

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

Instructional Goals: To introduce officers to the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) strategy; understand the CSP model and framework; understand how CSP differs from and dovetails with traditional policing strategies; and understand why CSP is effective at increasing safety with fewer arrests.

Performance Objectives: As a result of this training, participants will be able to provide an integrated response that demonstrates an:

- 1) Understanding of the 'whole of community' public health approach to increasing safety, reducing violence, and solving criminogenic problems in chronically high crime neighborhoods.
- 2) Understanding of the 'all hands-on deck' holistic safety mission of CSP and how it differs from and works with the crime reduction mission of traditional enforcement and community policing.
- 3) Understanding of the values, officer mindset, key program characteristics, program requirements, and disqualifying factors of CSP safety policing.
- 4) Increase awareness of independent assessments of neighborhood conditions, cultures, assets, hazards and how to use them to determine CSP site viability and suitability.
- 5) Ability to solve police-community friction, identify potential partners, and develop sufficient trust for the strategic relationships required to carry out safety strategies with partners in CSP sites.
- 6) Ability to develop trauma-informed, culturally competent listening, trust-building and team-building skills required to co-develop and execute comprehensive wrap around safety plans in traumatized neighborhoods.
- 7) Understanding of how securing and sustaining basic safety in hot zones through holistic 'wrap around' safety strategies forms the cornerstone for building health, resilience and capacity in chronically high crime, high trauma neighborhoods.

DAY 1 – INTRODUCTION and UNDERSTANDING THE STRUCTURE OF CSP

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND CSP FOUNDATIONS

0800-0940 (100 Min)
(Shared Intro)

A. Welcome and Introductions

1. Background on instructor
2. Housekeeping items
3. Overview for the Day

B. Class Introductions – 1 Minute Introductions

1. Each participant shares rank, background, and current assignments
2. Answer the Questions:
 - a) What is your WHY? Why did you seek out this assignment?
 - b) What is something that you will bring with you to your work at CSP that the profession of law enforcement didn't teach you?

C. What is CSP:

1. **Community Safety Partnership General Definition:** Community Safety Partnership is a comprehensive 'whole of community', 'whole of government,' public health strategy for ending entrenched dangers that are

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

too big to be fixed by siloed government programs, small NGO's and/or traditional law enforcement.

2. **Community Safety Partnership in the context of Law Enforcement** is a 'root-causes' safety strategy that builds trust, stabilizes chronically violent neighborhoods and enacts locally designed plans to boost safety and reduce violence, trauma and fear in CSP controlled areas. CSP officers and their local partners deploy comprehensive safety plans to holistically fix dangerous neighborhood conditions; reclaim public spaces from gang control; ensure safe movement and access; reduce trauma and violence; and sustain wrap-around safety resources and strategies that improve neighborhood health and resilience.
3. **Definition of Holistic:**
 - a. Holistic means understanding the importance of a whole system of interdependent dynamics that have greater impact than any single factor.
 - b. The focus is on the conditions, policies, behaviors and other drivers of epidemic violence or crime and not just on individual crimes or criminals.
 - c. Holistic also refers to public health approaches that solve problems by focusing on root causes and using restorative tactics that avoid the need for suppression enforcement.
4. **Definition of Whole of Government:**
 - a. Linking crime suppression and community safety to comprehensive prevention, intervention and community-stabilizing investment strategies.
 - b. All relevant agencies and departments of government join the police department to jointly attack a systemic problem.
5. **Definition of 'Whole of Neighborhood':** Key neighborhood residents, local institutions and civic groups concerned with safety jointly act to remove vectors of danger, reduce violence and promote safety.
6. **Definition of Safety:**
 - a. the absence of danger, trauma, violence, threats of injury or risks of damage to person or property in public or at home; and
 - b. the presence of neighborhood-wide freedom from fear to move, act, enjoy life and pursue happiness in peace.

D. LEARNING ACTIVITY: How did we get here?

1. We have to know our history to create a better future.
2. Distribute flip charts to each table
3. Divide class into three groups
4. Advise tables to list characteristics, positive and negative outcomes of the designated policing strategies and traditional enforcement on flip charts. Specifically addressing the following:
 - a. Crime Suppression Enforcement
 - b. Community Policing
 - c. Problem-Solving
5. Each group presents in the front of the classroom their results (post the chart paper around the room).
6. Debrief: Large group discussion facilitated by instructors

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- E. Collateral Consequences of Well-Intentioned Policing Strategies
Large group discussion of collateral consequences
ASK class: Looking at the charts now posted around the room, offer ideas or thoughts regarding collateral consequences of well-intentioned policing strategies.
Ensure the following are covered:
 - 1. The societal creation of ghettos barrios and thin blue line policing
 - 2. Creates the us vs them
 - 3. Ask cops to fight the unwinnable wars with unavailable goals
 - 4. The cost of limited resources for solutions or referrals
 - 5. Emphasis on Arrests as a measure of productivity
 - 6. Repetition or over-use of saturating a crime spike in a community
 - 7. The absence of clear community messaging (i.e. No Comment).
 - 8. Impact of the lack of transparency
 - 9. What does “thin blue line” mean to officers vs. the community?
- F. Prepare for next lesson: CSP- Came from the recognition that the traditional strategies were not sufficient to address the systemic problems of crime-infested neighborhoods.
 - 1. Continuing with the same solutions will not result in different outcomes
 - 2. Systemic problems require strategic, long-term commitment and investment.

II. THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF CSP: THE LA STORY

0940-1030 (50 Min)
(Shared Presentation)

- A. Background and context of Los Angeles and police perceptions of causes of crime
 - 1. *“We have been forced into paramilitary [policing] to keep control. Ultimately, it causes you to lose control because there is no community trust....It is a paradox---we are pushed into it, but if there are no resources to get out of it, then it becomes our downfall.” Retired LAPD Commander with 34 years on LAPD.*
 - 2. *“Search & Destroy doesn’t just destroy community, it destroys you.” Former LAPD COP Beck*
 - 3. CSP Video and News coverage
- B. Video and Historical Debrief: Gang homicide epidemic in Los Angeles
 - 1. Conditions in hot zones
 - 2. South Los Angeles statistics
 - 3. Attorney General Report
 - 4. RAND Trauma Study
- C. Testimonials and Quotes
 - 1. Grass Roots CSP Officers and Gang Officers
 - 2. Secretary of State and Leadership quotes
 - 3. Crime Reduction Statistics at Jordon Downs
 - 4. Additional expert testimonials

III. WHY A PUBLIC HEALTH MODEL?
(Shared presentation)

1030-1120 (50 Min)

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- A. The case for Holistic Public Health Safety: When Handcuffs Are Not Enough or Just Make it Worse
 - 1. Overview of Call to Action Report: A Case for a Comprehensive Solution to LA's Gang Homicide Epidemic
 - a. 8,000 unsolved murders cumulated over 25 years since the late 1970's
 - b. Over 100,000 gunshot victims since the late 1970's
 - c. Over 9,000 resident deaths
 - d. 16 officers slain
 - e. 500 times higher risk of stranger murder in Jordon Downs in 1990 than the rest of the city of LA
 - f. 60% of local economic activity from the "underground crime economy" occurring
 - 2. Underlying Principals
 - a. Trauma Informed Studies
 - b. Population Safety
 - c. Community Violence Reduction Strategy
 - d. Community Trauma
 - e. Assessments
 - f. Generational Effects of Violence
 - g. Holistic approach
 - h. Wrap around safety
 - i. Partnership needed to carry out a wrap-around system
- B. Trauma Informed Care
 - 1. Neuroscience of fight or flight
 - 2. Community Trauma
 - 3. Officer Trauma (indicate more on Officer Wellness on Day 3)
 - 4. Compassion and Exposure Fatigue
- C. Comprehensive Violence Reduction Strategy (CVRS) includes:
 - 1. Prevention
 - 2. Intervention
 - 3. Re-Entry
 - 4. Enforcement to interrupt violence and set a public safety standard
- D. LEARNING ACTIVITY: Case Study: The Holistic Clean Up of MacArthur Park
 - 1. Distribute case study of MacArthur Park
 - 2. Instruction: Utilizing the underlying principles each table examines the case study through **two** of the Underlying Principals:
 - a. Trauma Informed Studies
 - b. Population Safety
 - c. Community Violence Reduction Strategy
 - d. Community Trauma
 - e. Assessments
 - f. Generational Effects of Violence
 - g. Holistic approach
 - h. Wrap around safety
 - i. Partnership needed to carry out a wrap-around system
 - 3. Debrief: Each table reports back

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

4. Facilitator leads large group discussion: What worked and what did not work

IV. THE CSP FRAMEWORK

1120-1300 (100 Min) (CSP Leadership)

