition of the time and energy invested by all those present. The key measure of success will be the follow-up, and expectations are high.



The Lee Institute looks forward to presenting this report to the CMPD's command staff, and discussing future opportunities for work together, such as:

- Facilitating public input for the CMPD's Communications Plan.
- Exploring alternative models for implementation of public advisory councils, including what has worked well elsewhere.
- Launching a second set of study circles in 2006 or 2007, building on experience from 2005.
- Facilitating a set of one-time guided public meetings to present and seek feedback on future stop data and survey data and/or find similar opportunities with pre-existing groups, such as neighborhood associations and crime watch groups.



Appendix 1

Why Are We Doing These Study Circles?

The Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD) is committed to working with citizens on issues of public safety. The CMPD has initiated these study circles in order to:

- Increase community knowledge and understanding of the North Carolina State University Arbitrary Profiling Analyses and the UNCC Annual Survey questions on arbitrary profiling.
- Engage the community in honest and constructive dialogue on the subject of arbitrary profiling that will build trust among participants.
- Generate a set of recommendations for improving the working relationships between the police and the community especially with respect to arbitrary profiling.
- Improve community-police relations.

What Is Going To Be Done With The Recommendations?

1. Recommendations from each Study Circle will be presented at final joint meeting. Participants at the joint meeting will select a final set of recommendations for what individuals, neighbors, the community, the police and governments can do to improve working relationships between the police and the community.
2. A report will be prepared by The Lee Institute summarizing the study circle process and the resulting recommendations.
3. The Lee Institute will present the report to the CMPD Command Staff.
4. The report will be reviewed by the CMPD staff and the Arbitrary Profiling Advisory Council.
5. The CMPD will implement or support recommendations that are feasible, and encourage the community to do the same.



Appendix 2

Study Circles on Arbitrary Profiling for the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department

Call for Volunteer Facilitators

The Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department, in collaboration with The Lee Institute, is going to conduct a series of study circles about arbitrary profiling within the Charlotte Mecklenburg community. The expected outcome is to build greater trust and collaboration between the Police Department and Charlotte Mecklenburg citizens.

Study circles are groups of 8-12 people from different backgrounds and viewpoints who, in this project, will meet for five two-hour sessions to talk about this issue using a guided curriculum. The circles are guided by one or two facilitators, impartial leaders who help manage the process but are not experts or teachers in the traditional sense. Each study circle will be provided with a recorder.

For this project we are looking for pairs of facilitators, up to 12 in all. Each pair will facilitate one study circle from beginning to end, starting this fall and ending before the end of this calendar year. Ideally, the pair would consist of a male and a female of different races. They need to be able to approach the topic objectively with no personal experiences that would taint their perspectives. We are looking for facilitators who are comfortable working with teens, young adults and adults. No prior experience is necessary in leading study circles but prior group facilitation experience would be desirable.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Libby Cable at lcable@tlwf.org or 704-714-4451. We hope this gives you an overview of the project's needs and expected outcomes. Thank you for considering joining this important initiative.



Appendix 3

Overview of Responsibilities for Facilitators

1. Serve the group as a whole.
2. Stay neutral.
3. Be fair.
4. Create a safe environment for open, honest dialogue.
5. Figure out how you will work best with your co-facilitator.
6. Partner with your recorder on how best to capture the main points raised by participants, to create the group memory.
7. Find areas of agreement among study circle participants; note areas of disagreement.
8. Have fun.

Overview of Responsibilities for Recorders

1. Capture the main points made by participants during study circle meetings – create the group's memory.
2. Label each flip chart sheet with: a) study circle location, b) date, c) question or issue being discussed, d) page number.
3. Post flip chart sheets on wall to provide participants with a visible record of the meeting.
4. Hold on to the flip charts (both written work and blank sheets) and other materials, and bring them to the next meeting.
5. Ask facilitators to clarify, paraphrase or slow down, as needed.
6. Help resolve logistical issues that may arise during or between meetings, such as replenishing meeting supplies.



