

**LEOPRD Conference – 23 April 2008**  
**Intercontinental Hotel, Miami**  
Notes of proceedings

**Attendees:**

Richard Adams  
John Anderson  
James Bennett  
John Carroll  
Daniel Castro  
Dr Gary Cordner  
Will Davis  
Vincent Demasi  
Steve Edwards  
Brenda Eich  
Mark Eisenman  
Mora Fielder  
Hemali Gunaratne  
Kenneth Hailey  
Darius Hill  
John Kapinos  
Kristin Kappelman  
Cesar Lozada  
Michael McAuliffe  
Emily Milstein-Greengart  
Peta Myers  
Tony Nelson  
Liz Newsom  
James O'Donnell  
David Paris  
Paul Paskoff  
Michael Pfeiffer  
Bryon Price  
Thomas Pulaski  
Steven Sargent  
MaryBeth Saunders  
Nicole Scalisi  
Amy Schapiro  
Julio Schrodel  
Hank Stawinski  
Bruce Taylor  
Bill Tegeler  
Randal Vosberg  
Chuck Wexler

Bruce Taylor [BT] welcomed all to the second LEOPRD conference. See his slides.

Steve Edwards [SE] gave a brief introduction, saying that he wanted BJA to be seen as more than just a grant-giving organization, that its involvement in projects such as LEOPRD was more than that. He noted that the field of research and planning had matured substantially, and that now was the right time for a forum such as LEOPRD.

Will Davis [WD] gave an introduction to the history of the LEOPRD forum, pointing out that the founding members wanted to raise the profile of planning and research both within and between organizations across North America. Initially, there was hesitation regarding the distinction that any new forum would have, especially with regard to the ongoing IALEP forum. The work of PERF and [AB] have shown that there is a need, certainly at a more senior level within planning & research, for LEOPRD.

Both WD and BT took participants through the bye-laws and administrative matters, and demonstrated the LEOPRD website in action.

**Q:** Michael Pfeiffer [MP] pointed out that it would be useful as a tool for finding out what organizations of a similar size did about problems they had encountered. He asked whether it would be possible include a ‘filter’ function to the site, so that you could ask questions of police departments only of a certain size or profile.

**A:** WD responded by saying that he envisaged the application form for LEOPRD asking the sort of questions that would enable filtered searching.

### **Planning & Research Directors Survey**

Hemali Gunaratne [HG] gave a presentation on findings from the LEOPRD survey. See her slides. She stated that this was a follow-up survey from Doug Abrahamson’s initial survey and was aimed to collect information from PRDs nationally.

**Q:** WD asked if the survey results could be supplied in more detail, ie with the responses broken down by the size of the organization/department.

**A:** BT said that once more surveys had been completed & received back in PERF, we could calculate this level of detail.

Paul Paskoff [PP] stated that the findings of the survey would lead to questions about the variety of roles PRDs perform. BT responded by saying that as the survey had shown, the work ranged from HR to intelligence, crime mapping and even finance, and as such one of the first things the forum would need to identify is what PRDs are there for.

Mora Fielder [MF] commented that the findings from the survey were interesting, but questioned how we could make best use of it. She suggested that besides the website, something else should be produced, and thought it was worrying that ‘best practice’ was by the far the number 1 activity of PRDs.

Julio Schrodel [JS] was interested in the functions that comprised planning & research units, stating that there was a wide variety across the survey responses. HG said that the

results suggested that statistical analysis and crime mapping was generally being taken away from the units, as currently only half said they carried out those activities. BT noted that the new website would be a good place for exploring this further, and asked representatives to submit their organization charts so that comparisons could be made.

Gary Corder [GC] questioned whether the surveys were comparable, given that the sample size in last year's survey was much bigger – he noted that the charts shown should clarify the change of sample size.

HG suggested that one of the next steps for LEOPRD would be to identify a model or some model P&R units that could be used to help lesser established units. MP noted that the survey findings show the P&R units are generally reactive services, when they should be proactive. It appears there is a disconnect between the skillset of the P&R units and what the Chiefs of Police think they are there for.

Tom Pulaski [TP] asked whether next year's survey could include a question about the experience of PRDs in their position, to discover the average length of time served and the staff turnover.

SE asked that future surveys question the use of Local Initiated Research Partnerships [LIRP], whether P&Rs use them, the role of outside consultants and their interaction with these consultants.

After a break, Richard Adams [RA] commented that he had thought his unit was progressive, but had been surprised by the morning's discussion that his unit was not as organized as he'd thought. He questioned the group on what they considered a P&R unit to be, and concurred with the earlier request that organization charts be submitted to help identify the model role of a P&R unit.

WD identified a need to enhance the visibility of P&R units within each organization, more so if they were 'buried' within the structure.

Asked about a Chief's opinion, Vincent Demasi [VD] stated that they are becoming more and more involved in what's out there and what's relevant to the organization. However, they need expertise to navigate through the vast amounts of information that is available. He thought LEOPRD was an excellent idea for searching through relevant material quickly & easily.