- A. CPS Mission, Vision, Values: Setting the structure for CSP to succeed
 1. **CSP Mission:** To create safe, healthy, and violence-free communities in neighborhoods that suffer chronic violence and epidemic levels of trauma.
 2. **CSP Vision:** It is the vision of the Community Safety Partnership Bureau to implement a transformative wrap-around partnership model that creates safety and healthier conditions for the communities in and around the CSP Neighborhood Engagement Areas.
 3. **CSP Values:** We value the dignity, humanity, and rights of all people; respect and seek local instruction on the unique cultures, needs and differences of our many communities; we seek to learn from those communities how to serve their safety needs; we value trust, honesty, collaboration, and teamwork; we value creative problem solving, evidence-based solutions, and effective strategies that reduce violence and increase safety.
 4. **CSP Philosophy:** It is CSP's belief that safety is the first of all civil rights, that freedom from violence is the first of all freedoms, and that all children have the right to thrive; that residents in poor neighborhoods also deserve safety and security, that families in poor neighborhoods should live in peace, feel safe in their surroundings, and experience a healthy quality of life; and that achieving these goals in poor neighborhoods requires comprehensive, holistic strategies to remove the complex and entrenched barriers to safety in high crime zones.
- B. **CSP Paradigm Shift:** The CSP safety model is grounded in public health principles of preventing violence, reducing trauma, and holistically removing vectors of public danger. Law Enforcement has been grounded in crime reduction, crime suppression, crime control and public order principles. CSP's public health safety model represents a paradigm shift, aimed at resolving root causes of violence and disrupting the criminogenic conditions that foster chronically unhealthy and dangerous dynamics in poor neighborhoods.
- C. **CSP Goal:** To create a demonstrably safer environment, and a more resilient and resourced neighborhood capable of sustaining a system of wrap around safety programs.
- D. **CSP Strategies, Tools, and Tactics-The 'Must Haves':** Conditions for CSP Success (reference the MacArthur park large group discussion, provide the handout of "Must Haves", highlight those discussed in large group, identify those that were not).
 1. Transformation to guardian mindset by the officers
 2. Sufficient site stability
 3. Selection of CSP officers with a minimum of a 5-year commitment
 4. Identify the assets of the community

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

5. Identify who are the institutional and community leaders
6. Ongoing assessments conducted by independently done with UCLA, UPI, etc.
7. An understanding that enforcement needs to be brought back if and when the violence returns
8. Specialized training for new CSP officers by tenured CSP personnel and CSP Experts
9. A whole of community approach violence reduction and capacity building
10. Creation of strategic partnerships among residents, local leaders, government agencies, experts, and the police
11. Remove the conditions that generate crime
12. Suppress mass incarceration tactics
13. Disrupt criminal dominance
14. Use of trust-building and relationship-building skills including active listening and truth & reconciliation
15. Creation of jointly carried out wrap-around safety plans that link holistic safety tactics including restorative justice, problem-solving, and

E. Characteristics and Attributes of the Ideal CSP Officer

VIDEO: CSP officers discussing their positive experiences

Class generates list of attributes needed to be a successful CSP officer.

Cover the below list if not brought up in discussion:

1. Sustained commitment to a guardian mindset
2. Compassionate, empathetic, strategic
3. Inspirational leader
4. Naturally open to a range of humanity
5. Naturally comfortable with different cultures
6. Ability to generate and sustain trust from multiple stakeholders
7. Ability to create and sustain trust
8. High EQ and Socio-political IQ to handle group conflict and local politics
9. Can share leadership and act jointly with partners
10. Generosity and compassion-centered

F. Mindset of CSP Officers and CSP Policing

1. Community informed
2. Community co-led
3. Relationship-based
4. Root-cause focused on drivers of violence and assets for community stability
5. Seeks neighborhood-wide impact
6. Not risk adverse
7. Entrepreneurial, enterprising, and innovative
8. Collaborative as well as consultative
9. Trauma informed
10. Comprehensive and holistic
11. Mindset of safety and service with the understanding that stabilizing the violence is critical
12. Guardian of the community
13. Engaging
14. Transforming conflict into positive outcomes

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

15. Recognize and understanding community threat
 16. Understand community trauma
- G. The success of the CSP program is directly related to the Department members who are selected for these positions. Selections prioritize officers who embody characteristics that are fundamental for trust and relationship-building. Thought process should include critical examination of every action and encounter:
1. Consider: "Will this action destroy community trust?"
 2. Resist any pressure to make a counter-productive arrest
 3. Standing up to pressure to produce results quickly when CSP collaboration takes time and relationship-building
 4. Resist perceived pressure to promote out

1300-1400 Lunch

V. LOGIC MODEL for CSP Wrap-Around Safety Process

1400-1700 (180 Min)
(Shared Presentation)

Reference: UCLA Luskin Report, March 2020
Evaluation of the LAPD Community Safety Partnership

A. PLANNING & FOUNDATION

1. Reduce the violence
 - a. CSP cannot function in a war-zone
 - b. Be strategic in how enforcement is used to stabilize the neighborhood
2. Community Assessment, planning and building a strong foundation
3. Professional, independent site assessments of the neighborhood conditions being considered for CSP
4. Develop a wraparound public safety plan
 - a. Assets local dynamics
 - b. What are the assets
 - c. What are the hazards
 - d. Where is the local leadership?
5. Train CSP Officers