Appendix 4

CMPD Study Circles Recommendations as Reported by Facilitators

APAC

- Continuous and ongoing diversity training for both community members and CMPD officers
- Pay police officers more
- Invite officers to existing community meetings
- Improve communication between Latin American communities and police/other communities
- Expand media in Latin American community
- Promote neighborhood crime watch
- Officers should be more consistent
- Officers should learn Spanish

Commonwealth/Morningside

- Get more engaged in communities by working through existing neighborhood organizations
- Work on establishing relationships with marginalized populations
- Train neighborhood associations on how to relate to people of different cultures
- Hire a person in the community to serve as a community liaison
- Business and faith-based groups hold open houses for the community
- Police presence at neighborhood and business association meetings
- Have neighborhood take up the cause of meeting the needs of community
- Invite members of media to do ride-alongs
- Police sponsor street community celebration or community activity
- Police officers rotate so that they are not in same neighborhood all the time
- Self-awareness/personal development training for police officers

Garinger High School

- Establish one-on-one relationships between police and community members
- Educate young people on ways to avoid fighting (“respond,” not “react”)
- Use local celebrities to bridge the gap between police and communities
- Officers go to churches and schools to talk about local problems – involve audience and do not structure as a “lecture”
- Officers teach people about their policies and procedures
- Create public service announcements with catchy phrases
- Have a reward program in schools/communities for good students



Johnson C. Smith University

- Individuals work in their own communities to help solve problems
- Spread positive stories about police officers to influence negative perception
- Officers improve balance between law enforcement and community interaction
- Work with media to reduce negative image
- Officers spend time with young adults in schools/group homes
- In high school classes, show police training videos to educate about policies and procedures
- Offer a public safety class in high school to educate about police, fire department, etc.
- Promote CMPD high school academy
- Set up youth police commission to make youth voices heard
- Police sponsor events in communities

Olympic High School

- Expand high school job shadowing program
- Share positive statistics on CMPD before problems arise
- Hold “learn about police” sessions for high school students on policies and procedures
- Create opportunities for fun activities with young people and police
- Have a “security board” in schools, maintained by resource officer, to educate about current security-related information

Plaza/Milton Rd.

- Education on police policies and procedures
- Increase communication between police department and community
- Work with media to increase awareness and promote positive activities of police department
- Police become more visible in positive situations, community events
- More effective use of technology to keep officers in the field
- Continue community meetings to update on findings from profiling study and other trends in community

West Blvd.

- Educate people on police policies and procedures
- Hold structured community/police meetings to increase communication
- Distribute community newsletter to educate those who cannot attend community meetings
- Faith community should play a direct role with police department to increase communication and community involvement
- English should be learned by everyone and used as the expected language of communication in emergencies
- Diversity education taught at an early age in schools and communities
- Educate professionals in community (teachers, healthcare workers) on diversity
- Increase numbers of multi-lingual police officers
- Create incentives program for police to participate in community work



Appendix 5

Personal Commitments

- Make eye contact with and recognize officers I pass by
- More intensive communication with officers
- Get more involved in making things happen
- Speak up when I hear a negative comment about police
- Talk to other officers about the study circle experience
- Get media involved in my community meetings
- Make sure my voice is heard
- Educate as many people as possible
- Educate others about study circles
- Be less quick to judge
- See officers as “human”
- Encourage police involvement in story time at the library
- Spread information in schools, increase communication
- Educate in the community about what I learned
- Get more to attend my neighborhood watch meetings
- Become more involved in public affairs campaign as a Black American
- Thank police officers
- Continue with my commitment as a police officer and continue to improve
- Shut down rumors when I hear them in school
- Work on my communication skills
- Use my better understanding in a positive way
- Educate other law enforcement agencies
- Better explain police procedures
- Educate others
- Asking youth for their input
- Wave or speak to officers when I see them



- Come up with the catch phrases to use on behalf of police/community for public service announcements
- Continue relationships with police and others in the community
- Grow the relationship between my community and the police
- Don't rely on media to spread the positive word
- Spread the idea of study circles to other communities
- Acknowledge police officers when I see them
- Improve my interaction with police officers, say thank you
- Continue this process
- Enhance community policing and education
- Bring this process to the groups not represented here
- Carry out message to the City Council
- Encourage Criminal Justice students to keep their connection with the community
- Commit to our CMPD values
- Continue to trust police and help make the police department the best it can be
- Network with officers in my area
- Think of police officers in terms of "us" rather than "them" and "me"
- Pass along this information to my neighborhood watch
- Deputy Chief Stephens: We (police officers) must act in a way that is worthy of public trust
- Paul Paskoff: Everyone will get a copy of final report, Lee will present findings to command staff (all are invited), I will attend a community meeting