



CLEVELAND COMMUNITY POLICE COMMISSION

2020 Community Satisfaction Survey

Findings Report

March 2021

Executive Summary

Like everything else in 2020, the CPC's *Community Satisfaction Survey* was interrupted by COVID-19. For example, this survey was intended to accompany the CPC's assessment of the updated police training curricula; however, because we could not do in person promotion or distribute the survey as easily as we had planned, it was delayed. Regardless, this first in an annual series of community assessments is complete.

In this survey, we asked community members to assess their level of satisfaction regarding the performance of CDP officers, and we asked about how that assessment has changed over the last two years, if it has. We also asked community members about their own experiences with officers.

Key Findings

- Our results are similar to the *Biennial Surveys* produced for the Monitoring Team. Respondents are split over how satisfied they are with the performance of CDP officers and if there has been any improvement in that performance over the last two years.
- However, we found that many respondents are not yet comfortable making a fully informed assessment. This means that a smaller portion of respondents could definitively say that they were satisfied or had observed progress than the *Biennial Surveys*.
- Many respondents state explicitly that they are not seeing progress.
- When provided the space to do so, respondents suggested that the CDP still needs to put more effort into trainings relating to the Consent Decree. Issues like Biased Policing, Use-of-force, De-escalation, Crisis Intervention, Community Engagement, and District Awareness, are still training curricula that respondents think need to be improved on.
- When asked about personal interactions with officers, some respondents described them in glowing terms; others, however, describe harassment, discrimination, and unconstitutional policing practices.

Where we go from here

- This is just the first of what will be a series of annual surveys that aim to assess changes in the community's satisfaction with the CDP and its officers. Tracking this progress is an important part of insuring that the CDP and City continue to make progress with implementing the Consent Decree.
- For the next survey, which will be coming out this year, we want to improve on this survey.
- We hope to expand the number of community organizations who encourage their members to participate, with the goal of getting more vulnerable populations, more likely to interact with the CDP, to participate.
- When we made this survey we did not expect so many CDP employees to take it, because of their increased interest, we hope to add a section for them to explicitly outline ways they think the place they work can be improved upon.
- The data collected from this survey is going to be incorporated into other, ongoing CPC projects.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table of Contents.....	2
Background	3
CSS Survey.....	4
Methods.....	4
Data.....	5
Demographics	5
Sample	7
Results.....	8 - 36
Results Part I - Level of satisfaction with Cleveland police officers.....	8
Assessment of responses.....	8
Questions and responses.....	10
Results Part II - Changes in officer performance	18
Assessment of responses.....	18
Questions and responses.....	19
Results Part III - Personal experience	23
Assessment of responses.....	23
Questions and responses.....	25
Appendix	see attachment

Background

The Cleveland Monitoring team commissioned two *Biennial Community Surveys*, the first in 2016¹ and the second in 2018;² a third survey was intended for 2020, but was delayed due to Covid-19. These surveys were created to assess Cleveland's citizens' overall approval of the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) and its officers.

The 2016 Survey found that there were markedly different assessments of police among different demographics. With younger residents and Black residents giving the police lower marks than older and White residents. The 2016 Survey also found that majorities of residents across demographics perceive that there is disparate treatment of Black and white residents by DPC officers.

The 2018 Survey provided insights into changes in citizens' assessments over the two year span. Some of these metrics improved, such as the percent of residents with an overall positive assessment of the CDP; whereas other metrics declined, such as the percent of residents who perceive that the CDP treats residents of different races fairly.

Both surveys also asked residents about their interactions with officers, as with other metrics there was evidence of progress and regress. Slightly fewer residents reported use of unnecessary force, for example, however, more residents felt that police were discourteous and disrespectful to them during the encounter. Because the surveys are not longitudinal, it limits the amount that can be extrapolated from these findings; though they are in line with other assessments^{3,4} of the City and the CPD's progress in complying with the Consent Decree⁵—that it is an ongoing effort with mixed results.

¹ Cafarchia, F. (ISA), Gomez, S.T., & Diaz, D.O. (Gomez Research), 2016, "Cleveland Ohio Community Survey: Public Perceptions of Safety and Policing."

<<<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5651f9b5e4b08f0af890bd13/t/576c754cf7e0abd30d509f7b/1466725709074/Biennial+Community+Survey--2016-06-23.pdf>>>

² Anzalone Liszt Grove Research, 2018, "Key Findings and Recommendations from 2018 Survey."

<<<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5651f9b5e4b08f0af890bd13/t/5c45e4498a922d3a72ed1d91/1548084297997/Appendix+A+-+Cleveland+Police+Survey+Memo.pdf>>>

³ Cleveland Police Monitoring Team, July 2020, "Eighth Semiannual Report."

<<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5651f9b5e4b08f0af890bd13/t/5f0dc503ea043118c97d16e5/1594737927356/FILE_9341.pdf>>

⁴ Cleveland Community Police Commission, 2020, "Quantification of the Cleveland Police Monitoring Team's Eighth Semiannual Report." <<<https://clecpc.org/wp-content/uploads/CPC-Quantification-of-Monitoring-Team-8th-Semi-Annual-Report-July-2020.pdf>>>

⁵ United States of America v. City of Cleveland, 2015, Consent Decree

<<https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2015/05/27/cleveland_agreement_5-26-15.pdf>>

CSS Survey

In late 2019 and early 2020, the CPC, with assistance from the Tesser Group,⁶ developed the *CPC 2020 Community Satisfaction Survey (2020 CSS)*.⁷ The purpose of this survey was to supplement the findings of a 2020 CPC report, *A Review of Cleveland Division of Police Training Curricula*.⁸ This survey will also serve as baseline for future CPC surveys. The goal of this assessment is to better inform the citizens of Cleveland about the overall progress of police reform in the City.