B. INPUTS

1. Conduct Community Outreach to initiate trust and build support
2. Enthusiasm from Department leadership
3. Full backing of the holistic model from government/non-profit stakeholders
4. Identify sufficient financial funding sources
5. Both structural and powerful governmental and institutional partners
6. Choose the new CSP site for the right reasons
7. Select the officers with the right CSP mindset
8. Map out the proposed CSP site attributes

C. ACTIVITIES

1. Site Assessment
2. Hiring and training of well-suited officers and leaders who emphasize:
 - a. Trust Building vs Trust Destroying Actions
 - b. The Power of Active listening
 - c. Acknowledge community injury and memory from transgressions

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- d. Truth and reconciliation (more to be covered later in the session)
- 3. Trust and Relationship Building – Reinforce the Behaviors of High Trust leaders (Franklin/Covey)
 - a. Talk Straight
 - b. Demonstrate Respect
 - c. Create Transparency
 - d. Right Wrongs
 - e. Show Loyalty
 - f. Deliver Results
 - g. Get Better
 - h. Confront Reality
 - i. Clarify Expectations
 - j. Practice Accountability
 - k. Listen First
 - l. Keep Commitments
- 4. Dynamic and Ongoing Partnership Building - CSP's quest for trust doesn't just require officers to act differently, it requires them to think differently
 - a. Building a Relationship requires equitable participation
 - b. Who's included?
 - c. Who gets a voice?
 - d. Relationships take time
- 5. Planning and Execution of Safety Wraparound Programs

D. OUTCOMES

- 1. Disrupt vectors of violence and danger with **holistic tactics**
- 2. End epidemic levels of violent crime
- 3. Reduce trauma, fear and violence
- 4. Decrease influence, control and dominance of gangs
- 5. Build and sustain partnerships
 - a. With community leaders
 - b. Gang leaders
 - c. Professionally trained gang interventionist
 - d. Local NGO's
 - e. Local political representatives
 - f. Relevant government agencies
 - g. Academic experts
- 6. Create a strategy and resource center that offers CSP teams help and expertise
- 7. Increase neighborhood safety
- 8. Foster ongoing dynamic partnership-building between law enforcement and community residents, and other stakeholders.

E. ACCOUNTABILITY AND MONITORING

- 1. Ongoing resident surveys
- 2. Program evaluation every 3-5 years
- 3. Continuous feedback including LAPD policy and training

F. TRANSFORMATION

- 1. Collaborative, relationship-based policing that transforms traditional enforcement
- 2. Earning and maintaining public trust to collectively counter systemic threats

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

3. Truth and Reconciliation
 - a. LAPD History
 - b. Community Memory of Conflict with LAPD
 - c. Barriers to Trust
 - d. Reconciliation requires an acknowledgement of our shared history
 - e. What does that mean to law enforcement?
 - f. Recognition of past harms
 - g. If I didn't do it - why do I have to apologize?
 - h. What does a sincere acknowledgement or apology look like?
 - i. The unintended consequences of an insincere apology.
 - j. What does reconciliation mean to you?
- G. Exert control over public spaces: CSP officers work with community to take back public spaces that have been overrun with gang and other violence
 1. Libraries
 2. Pools
 3. Parks
 4. Recreation centers
 5. Public Housing Developments
 6. Walk passages to schools
 7. Public walkways
 8. Alleyways, etc.
- H. Time
 1. Healing and reconciliation take time.
 2. Respecting the other by demonstrating consistency and follow through over time.
 3. Resolving racial and other conflicts takes time.
 4. Giving time to build a relationship demonstrates respect.
- I. LEARNING ACTIVITY: Understanding the Wholistic Approach
 1. Distribute CSP Case Study
 2. Ask tables to map a whole of government and whole of neighborhood approach to influence a sustainable wrap-around approach to solving the problem
 3. Tables report back
 4. Debrief
 - a. Understanding the 'Whole of Government, the Whole of Neighborhood System' vs. Police as the only entity
 - b. Understanding the importance of linking polices service with other individual service programs
 - c. Large group discussion: How does an enforcement strategy give short term results with long-term unintended consequences
 - d. False measures of productivity
 - e. Trust is destroyed
 - f. Did we create safety for the family? The neighborhood? The larger community?
 - g. Traditional enforcement displaces the crime somewhere else
- J. DAILY DEBRIEF
 1. Distribute two "Post-It's" to each student

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

2. Ask students to write one key take-a-way from the day and one burning question or fear on different Post-It notes.
3. Ask class to place each Post-It on the designated flip chart as they exit for the day.