It was clear, MF said, that there needs to be a mechanism so that we do not step on IALEP's toes, to which JS asked whether there was some duplication with IALEP-example "how do you maintain the director's level of overseeing projects, rather than getting directly involved?"

### **Strategic Planning Session**

John Carroll gave a presentation on Broward County's attitude towards planning. Slides available

WD gave a presentation on the planning process in Scottsdale, AZ. Slides available

Hank Stawinski gave a presentation on the planning process in Prince George's County, MD. He described how he had had to rebuild his P&R unit from its previous form, where there was difficulty in making policy relevant to the Chief & the rest of the organization. The key strategy of his unit is to reduce the likelihood collateral damage, and to deal with the offensive in addition to being on the defensive. The P&R unit has the budget at its core, but when issues arise there is a vision so they know what they want to do now and in the coming years. They present their plans to the community, so that they are fully involved in the planning process.

### **Training in P&R Units – Working Lunch**

GC gave a presentation on training in police departments for research and planning. John Anderson of Lockheed Martin questioned why there was so little formal education in crime & policing, and whether a National Police College was in the planning stage at all. GC replied that he had not heard of any plans for a college, and said that this is the kind of the education someone would require mid-career, as their experience would count for more than qualifications at that stage.

-

Chuck Wexler gave a short speech thanking the attendees and particularly the Advisory Board for their contributions.

John Kapinos [JK] gave a presentation on his department's planning for future development in Fairfax County, VA. Slides available.

MP asked whether there would be adjustments to the size of the police department, given the heavy increase in population and commercial outlets in the area. JK responded that they were analyzing the peak times/days for response, and stated that manpower would indeed be an issue that needed addressing.

### **Panel Discussion**

SE moderated the panel discussion, his priority being an examination of differences in perspectives between Chiefs and PRDs as to what the role of a Planning & Research unit is. VD commented that his police department was in the midst of great change, with a more focused emphasis on data and research emerging. He noted that there was lots of information available, and if senior managers don't have that information at hand during community meetings, they risked "going down in flames".

JS said that there was a need to change the mindset of P&R units, that things were ok as they were. He said that it would help a department that was trying to institute something difficult if there were examples from other units that had been successful. This is where the LEOPRD forum would come in.

MF commented that there was an abundance of skills and experience in the room, and thought that the LEOPRD forum would be the ideal conduit to share these. For example, one of the challenges facing P&Rs was the demand for long term predicting, she

questioned whether we have the right tools for that and suggested that LEOPRD could identify best practice.

SE asked the panel whether they were happy with the way their P&R unit is structured, and whether the current structure meets the needs of the organization. VD replied that it wasn't currently working in his organization; the police department had 'done away' with silos and was working more as a matrix. A loss as a result of this was that planners need to be experts in many fields, whereas previously you could ask the experts in the field to work with the planners.

SE asked the Chiefs on the panel how they support their PRDs so that they can "say no"...GM replied that there are departmental priorities and that the PRD would need to identify exactly what resources are required to get the job done. DP replied that his department has a strategic plan, and if the PRD request is not in line with that, it gets pushed back.

Brenda Eich [BE] asked the panel whether they had any preference regarding the composition of a P&R unit, ie should they be sworn, civilian, or a mix of both? VD replied that he felt it doesn't matter, as long as there was plenty of policing experience. DP agreed; though he thought civilians provided more continuity as police officers were always liable to role rotation. VD added that he thought experience of a P&R unit was extremely useful for a police officer in terms of development.

### **Next Steps**

BT commented on what had been achieved throughout the day, and identified a number of next steps for the LEOPRD group:

#### What have we learned today?

- Major change or incremental change needed?
- Silos – piecing the various parts together across agency
- Mixing of staff—sworn and non-sworn and skill levels
- Investment in civilian staff (retention issue, career track)
- Managing change (sworn staff move through research too quickly, engaging civilian staff)
- Level of sophistication in P&R is impressive – higher education has not kept up with pace.
- Successful elements of PRUs (professional development/training opportunities, ready access to information and network to help answer questions, good records of past success/failures, mix of skilled personnel, positioning of PRD in organization and ability to form work groups across agency)
- Interfacing with consultants.

### Next Steps

- List serve
- Other networking opportunities (regional conferences, teleconference)
- Participation in Advisory Board

- Areas for LEOPRD development (listserve, poll question-Hank , training and certification for PRDs and consult other fields [DHS website on lessonslearned.gov, master DOJ training calendar- Amy-COPS] and their approaches, definitional issues with PRUs, multiple models for PRUs, Police Crime College)
- LEOPRD products (strategy guide for Chiefs/Sheriffs; submitting documents for LEOPRD website, model PRU document)
- Submitting documents to LEPRD website (operational exercises and results, OW Wilson citation, workpower assessments, staffing analysis, org charts, Compstat documents, COPS document on chief's guide to conducting research)
- Completing Planning and Research Survey
- Elections