Methods

The 2020 CSS is a non-random survey that was made available and advertised at various meetings by the CPC and other organizations. The CPC also used social media to encourage the citizens of Cleveland to participate in the survey. Because the survey sample was not drawn at random, it limits the types of statistical analysis that can be performed; however, the responses will still provide useful insights into the assessments and lived experiences of Cleveland's citizens.

The 2020 CSS was available in an electronic form, via SurveyMonkey, and as a paper survey. Data was collected principally in March and April 2020, with some collected in October and November of 2020.

The 2020 CSS asked each respondent up to 62 questions. Some questions were follow-ups that depended on the respondent's answer, so not all respondents were asked all 62 questions.

The first group of questions collected demographic data, such as residency, zip code, age, race, sex, education, LGBTQ status, and whether or not they were employed by the CDP.

Next, the survey asked respondents to assess the performance of the CDP on topics relevant to the Consent Decree, and covered by the updated training curricula, specifically Use-of-force, Bias-free policing, Crisis Intervention Training (CIT), Community and Problem Oriented Policing (CPOP), Search and Seizure, and District Awareness. These are the topics covered in the new officer training curricula that were assessed in the CPC's 2020 report. Respondents were asked about both their current level of satisfaction with CDP officer performance in these areas and their assessment of how officer performance has changed, if at all.

Finally, respondents who had an encounter, or knew someone who had an encounter, with CDP officers in the last 6 months were asked for particular details about that encounter.

Because of the sensitivity of some of the questions, respondents were allowed to skip questions and continue the survey. When applicable, respondents were given the choice of answering that they did not have enough information or the relevant experiences to answer the question. This differs from the Monitoring Team's surveys, as the intent was to capture respondents' uncertainties regarding the

⁶ The TESSER Group, Aurora Road Suite 309, Solon, Ohio 44139, United States <<<https://thetessergroup.com>>>

⁷ PDF of paper survey attached as a separate document.

⁸ Robinson, K.J. (Tesser Group), 2020, "A Review of Cleveland Division of Police Training Curricula." <<<https://clecpc.org/wp-content/uploads/Review-of-Cleveland-Division-of-Police-Training-Curricula-Gap-Analysis-2020.pdf>>>

reform process. Also, the survey was made available to all members of the Cleveland community, including people who live in Cleveland, work in Cleveland, and regularly visit Cleveland, as anyone has the potential to interact with CPD officers. The survey also provides space for respondents to elaborate and make suggestions. This qualitative data is intended to provide context for answers and insights into the experiences of respondents.

Data

The 2020 CSS received a total of 729 responses. Of these, 327 were CDP employees and 402 were not employees. For the analysis in this report, these two groups will be examined separately.

Demographics

Residency

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
I live in Cleveland	36.41%	146	5.14%	16
I work in Cleveland	20.7%	83	50.8%	158
I both live and work in Cleveland	36.16%	145	43.41%	135
Other (please specify)	6.73%	27	0.64%	2

Police District⁹

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
First	17.42%	69	22.30%	66
Second	24.24%	96	19.93%	59
Third	13.38%	53	2.36%	7
Fourth	17.17%	68	7.77%	23
Fifth	6.31%	25	4.39%	13
Outside Cleveland	21.46%	85	43.24%	128

⁹ Calculated by ZIP Code.

Age

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Under 18	17.91%	72	2.89%	9
18 - 24	7.71%	31	1.93%	6
25 - 34	18.16%	73	12.22%	38
35 - 44	12.19%	49	18.97%	59
45 - 54	11.94%	48	47.91%	149
55 - 64	18.91%	76	16.08%	50
65 - 74	10.2%	41	0.0%	0
75 - 84	2.74%	11	0.0%	0
85+	0.25%	1	0.0%	0

Sex / Gender

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Male	37.91%	152	80.65%	250
Female	58.85%	236	16.77%	52
Non-binary	3.24%	13	2.58%	8

Race/Ethnicity

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
American Indian/Native American, non-Hispanic	0.25%	1	1.29%	4
Asian, non-Hispanic	1.76%	7	1.62%	5
Black/African American, non-Hispanic	33.67%	134	21.04%	65
Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
White, non-Hispanic	48.74%	194	61.81%	191
Hispanic/Latino of any race	10.55%	42	7.44%	23
Other (please specify)	5.03%	20	6.8%	21

Education

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Less than high school	9.73%	39	1.61%	5
High school/GED	14.21%	57	19.35%	60
Some college	15.46%	62	41.29%	128
Associate's degree	5.99%	24	12.26%	38
Bachelor's degree	25.69%	103	20.32%	63
Master's degree	21.2%	85	2.9%	9
Doctorate	7.73%	31	2.26%	7

Identify as LGBTQ

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	13.14%	51	1.62%	5
No	83.25%	323	91.23%	281
Prefer not to answer	3.61%	14	7.14%	22

Sample

While, again, this is not a randomized sample and some groups are underrepresented, such as Black residents, and others are overrepresented, such as those with college degrees, the responses that we received are reasonably reflective of the Cleveland community. This gives us confidence that we are able to use this data to broadly assess the community's level of satisfaction with the CDP in these areas.

That these findings are also in line with previous assessments, including the *Biennial Surveys*, suggests that the survey is a reasonably valid way to assess community satisfaction. However, because of these limitations, only crosstabs between CPC employees and non-employees are included in the results presented here.

Results – Part I

Part I - Level of satisfaction with Cleveland police officers

These questions were asked to assess the respondents' level of satisfied with the performance of officers as it related to recent updates in CDP training curricula: Q10 asked about Use-of-force, Q11 asked about Bias-free Policing, Q11 asked about CIT, Q13 and 14 asked about CPOP, Q15 asked about Search and Seizure, and Q16 asked about District Awareness Training. Questions 17 asked respondents if they felt that officers were well trained. Q18 asks respondents to suggest possible ways that the CDP can improve training. Q19 asked the respondent for an overall assessment of the CDP officers' professionalism. Question 20 asked the respondents to describe an interaction with officers where they performed well, and Q21 asked for an example of when an officer had behaved unprofessionally.