END OF DAY ONE

DAY TWO

VI. DAY 1 REVIEW

0800-0850 (50 Min)

- A. Using the Post-It exercise go through each identified “Take-Away” and “Concern”
 1. Engage class in large group discussion about the “take-aways” and “concerns”.
 2. Identify shared positive responses.
 3. Address any potential myths or misperceptions from Day One.
 4. ASK large group how they can overcome some of the common “concern” themes that emerged.
- B. Introduce: Application of the Three-Day CSP Course is the FINAL PROJECT (15 min)
 1. Each Table will be assigned a CSP Site to use as a case study to study and understand for the remaining two days of training.
 2. The Team at each table will be responsible to use the LOGIC Model and various blocks of instruction as foundational “chapters” in their final project.
 3. Various blocks of instruction will utilize learning activities for building out these different “chapters” and in the last session, time will be given to compile these items together and examine potential strategies for a Comprehensive CSP Site Safety Plan.
 4. CSP Leadership and Community Partners will be invited back into class to hear each Team deliver their teach backs on the final project.
 5. Best Practice: Each Team should coordinate and build their Comprehensive CSP Site Safety Plan as they progress through the next two days. All content will be helpful for designing your plan so take notes and identify ways to use the information later. Instructors will identify which specific activities will be required “chapters” for the Final Project.

VII. LOGIC MODEL (Continued from Day 1)

0850-0940 (50 Min)
(Community Partners)

- A. Community introductions
 1. Background
 2. Linkage to CSP
 3. Where they are and where they want to go with the Department
- B. CSP-Community Program development that:
 1. Prevent, counter, and intervene in violent activities
 2. Reduce gang risk factors
 3. Boost protective factors
 4. Build resilience

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- C. Identify resources
 - 1. Assist partners in obtaining necessary resources
 - 2. Need to change conditions and behaviors that turbo-charge violence, trauma, and crime into chronic conditions of danger
- D. Consult, coordinate, communicate, and act – why we need each other
 - 1. Cultivate experts
 - 2. Coordinate with government alliances
 - 3. Act with partners
 - 4. Establish a dedicated presence and engagement such as foot patrols dedicated to non-enforcement interactions

VIII. APPLIED APPLICATION OF LOGIC MODEL

0940-1030 (50 Min)
(Community Partner + CSP)

- A. LOGIC Model Exerting Control Over Public Spaces-Case Studies
LEARNING ACTIVITY: Applying the logic model (Exerting control over public spaces) Case Studies from the community
 - 1. One community partner assigned per table
 - 2. Distribute case study with necessary statistics regarding crime, and assessment
 - 3. Table works with Community Partner on the section of the Logic model on “exerting control over public spaces” with partners for Community First Strategies (allow 15 min).
- B. Debrief:
 - 1. Each table reports their plan
 - 2. Community partners discuss lessons learned from actual CSP cases

IX. WRAP AROUND SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS

1030-1210 (100 Min)
(Community Partner+ CSP)

- A. What does success look like?
 - 1. To the community
 - 2. To the department
 - 3. To the officers
- B. How to measure results (performance goals):
 - 1. Setting goals
 - 2. Setting performance measures
 - 3. Re-setting data collection standards: From pure numbers (symptoms of the problem) to sustainable violence reduction (root causes of the problem)
 - 4. Securing independent evaluation teams
 - 5. Setting accountability standards from Chief of Police down to the foot patrol CSP Officer
- C. LEARNING ACTIVITY: To Build or Destroy a CSP Model – Knowledge Check
 - 1. Distribute worksheet and flip charts to each side of the room
 - 2. Divide class in half, each side takes only one question and physically turns from the other side of the class

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

3. Ask each side to brainstorm on one of the following questions:
 - a. Actions and Behaviors that a CSP Officer/Team SHOULD NEVER DO
 - b. Actions and Behaviors that a CSP Officer/Team SHOULD DO
4. Large Group Debrief:
 - a. Each side of the room presents their findings
 - b. Compare the Should Do lists and the Should Never Do lists in a facilitated discussion.
 - c. Facilitate the class recognition that every trust building effort (as previous taught) has a detrimental opposite action such as provided in the list below.
 - d. List of possible Should Never Do list;
 - Lie
 - Endanger residents with CSP strategies (inadequately assess the dangers
 - Fail to be transparent so all factions can trust and understand what you're proposing
 - Compromise relationships regarding confidential information sharing about solving crime
 - Displace neighborhood groups for programs
 - Seek to bend CSP into enforcement goals to gain acceptance and approval of officers with warrior mindsets
 - Play favorites—racially, socially, by clique or other faction
 - Abuse trust by sexually fraternizing or otherwise abusing fiduciary duty
 - Send mixed messages
 - Frame CSP as an Enforcement Strategy
 - Not to listen and to communicate with, and engage all stakeholders
 - Fail to consult and warn neighborhoods
5. Ask class to identify if any of the items brainstormed are consistent in both CSP and traditional models of policing.
6. Facilitate Group Discussion: Who owns a CSP Partnership?
Ensure that the class recognizes the detriment of thinking that CSP is a department's strategy versus a community safety strategy and partnership with residents, other government agencies and institutions.