Assessment of Non-CDP employees' responses

Overall, non-employees were much more critical of the CDP than employees. Among non-employees, between one third and one half of respondents said that they did not have enough experience to answer the question when that was an option. On those questions (Q10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16), it was the most common choice, and on all of those questions the combined totals for satisfied (*very satisfied* plus *satisfied*) and unsatisfied (*unsatisfied* plus *very unsatisfied*) were roughly equal. On questions without that option, Q13 and 16, about two-thirds of respondents were satisfied and one-third were unsatisfied. The reason it was not an option for these questions was that these are more general questions about officer performance and not in reference to a specific action taken by officers.

One of the main goals of this survey is to assess the citizens' levels of satisfaction with the CDP; however, many residents do not feel that they have the necessary experience or have seen enough to assess officer performance. This makes sense, as not everyone has regular interactions with police. This is something important to consider going forward, as it suggests that respondents are comfortable withholding their assessment until they feel fully informed.

About half of the non-employee respondents felt that the police needed to be better trained (17) and about a third felt that officers behaved unprofessionally (Q19). This suggests that training might be a bigger concern for the respondents than professionalism. This makes sense, as results from the CPC's 2020 *Review of Policing Training Curricula* suggest that citizens are skeptical about the new curricula and that these new curricula do not meet citizens' expectations.

For Question 18, the main recommendations provided by non-employees to improve CDP officer training directly relate the updated curricula. The top responses were Bias-free policing, mental health crisis intervention (particularly for homeless people), de-escalation, district/community awareness, and courteousness/professionalism. Some of the more illustrative responses are listed below the suggestion totals.

For Question 20, below are a selection of detailed, illustrative responses of when officers performed their duties well. One describes how officers handled a person likely experiencing a mental health crisis with dignity and compassion, which made the respondent feel safer. The other describes a case that was solved to the respondent's satisfaction. This suggests that citizens are most pleased with officers when

they help them *and* when they do not harm other citizens—including those who the respondent had complained about. Respondents also suggested, more generally, that officers were courteous and professional and usually do a good job.

For Question 21, respondents repeatedly mentioned the incidents when officers were unprofessional during the *George Floyd* protests in June, below is an illustrative example. Citizens also described how officers sexually harassed, bullied, and stereotyped young people. Below are illustrative examples of the sort of conduct that the *2016 Biennial Survey* suggested would result in an echo effect, where upon hearing of this conduct from neighbors or family, a citizen's opinion of the CDP and its officers is badly damaged, possibly permanently. These sorts of instances have been reported repeatedly for many years. It will take many more positive stories, like those listed in Q20, to change that.

This is why it is important that so many respondents opted to not assess officer performance in a given area because of their lack of experience. This means that the opportunities to *demonstrate* improvements resulting from improved officer training are rare. And it is not until the CDP has demonstrated to the citizens of Cleveland that it has dramatically improved that it can be suggested that the current reform process has succeeded.

Assessment of CDP employees' responses

Among CDP employees, the assessment of officer performance was more generous; also, fewer CDP employees skipped questions. Employees were also less likely to say that they did not have enough experience to answer a question when that was an option. There were, still, some CDP employees who were critical of officer performance. Interestingly, the one area with the worst assessment among CDP employees, with the fewest number of *Very Satisfied* responses (32%), roughly tied for the most *Unsatisfied* responses (7%), and most uncertain responses (27%) was Bias-free policing. This suggests that some CDP employees agree that this is an area of concern.

As with non-employees, CDP employees gave officers a higher rating for professionalism (97% positive) than for training (82% positive).

Far fewer CDP employees responded to Q18 than did non-employees. Among those who did respond, their recommendations were generally related to day-to-day police work, such as improved report writing and other technical aspects of policing. Illustrative examples are listed below.

About the same number of CDP officers responded to Q20 as did non-employees. They also generally describe officers as being courteous and professional. Some of these responses also mention handling a mental health crisis in a calm and dignified way.

Very few CDP employees responded to Q21. Some of the concerns raised were general unprofessionalism and aggressiveness with citizens.

Part I – Questions & responses

In the past 24 months, to what degree are you satisfied with the performance of the Cleveland Division of Police officers in the following areas? (Numbers in parentheses are overall the totals for Very Satisfied + Satisfied and Very Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied.)

10. Officers' use-of-force during an encounter, altercation, or arrest.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	11.94%	45	37.04%	110
Satisfied	14.59% (26.53%)	55 (100)	32.32% (69.36%)	96
Dissatisfied	14.85%	56	5.05%	15
Very dissatisfied	11.41% (26.26%)	43 (99)	2.69% (7.74%)	8
I have not experienced or seen an encounter, altercation or arrest.	47.21%	178	22.9%	68
Skipped		25		14

11. Officers' perceived bias during an encounter or investigation.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	10.37%	39	32.32%	96
Satisfied	17.02% (27.39%)	64 (103)	33.00% (65.32%)	98 (194)
Dissatisfied	18.35%	69	4.71%	14
Very dissatisfied	11.70% (30.05%)	44 (113)	2.69% (7.40%)	8 (22)
I have not experienced or seen a police encounter or investigation.	42.55%	160	27.27%	81
Skipped		26		14

12. Officers' handling of individuals experiencing a mental health or other crisis.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	9.09%	34	40.54%	120
Satisfied	16.04% (25.13%)	60 (94)	38.18% (78.72%)	113
Dissatisfied	14.97%	56	3.38%	10
Very dissatisfied	12.30% (27.27%)	46 (102)	1.35% (4.73%)	4
I have not experienced or seen officers handling of individuals experiencing a mental health or other crisis.	47.59%	178	16.55%	49
Skipped		28		15

13. Officers' interactions with the public.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	19.84%	74	47.32%	141
Satisfied	45.31% (65.15%)	169 (263)	45.97% (93.29%)	137
Dissatisfied	27.88%	104	5.70%	17
Very dissatisfied	6.97% (34.85%)	26 (130)	1.01% (6.71%)	3
Skipped		29		13

14. Officers' responsiveness to community feedback.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	11.73%	44	35.91%	107
Satisfied	25.60% (37.33%)	96 (140)	44.97% (80.88%)	134
Dissatisfied	16.00%	60	6.04%	18
Very dissatisfied	13.60% (29.60%)	51 (111)	1.68% (7.72%)	5
I have not experienced or seen officers receive community feedback.	33.07%	124	11.41%	34
Skipped		27		12

15. Officers' respect for citizens' rights during a search or arrest.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	9.55%	36	42.76%	127
Satisfied	18.30% (27.85%)	69 (105)	36.36% (79.12%)	108
Dissatisfied	14.85%	56	2.69%	8
Very dissatisfied	11.94% (26.79%)	45 (101)	1.35% (4.04%)	4
I have not experienced or seen a search or arrest.	45.36%	171	16.84%	50
Skipped		25		14

16. Officer's knowledge and understanding of the neighborhood.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	16.67%	61	41.55%	123
Satisfied	46.99% (63.68%)	172	50.00% (91.55%)	148
Dissatisfied	27.05%	99	6.76%	20
Very dissatisfied	9.29% (36.34%)	34	1.69% (8.45%)	5
Skipped		36		15

17. Overall, do you feel that Cleveland police officers are well trained?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	50.55%	183	83.62%	245
No	49.45%	179	16.38%	48
Skipped		40		18

18. Please describe what additional or improved training you feel officers need?

Question 18 is a qualitative question where respondents were provided space to suggest what areas the CDP can improve officer training. Please remember that respondents could suggest multiple areas of training that could be improved upon.

Non-CDP employee responses

151 respondents answered Question 18.

The most common response, by far, among non-CDP employees was bias-free/racial-bias training, with 43 responses. Other top concerns included crisis intervention/mental health crisis training (34), de-escalation training (33), neighborhood/district/cultural awareness training (26), and training on behaving more professional and courteous when interacting with citizens (24). Other concerns included more training on how to deal with their own psychological needs/stress (12), training on Constitutional policing (9), community policing (8), training to maintain regular police competencies (8), training on dealing with the LGBTQ community and individuals (5), college level/other coursework (5), accountability training (3), and Use-of-Force training (2). Some respondents suggested that instead of additional training, that some of officer's non-policing duties need to be given to other professionals (6).

"Cultural Competence- Cleveland has several diverse, and cultural communities and each one brings something different to the things that make Cleveland what it is. Police Officers would be best served if they were trained in those cultural [differences] to improve community engagement with residents of these communities.

De-escalation Training- De-escalation training along with cultural competence will help police officers in [their] approach when making arrest and [answering] calls from dispatch. Having the training to calm a [situation] and prevent escalation is while also prevent the need to use force."

- Ms. A, a middle aged Black woman living in the Second District

"I think they need sensitivity training. They need on-going mental health counseling or trauma informed care for themselves. They need training on restorative justice, community policing, de-escalation techniques for youth. They need on-going anti-bias training to understand that Black people are humans, and community members. We deserve protection from police too. They need on-going training on how to interact with trans, gender non-conforming, LGBTQ youth."

- Ms. B, a younger Black woman living in the Third District

"[How] to help people in mental health crisis, how to respectfully engage homeless populations and when to leave people alone, less racial bias, less force."

- Ms. C, a young white woman living in the Second District

"They need to come out of their vehicles more and walk the neighborhoods and get to know and talk to the citizens."

- Ms. D, a younger Hispanic/Latina woman living in the Second District

CDP employee responses

35 respondents answered Question 18.

Among CDP employees, the top three most common responses were: better training on Constitutional policing/"what the law is" (5), writing reports (4), and community engagement (4). Other recommendations included DUI/pursuit training (3), improved first aid training (2), tactical training (2), firearms training (2). Bias free training, Use-of-Force training, de-escalation training, and demilitarization, were each suggested by one respondent. One respondent suggested that policy and procedures are unnecessarily complicated. Other responses suggested specific trainings such as how to handle hit-skips, and how best to employ officer discretion.

"Reporting writing, constitutional laws and many codes, what is probable cause, how to convey their encounters into their reports."

- Ms. E, a middle aged white woman living in the Second District.

Day to day activities, leaders need to address the ambiguity of current GPO's, DN's and create identifiable and reachable expectations that the rank and file can meet and feel engaged with the division. There needs to be an element of physical fitness AND mental health programs that can reduce the stress of the constant negative encounters with the public and the divisions own discipline policy. The patrol section does a great job trying to engage the public in meaningful ways but is asked to do too much and simply does not have the time to build trust and personal relationships with the community, which is necessary to have any impact on the outcome of crime. In a nutshell i don't believe handing out stuff (toys, food, candy) and creating staged photo ops is what is going to create strong bonds with the community.

- Mr. F, a middle aged white man living in the Second District.

"To spend more time interacting with youth and the everyday community members not during a law enforcement situation."

- Mr. G, a middle aged Black man living in the First District.

19. Overall, do you feel that Cleveland police officers behave professionally?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	68.72%	246	97.64%	289
No	31.28%	112	2.36%	7
Skipped		44		15

20. If you think the officers performed well, can you please describe that experience?

Question 20 is a qualitative question that asks respondents for an example of when they think that CDP officers performed their duties well.

Non-CDP employee responses

148 responses to Question 20.

“There was a guy that was really high on something outside of our office door. Our office manager called the police. They talked with them and tried to get him to move himself but found that he was too intoxicated or high. They called an ambulance that would take him to St Vincent to get treated.”

- Ms. G, a middle aged Asian woman living in the Third District.