1210-1310 Lunch

X. SUSTAINING SAFETY TRANSFORMATION

1310-1400 (50 Min)
(Community Partner)

- A. Community does not want to start over
 1. Necessity of time to build relationships
 2. Past gains and losses
 3. Weary of changes in leadership

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- B. Passing on the relationships
 - a. Introducing new CSP Officers to the CSP Site and the Neighborhood
 - b. How you transition matters
 - c. Acknowledging change – intentional transitions
- C. Keeping the communities organized
 - a. Acknowledging and responding to community leadership
 - b. Community commitment and follow-through
- D. Build the relationships with the stable neighborhood institutions
 - 1. Building capacity to expand and eventually take on greater roles
 - 2. Promoting community-driven efforts
- E. LEARNING ACTIVITY: Watts Case Study

XI. THE ROLE OF GANG INTERVENTION

1400-1450 (50 Min)
(UPI Partner + CSP)

- A. Gang Interventionists - Panel discussion
 - 1. Critical leadership role played by gang interventionists
 - 2. LAPD's role in working with gang interventionists
 - 3. Where we've been
- B. Testimonials
 - 1. OBSERVATIONS- Working with CSP vs. Divisional Officers.
 - 2. Working through differences
 - 3. What would make things better?
 - 4. Vision: Where would you like CSP and Gang Interventionists to be in the next 5 years?
- C. Questions & Answers

XII. THE ROLE OF RE-ENTRY

1450-1540 (50 Min)
(Re-Entry Partner + CSP)

- A. Re-Entry Landscape - What is it?
 - 1. What is it?
 - 2. Current Situation and Los Angeles Statistics
 - 3. What Options exist for those re-entering society?
- B. Re-entry Case Study/Testimonials -Lessons learned
 - 1. Missed Opportunity
 - 2. Community Observations
 - 3. Gaps
- C. Resources needed
 - 1. Current Programs
 - 2. Limitations/Obstacles
- D. Success Example - CSP and Re-Entry
 - 1. Alignment of Programs and needs
 - 2. Access to services
 - 3. What made a difference?
- E. The Arrest

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

1. The arrest - a symptom of a greater problem. The arrest is not the solution but a result of societal failures
 2. The arrestee viewed as a person in the context of their community and their life experience
 3. The arrest crisis as a moment to interrupt ongoing cycles of community trauma
- F. Looking at Prevention, Intervention and Re-entry
1. How does a public health model inform the purpose of engaged enforcement?
 2. What does Community First Mean?
 3. Community is the architect of what public safety means to their neighborhood
 4. Policing is a facilitator and guardian to create a safe environment for communities to thrive
 5. Shared Responsibility - Other government entities and non-profits are needed to create and build capacity.

XIII. DAILY DEBRIEF

1540-1700 (80 Min)

- A. Small Group Exercise
 1. Break into small groups
 2. Advise groups to come up with 1-3 points that resonated
 3. Allow 10 minutes for discussions
- B. Large Group Debrief:
 1. Take A-ways
 2. Questions Remaining
 3. Direction for the Next Day

END OF DAY TWO

DAY THREE

XIV. DAY THREE OVERVIEW AND EXPECTATIONS

0800-0810 (10 Min)

- A. Summary:
 1. Highlights from Day One and Day Two
 2. How both Days relate to Day Three
- B. Day Three Overview
 1. Ongoing Participation
 2. Importance of Course Evaluations for Quality Through Continuous Improvement
 3. Commitment to ongoing learning after the class is over (Core Value)
 4. Remind participants that the application of three days of training will be a FINAL PROJECT based on their CSP Site. The classes today will have activities that create the material for some of the “chapters” in the presentation.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

XV. ACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE CSP TEAM

0810-0850 (40 Min)
(Shared Presentation)

- A. Building Partnerships - Structural partners include:
 - 1. GRYD
 - 2. HACLA
 - 3. Professional Intervention
 - 4. Residential Entities
 - 5. Other police units within your department
 - 6. Formal and informal local leaders
 - a. City and County Government Agencies
 - b. Non-CSP Officers at your CSP site
 - c. Outside experts
 - d. Non-profit Foundations
 - e. Others?
- B. Crafting holistic wrap around strategies
 - 1. Peaceful retaking control of public spaces
 - 2. Removal of criminogenic vectors of violence
 - 3. Gang intervention strategy
 - 4. Reentry interception and integration plans
 - 5. Building teams out of partnerships formed
- C. Challenges and Barriers – what to do when a full CSP model is not available or possible.
 - 1. Presenters share past experiences and creative solutions
 - 2. Question and Answer on what may be possible
 - 3. Determination to not give up when obstacles arise
 - 4. “Community First” means you don’t solve problems in isolation.