“My vehicle was damaged and personal items were stolen. My car was parked downtown in a garage while I was working. The responding officers, who were white, did an amazing job! They recovered the items and arrested the individuals responsible. I hope and pray the city hires more officers similar to the ones that assisted me.”

- Mr. H, a middle aged Black man living in the Fourth District

CDP employee responses

136 responses to question 20

“Seeing officers speak calmly to a person in mental crisis able to talk him into their car without incident.”

- Mr. I, a middle aged man living in the First District

“I have observed officers handling calls in my neighborhood and they treated the caller with respect and took her concerns seriously.”

- Mr. J, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

21. Can you please describe an incident or incidents when an officer behaved unprofessionally?

Question 21 is a qualitative question that asks respondents for an example of when they think that CDP officers were unprofessional in the performance of their duties.

Non-CDP employee responses

89 respondents answered Question 21.

“On May 30, 2020, before a legally insufficient dispersal order was given, I was pepper-sprayed directly in the face while standing in front of a Cleveland cop. On that same day, while video-recording from a long-distance a Cleveland cop who was shooting some sort of munition at protesters, I experienced that cop turn his gun at me and shoot at my feet, I presume, as means to scare me off from recording his behavior.”

- Mr. K, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“I woke up late and was rushing to school and as I was walking up to the school and the cop stopped me and said why are you late I said I woke up late and he said no you [probably] smoking weed with your [friends] and called my mom and sent a letter to my house for a [hearing].”

- Mr. L, a black teenager living in the Second District

“I have seen police officers make sexually suggestive comments, and gestures to teenage girls when they are patrolling schools and neighborhoods. I have seen police officers curse and yell at children. I have seen police officers hem up and physically assault young men and treat them like suspects because they fit the aesthetic and profile.”

- Ms. M, a young black woman living in the Third District

“Often use crude and aggressive language, especially (and exclusively) to homeless and perceived poor members of the public. Getting into personal arguments rather than objectively instrumentalizing laws. Littering (constantly). Wearing radical ideological insignia (3%, Punisher, Thin Blue Line, Molon Labe etc.)”

- Mr. N, a younger white man living in the Third District

“Today while in line to vote in presidential election a young black man was holding a demonstration in support of Black and Brown lives and a police officer openly mocked him to my face.”

- Ms. O, a younger white woman living in the Second District

CDP employee responses

5 respondents answered Question 21.

“This runs the gamut from running red lights while driving (not using flashing lights, speeding or other indications of on a run), parking illegally in order to get coffee or food, driving while using their cell phones, stopping people who “seem out of place” meaning racial profiling.”

- Mr. P, a middle aged white man who works in the Third District

“Several where there was undue aggressive behavior exhibited during interactions with calm and compliant people who are being considered suspects.”

- Ms. Q, a middle aged Black woman who lives in the Fourth District

Results – Part II

Part II - Changes in officer performance

The purpose of these questions was to ascertain if respondents had noticed any changes that might have resulted from the updated training curricula. Q23 asked about Use-of-force, Q24 asked about Bias-free policing, Q25 asked about Crisis Intervention, Q26 and 27 asked about CPOP, Q28 asked about Search and Seizure, and Q29 asks about District Awareness training. Question 30 asked respondents for any comments or observations they had regarding any changes in officer performance they had seen over the last two years.

Assessment of Non-CDP employees' responses

Similar to *Part I*, many respondents did not feel they had enough experience with the relevant topic to assess any changes in officer performance. For most questions about half of respondents did not have enough experience to answer the question. The exceptions were when respondents were asked about general police interactions with the public, responsiveness to community feedback, and officers' knowledge of the district, which had about one quarter, one third, and one third responding as such respectively.

As with the questions above, this makes sense, as not all community members have regular interactions with officers. This also means that the total percentage of respondents who have *seen* improvement is low, usually around 15-20%; officers' general interaction with citizens had the highest rate of improvement at 28% (Use-of-force had the least improvement). As was discussed above, in order for the current reform efforts outlined by the Consent Decree to be considered effective—a much larger share of Cleveland's citizens must be convinced of its effective implementation.

Along those lines, respondents' second most common answer was that they had not noticed any changes in officer performance over the last 24 months.

Generally speaking, slightly fewer respondents said they had observed officers' performance getting *worse* than had said they were getting better. Still, this exacerbates the problem outlined earlier, as even if some people are seeing improvement, a not-insignificant number have observed things getting worse, which means it will take even longer for citizens to be convinced that the Consent Decree process had yielded real reforms.

For Q30, many respondents simply implied that there was no change, typing out "no" or "N/A" as their response. Other respondents used the space to make observations that did not address changes in officer performance. Below are some illustrative responses that directly address the question. Some respondents did mention that younger officers seem to be better than older officers. Some respondents also suggested that officers have become less courteous, but are otherwise the same. A few respondents suggested that the changes implemented by the CDP were purely cosmetic, and just papered over existing problems.

Assessment of CDP employees' responses

As was the case in *Part I*, CDP employees gave officers higher marks than non-employees. However, with the exception of officers' general interaction with the public, only a minority of employees said that there had been improvement with officers' performance over the last 24 months. The area that CDP employees gave the worst assessment to was Bias-free policing, with only 37% of employees saying there had been improvement. This is also similar to the results from *Part I*. Which reinforces the suggestion that people who work for the CDP are aware that bias is a real problem within the Division.

For question 30, many employees also implied that there was no change, typing out "no" or "N/A" as their response. Several of those who did comment said that officers were engaging less with the community out of fear of discipline. This is a sentiment that had been implied elsewhere in open ended responses. Some respondents also mentioned that the changes were superficial—as even with good policy in place, bad implementation will mean that needed reforms will not come about.

Part II – Questions & responses

In the past 24 months, have you noticed any changes in Cleveland police officers' performance in the following areas?

23. Officers' use-of-force during an encounter, altercation, or arrest.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More harsh use-of-force	9.97%	34	0.72%	2
Less harsh use-of-force	15.84%	54	46.93%	130
Unchanged	17.89%	61	22.38%	62
No experience to determine	56.3%	192	29.96%	83
Skipped		61		34

24. Officers' perceived bias during an encounter or investigation.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More biased or prejudiced	13.49%	46	2.16%	6
Less biased or prejudiced	16.13%	55	37.77%	105
Unchanged	21.99%	75	33.09%	92

No experience to determine	48.39%	165	26.98%	75
Skipped		61		33

25. Officers' handling of individuals experiencing a mental health or other crisis.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More effective and compassionate	14.16%	48	48.2%	134
Less effective and compassionate	12.39%	42	4.32%	12
Unchanged	19.76%	67	24.46%	68
No experience to determine	53.69%	182	23.02%	64
Skipped		63		33

26. Officers' interactions with the public.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More positive	30.5%	104	55.96%	155
Less positive	15.25%	52	3.61%	10
Unchanged	28.74%	98	28.88%	80
No experience to determine	25.51%	87	11.55%	32
Skipped		61		34

27. Officers' responsiveness to community feedback.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More engagement	21.7%	74	45.32%	126
Less engagement	14.37%	49	6.47%	18
Unchanged	26.39%	90	30.22%	84
No experience to determine	37.54%	128	17.99%	50
Skipped		61		33

28. Officers' respect for citizens' rights during a search or arrest.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More respect	14.04%	48	41.73%	116
Less respect	13.45%	46	1.8%	5
Unchanged	21.05%	72	35.97%	100
No experience to determine	51.46%	176	20.5%	57
Skipped		60		33

29. Officers' knowledge and understanding of the neighborhood.

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More knowledgeable	21.47%	73	39.21%	109
Less knowledgeable	13.82%	47	6.83%	19
Unchanged	32.06%	109	36.33%	101
No experience to determine	32.65%	111	17.63%	49
Skipped				33

30. Do you have any comments or observations on changes in Cleveland police officer performance over the last 24 months?

Question 30 is a qualitative question where respondents were provided space to make additional comments concerning the overall changes in officer performance over the last two years.

Non-CDP employee responses

175 respondents answered Question 30.

85 respondents answered “no,” “none,” or “nah.” 14 respondents answered “N/A” or “NA”

“While they are “engaging” more... it is all for show. It is not authentic, and [doesn’t] result in change. It is sugarcoating to the same old same old, no nothing us vs them attitude.”

- Mr. R, a middle aged white male living in the Fourth District

“You [the CDP] are doing virtually the same, but are even less friendly. I didn't know that was even possible.”

- Ms. S, a young white woman living in the First District

“The younger officers I've met have been great!”

- Ms. T, a younger white woman living in the Second District

“No Substantial Improvements Can be substantiated, NO matter [Cited] or Not.”

- U, a person of Asian heritage living in the Third District

CDP employee responses

124 respondents answered Question 30.

49 respondents answered “no,” “none,” or “nah.” 17 respondents answered “N/A” or “NA”

“I have noticed do to the restrictions that are being put on the Cleveland Police Officers, Officers are refraining from actively engaging in certain areas of police functions, which is leading to higher crime rates in certain areas of the City of Cleveland.”

Ms. V, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fourth District

“While there has been many excellent new policies and procedures put in place, the unwritten attitude and biased discipline demonstrated by the command staff has caused many officers to use poor tactics. They put their personal safety, the safety of other officers, and the safety of the citizens at risk for fear of discipline.”

- Mr. W, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“Officers are jaded, and less willing to go out of [their] way to help due to moral within the department.”

- Ms. X, a middle aged white woman living in the Second District

Results – Part III

Part III – Personal experience

The final group of questions asked respondents if they or someone they know had an encounter with a CDP officer within the last 6 months. Those who responded yes were then asked questions about that encounter that concern topics related to the recent training curricula changes as mandated by the Consent Decree. Q32 and 33 ask about how often the respondent or someone they know encounters officers and what type of police encounter they had respectively. Q34 and 35 asked about Use-of-force; Q37-39 asked about Bias; Q40-43 asked about Crisis Intervention; Q44-48 asked about CPOP; Q49-59 asked about Search and Seizure; Q61 and 62 asked about District Awareness; and Q63 asked the respondent for their overall assessment of the encounter.

Assessment of non-CDP employees' responses

About three-fifths of non-employee respondents, or someone they know, had an encounter with CDP officers in the last six months. Overall, according to Q63, 61% of respondents were satisfied with their or their friend's encounter with the CDP. However, the 39% of respondents who were not satisfied, raised significant concerns about the CDP's practices.

Use-of-force

15 respondents said that the encounter involved use of force, five of those said that the use of force had been beyond what was necessary. When asked to describe the encounter, a few respondents described what happened to them during the George Floyd protests. Another respondent, a Black woman labeled Ms. Z in this report to protect her anonymity, simply wrote "I lived." An answer that, in its simplicity, speaks to the disconcerting reality that underlines why finishing the process of police reform is so essential.

Bias-free Policing

Of the 135 respondents who answered these questions, 52 respondents (or 38%) said that they had felt that the officer was bias during this encounter. Race was the most prominent reason behind this bias at 80%, followed by gender and age at about 50% each. Respondents describe officers stereotyping them, singling them out, and belittling their inelegance on account of their, or their neighbors', race, age, or gender.

Crisis Intervention

Of the 135 respondents who answered these questions, 24 respondents (or 18%) said that the encounter involved a mental health crisis. Slightly more than half of the time, the officers responded with compassion and clearly understood how to handle the situation. A few respondents mentioned how the officers were sympathetic and understanding. Others said that the officers need additional training to deal with mental health crises.