XVI. CULTIVATING INDIVIDUAL, ORGANIZATIONAL, AND COMMUNITY HEALTH
(CSP)0850-0940 (50 Min)

- A. Healthy officers foster healthy partnerships and healthy communities
 - 1. How we treat each other internally will reflect how we treat people within the community
 - 2. Procedural Justice – What does that mean for the CSP Officer?
 - a. Respect
 - b. Voice
 - c. Neutrality
 - d. Trustworthiness
 - 3. Educating on health and mental health care
 - a. Recognizing signs of stress
 - b. Being willing to ask for help - you are not alone
- B. Cumulative Trauma in Officers (*Use of Brief Resiliency Scale)
 - 1. What is Vicarious Trauma?
 - 2. Why does it sometimes hurt to help?
 - 3. Support Systems

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

4. Post-Traumatic Growth
 5. Review results from Brief Resiliency Scale –
 - a. Assess Ability to “Bounce Back”
 - b. Strategies to Reset
- C. Personal Strengths (*Use of Strengths Finder)
1. Explore individual identity & background that created those strengths
 2. Discuss CSP Team – identity, background and diversity of strengths
 3. Using strengths to meet community needs
 4. Using stakeholder/community strengths to meet community goals
- D. Remember your WHY from Day One
1. Write it down
 2. Share with one other person
 3. Has your Why changed?

XVII. UNDERSTANDING CSP SITE ASSESSMENTS 0940-1040 (50 Min)

Break class into smaller groups related to CSP assignments:

- A. Strategizing Responses to Community Needs
 1. Distribute Community Assessments associated with CSP Site
 2. Distribute any other relevant outside data regarding these communities
- B. Facilitators instruct direction for review of source material:
 1. Consider Community and Culture FIRST
 2. What themes and concerns stand out the most?
 3. What are the community priorities that emerge from these assessments?
 4. Past perceptions of LAPD or CSP that may need to be addressed
- C. Each Site will review source material and provide an assessment (20 minutes)
Given the background information learned:
 1. What do you know?
 2. What do you still need to learn?
 3. Where might law enforcement have a role?
 4. Where might community partners take a lead role?
 5. How might your CSP team work in partnership to build capacity for cultivating healthy and resilient communities?
- D. Assessment Debriefs **(last 30 minutes)**
 1. Assessment Summary: 5-7 minutes for each Table Leader
 2. Group Discussion: The importance of an outside assessment
 3. What are the questions you would want to see in the next assessment?
 4. **FINAL PROJECT:** Each group will hold on to their Assessment Summary as Part II of their Final Project and Teach Back

XVIII. RESOURCES FOR IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL COMMUNITY PARTNERS

1040-1130 (50 Min)

- A. Potential Partners –
 1. Instruct students to consider their CSP site and consider creative connections as listening and learning from potential partners.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

2. **FINAL PROJECT:** Each group will utilize and brainstorm on how to identify and build new relationships with potential partners as Part III of their Final Project and Teach Back
- B. Individual Presentation of connection to CSP and potential partnerships
1. Urban Peace Institute
 2. Intervention
 3. GRYD
 4. Parks and Recreation
 5. HACLA
 6. Other key stakeholders
- C. Q&A: Moderated panel discussion
1. What's Working
 2. What's Not Working
 3. The importance of not working alone
 4. Open questions
- D. Optional Activity (based on time) Lightning Round: Stakeholders rotate time at each table to discuss site specific concerns related on review of Site Assessments.
1. The importance and significance of not working alone
 2. Make links to site assessments conducted earlier

1130-1230 Lunch (Community Partners stay for lunch if possible)

XIX. INTERACTING WITH GOVERNMENT PARTNERS

1230-1400 (100 Min)
(Council Districts)

- A. Government Partners Panel
1. Introduction of District Leadership
 2. Impact of CSP on their Districts
 3. How CD's support CSP
 4. How CSP can work collaboratively with CD's
- B. Open Panel Question and Answer

XX. CREATING SAFETY PLANS UNIQUE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD

1400-1500 (60 Min)
(Shared presentation)

- A. Jointly executed safety plan: Understanding that neighborhood safety is the cornerstone for Community Engagement
1. Community as Architects - Collaboration with Stakeholders as equal partners in evaluating community needs
 2. Direct interaction and community engagement that leads to relationship building
 3. The justice we deserve and the security that is required: provide security amidst despair
 4. Providing and sustaining safety infrastructure