CPOP

In slightly more than half of the encounters the officer was engaging with citizens. Of these, the officer specifically engaged in Community engagement about one-third of the time. When officers worked on community engagement they asked questions about the community about two thirds of the time, and two thirds of the time the respondent said that the officer walked away with a better understanding of the neighborhood. While there have been issues with implementing CPOP, this suggests that if there is still an opening for officers to engage with community members in ways that will better inform policing. This is backed up by some of the responses that suggest that officers should get out of their cars more and interact with citizens. Other respondents noted that there is a noticeable discrepancy between neighborhoods when it comes to community policing.

Search and Seizure

A quarter of the 123 respondents who answer this question (31) said that their Constitutional rights were violated. Practices explicitly prohibited in the updated Search & Seizure GPO¹⁰, are still being employed. 16 times an officer refused to give their name and badge number after being asked to do so. 12 times an officers searched a home or a vehicle without probable cause or a warrant. 4 times an officer seized property without probable cause or a warrant. Of the 17 incidents when someone was arrested, 10 of those times the person did not believe they had probable cause or a warrant. Twice someone was arrested because they refused to sign a ticket. During 12 of the 17 arrests, officers *did not* read the arrestee their Maranda Rights.

During these incidents, respondents mention that officers just forced their way into their homes or vehicles, and how, if there was not imitate cooperation, then there were threats of escalation. This is why the CPC pushed so hard for these policy changes. However, as has been discussed in other forums, and mentioned by respondents to this survey, if they are not put into practice, then the CDP is not living up to the mandates in the Consent Decree.

District Awareness

Approximately two-thirds of the 120 respondents who answer this question said that the officers appeared to have decent knowledge of the neighborhood they were working in. For a few respondents it was knowing small details that demonstrated this knowledge, such as knowing how to navigate peculiar streets. One example provided of when an officer was not knowledgeable was when they did not know who lived in the neighborhood.

Assessment of CDP employees' responses

CDP employees do have more encounters with officers than non-employees, with about half having an encounter in the last 6 months. While employees register fewer concerns than non-employees, they have mentioned feeling targeted because of their race, that their vehicles and persons were searched without probable cause, and that officers need to do a better job of engaging with and learning about the communities they work in. One very positive interaction observed by an employee, that demonstrated an officer's knowledge of the neighborhood, was when an officer helped out a family in the early days of COVID when they recommended where they could still get needed supplies.

¹⁰ Please note that the City of Cleveland has not, as of this drafting of this report, updated its website to reflect the most recent changes, please visit our website for more information: <https://clecpc.org/our-work/search-seizure/>

Part III – Questions & responses

31. Have you, a family member, or a friend had a direct interaction with a Cleveland police officer in the past 6 months?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	40.3%	135	48.19%	133
No	59.7%	200	51.81%	143
Skipped		67		35

****ONLY RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED YES IN QUESTION 31 ANSWERED THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS****

32. How often do you, your family, or your friends have encounters with Cleveland police officers (not including when officers are working as security guards)?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
More than once a week	7.97%	11	42.42%	56
Weekly	11.59%	16	7.58%	10
Monthly	23.91%	33	6.06%	8
Yearly	24.64%	34	12.12%	16
Only once every few years	23.19%	32	24.24%	32
Never	8.7%	12	7.58%	10

33. How would you describe your, a family member's, or a friend's recent direct interaction with a Cleveland police officer?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Traffic stop	22.96%	31	14.06%	18
Consensual, you or they felt free to leave at any time	29.63%	40	46.88%	60
Related to an investigation	11.85%	16	21.09%	27
Arrest	4.44%	6	0.0%	0
Unsure	31.11%	42	17.97%	23

34. Did the officer use force during the encounter?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	11.54%	15	0.00%	0
No	88.46%	115	100.00%	126

35. Did the officer use appropriate force during the encounter? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q34.)¹¹

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes , the officer only used as much force as was necessary to safely gain control of the situation	27.78%	5	100.00%	1
No , the officer used excessive force	72.22%	13	0.00%	0

36. Are there any other details you would like to provide concerning the officer's use-of-force? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q34.)

Question 36 is a qualitative question that asks respondents to describe the use-of-force incident that they or someone they knew were involved in. No CDP employees answered question 36.

“I was marching with Black Lives Matter as a student of political science. With a canvas painted sign and no intention of any kind of violence. Police officers (who inevitably lied afterward about [the] reason) fired tear gas and shock munitions into the crowd including me as the closest person to them. I guess that’s my fault for doing a constitutionally protected activity.”

- Mr. Y, a young white man living in the Third District

“I lived.”

- Ms. Z, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fourth District

¹¹ Please note that there is a skip pattern, but if a respondent does not answer a question they will not be automatically skipped to the next section, so they can answer a follow up questions to the question they chose not to answer.

37. Do you feel that race, gender, or age played a role in this recent encounter?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	38.24%	52	3.97%	5
No	61.76%	84	96.03%	121

38. What factor or factors do you feel played a role? (Respondent could select more than one answer.) (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q37.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Race	80.77%	42	100.0%	6
Age	48.08%	25	16.67%	1
Gender	50.0%	26	16.67%	1
Other	7.69%	4	0.0%	0

39. Please describe how you think these factors contributed to the encounter? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q37.)

Question 39 is a qualitative question that asks respondents who felt that their or the person they knows encounter with CDP officers was influenced by their race, age, gender, or other immutable demographics.

Non-CDP employee Responses

30 respondents answered question 39.

“During curfews, POC people I know who [live] downtown we’re stopped and question more frequently than white people I know who lived downtown.”

- Mr. AA, a younger white man living in the Third District.

“Officers weren’t expecting [a] person like me to know the law.”

- Mr. BB, a middle aged Black man living in the Second District.

“Male cop unnecessarily rude and condescending as if I were unintelligent.”

- Ms. CC, a younger white woman living in the Second District

“To ticket someone for not using a turn signal while in a turning lane and no other traffic on the road seems quite excessive. The police officer came onto the road from another street to make the traffic stop. It seemed to be a profiling incident or a power play.”