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

- B. Wrap Around Strategies to create Safety and take Control of Public Spaces:
 - 1. Reduce Gang membership and delinquency
 - 2. Provide avenues for personal development and employment
 - 3. Programs that engage and support trust building
 - 4. Programs designed to reach community needs from youth to seniors
 - 5. Engaged enforcement means – seeing past the moment of an arrest to the individuals and community around you (working through CAPRA problem-solving)
- C. Public Safety
 - 1. Coordinate with internal Department stakeholders when enforcement actions are required
 - 2. Organize the community to do early warning: identify or develop purposeful enforcement strategies that include community education, solicitation of expert community and other governmental partners to increase community cooperation and information exchange
 - 3. Consistent communication and messaging with community partners
 - 4. Public safety when strategies are grounded in a restorative justice process.
 - 5. “The first of all human rights is safety; the first of all freedoms is freedom from violence; and every child’s right to thrive requires freedom from trauma.”
(Connie Rice, Civil Rights Attorney and CSP Co-Founder)
- D. LEARNING ACTIVITY: Terrain Awareness (Instructors distribute large site-specific maps to each table)
 - PART I of Site Safety Plan:
 - 1. Strategize and keep notes on site specific needs for Safe Passages and Safe Public Spaces
 - 2. Create an assessment and map major passage-ways to major institutions, stores, etc. and identify all the vectors that made those passages unsafe.
 - 3. What would it mean to create a visible presence for all community members to be safe to and from schools, recreation facilities, libraries, mass transit, etc.
 - 4. How to create high visibility to allow community members to thrive without fear of being victimized
 - 5. Incorporate community capacity to participate with law enforcement in the safe passage mission
 - 6. Take back all the public amenities, assets, and facilities
 - 7. Identify potentially vulnerable areas
- E. How to Fortify Community Capacity to Sustain Safety Strategies
 - 1. Connect community members with public and private resources that help the community flourish
 - 2. Alliances should include an array of professionals from public health professionals to educators and business leaders.
 - 3. Develop comprehensive strategies that expand and support community membership in community planning and leadership, ultimately creating room for community leadership to take the lead.
 - 4. Involvement in community planning that enhances the health of the communities and reduces violence.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500

XXI. CO-CREATED COMPREHENSIVE CSP SITE SAFETY PLAN 1500-1630 (90 Min)

- A. TABLE TOP - GROUP COLLABORATION - (Based on three groups)
Instructions: Utilizing the LOGIC Model (from Day 2) and all source documents provided over the past 3 days, design potential strategies for community outreach, trust-development and relationship building based on what has been learned about the assigned CSP community.
1. There will be 40 minutes for project design and preparations for the final presentation.
 2. There will be a 5-minute break for logistics.
 3. Each team will then have 10 minutes for their presentation with 5 minutes for Q&A.
- B. REQUIRED CONTENT:
INTRODUCTION: Community First – (Who is your Client?)
Summarize the CSP Site being served, identify demographics, culture, strengths, past significant events, and most recent feedback on what they want from their CSP team and/or police department.
- PART I: **PLANNING** – Reference Safety Plans and Terrain Awareness
- PART II: **FOUNDATION** – Reference the Previous Site Assessments
Learn from Past Assessments, start with strengths
- PART III: **INPUTS** – Reference Potential Stakeholders from Class and Outside
1. Identify current and potential stakeholders
 2. Full backing of the holistic model from government/non-profit
 3. Consider potential funding sources
 4. Consider how the CSP Team will build Community capacity
 5. Identify where more voices need to be heard
- PART IV: **ACTIVITIES** - Potential Strategies for Community Outreach, Violence Reduction, Trust
Development and Relationship Building
1. Community Outreach
 2. Violence Reduction
 3. Trust Development
 - a. What do you know
 - b. What do you still need to know / learn
 4. Relationship Building
 - a. Where can practices of truth and reconciliation be introduced?
 - b. Strategies for CSP Officers to be healthy individually and together.
- PART V: **OUTCOMES & ACCOUNTABILITY** - Potential Measures of Success or Need to Reassess
- PART VI: **TRANSFORMATION** - Personal Growth/Awareness – Each team member answers one of the following questions:
1. What did you learn in CSP Core that surprised you?
 2. What are you most excited to start doing?
 3. Has anything changed in your personal “Why?” for doing this work?
- C. TEAM - TEACH BACKS

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
Community Police Relations
1850-20500**

Bring in CSP Deputy Chief and Command Staff, UPI Representative, and members of the CSP Steering (Based on Availability) for Presentations and Feedback

XXII. CLOSING – CSBP LEADERSHIP AND COMMUNITY PARTNERS 1630-1700 (30 Min)

- A. Time for Course Evaluations to be submitted
- B. Mission and Vision for newest CSP Officers
- C. Congratulations and Certificates