- Ms. DD, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fifth District.

CDP employee responses

5 respondents answered question 39.

“The officer was an officer of color. He pulled his car up to mine as I was driving on the Shoreway. He looked at me and saw I was Caucasian, pulled behind me, and put his overhead lights on, and pulled me over.”

- Mr. EE, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“Young and driving a nice car.”

- Mr. FF, a middle aged Black man living in the Fourth District

40. Did this encounter involve a mental health or other crisis?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	17.78%	24	3.15%	4
No	82.22%	111	96.85%	123

41. Did the officer treat everyone with dignity during the interaction? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q40.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	56.0%	14	80.0%	4
No	44.0%	11	20.0%	1

42. Did the officer seem to understand how to handle the situation? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q40.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	53.85%	14	80.0%	4
No	46.15%	12	20.0%	1

43. Are there any additional details about the situation that you would like to share? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q40.)

Question 43 is a qualitative question that provides space for the respondents to discuss their or someone they know’s encounter with a CDP officer during a mental health or other crisis. No CDP employees answered Question 43.

“THE OFFICERS WERE UNDERSTANDING.”

- Mr. GG, an older Black man living in the Fourth District

“If there’s a call that involves a mental health issue a patient advocate should be present as a third party, possibly through community partnerships with mental healthcare organizations.”

- Ms. HH, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fourth District

“They need more training on mental health. Health issues period.”

- Ms. II, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fourth District

44. Was the officer engaging with community members?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	54.14%	72	70.16%	87
No	45.86%	61	29.84%	37

45. Was this stop related to community policing (becoming familiar with residents and their needs)?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	25.19%	33	26.83%	33
No	74.81%	98	73.17%	90

46. Did the officer ask questions about the community during the conversation? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q45.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	69.7%	23	85.71%	30
No	30.3%	10	14.29%	5

47. How likely do you think it is that this conversation will positively influence the officer's future interactions with the community? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q45.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Not likely	11.76%	4	8.82%	3
Somewhat likely	38.24%	13	44.12%	15
Very likely	50.0%	17	47.06%	16

48. Do you have any additional thoughts on the officer's citizen engagement and community policing? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q45.)

Question 48 is a qualitative question that provides respondents a space to offer their thoughts on how CDP officers engage with the community and apply CPOP.

Non-CDP employee responses

16 respondents answered Question 48.

“It is unevenly applied. Some districts are better/worst than others.”

- Mr. JJ, a middle aged Black man living in the Second District

“[Officers] need to [have] more interaction with people, get out of the car.”

- Mr. KK, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“My encounters with officers are on a friendly basis, perhaps because of our community involvement. We talk even if they are standing in line at a deli. We have a block watch and we also keep them informed of what happening in the neighborhood.”

- Ms. LL, an older woman of mixed heritage living in the Fourth District.

“Gain more knowledge about the neighborhood before meetings - do research or a walk through with community development staff.”

- Mr. MM, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

CDP employee responses

17 respondents answered question 48.

“Nope they need to put the officers in the community unit that really care & know about the community & not pick the ones that they want.”

- Mr. NN, a younger Black man living in the Fourth District

“Police Officer to Citizen engagements should be genuine and sincere not adulterated by policies that push for not only generic encounters but those that would diminish the wholehearted attempts to build better community relations just because they want to put them on paper.”

- Mr. OO, a younger Black man living in the First District

49. Was the officer respectful of your, your family member's, or your friend's constitutional rights during the encounter?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	74.8%	92	98.37%	121
No	25.2%	31	1.63%	2

50. Did the officer provide their name and badge number if asked? (Only asked if respondent answered “No” to Q49.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	14.29%	5	33.33%	1
No	45.71%	16	0.0%	0
They were not asked	40.0%	14	66.67%	2

51. Did they search a person vehicle or home without a warrant or probable cause (belief supported by facts and situations, that a crime has been, is being, or will be committed)? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q49.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	36.36%	12	0.00%	0
No	63.64%	21	100.00	3 ⁹

52. Can you describe this incident? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q51.)

Question 52 is a qualitative question that asks respondents to describe what they understood to be an unconstitutional policing incident.

Non-CDP employee responses

8 respondents answered Question 52.

“There was suspicion of a mental health issue but the appropriate authority and doctor was contacted to explain that there was no crisis and the misunderstanding but the police insisted on entering the person’s home, though they were asked not to. They threatened escalation if there wasn’t cooperation with their violation. There have also been traffic stops when persons were searched for no reason other than racial profiling like stop and frisk.”

- Ms. PP, a middle aged Black woman who lives in the Fourth District

“There isn’t much to the story they entered my home unannounced & without a warrant.”

- Mr. QQ, a Hispanic/Latino teenager living in the First District.

CDP employee responses

Just one respondent answered question 52.

“Traffic Stop and attempting to search. Pushed but just not enough to warrant a complaint.”

- Mr. RR, a middle aged Black man living in the Fourth District

53. Did they seize or confiscate property without a warrant or probable cause? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q49.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	12.12%	4	0.00%	0
No	87.88%	29	100.00	3 ⁹

54. Can you describe this incident? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q53.)

No one responded to this question.

55. Were you, your family member, or your friend arrested?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	13.49%	17	0.00%	0
No	86.51%	109	100.00	124

56. Do you believe there was probable cause or an arrest or an outstanding warrant? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q55.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	41.18%	7	N/A	
No	58.82%	10	N/A	

57. Was the arrest for refusing to sign a ticket? (Only asked if respondent answered “yes” to Q55.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	11.76%	2	N/A	
No	88.24%	15	N/A	

58. Did the officer read Miranda Rights to you, your family member, or your friend? (Only asked if respondent answered “Yes” to Q55.)

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	29.41%	5	N/A	
No	70.59%	12	N/A	

59. Are there any additional details about the arrest you would like to provide?

Question 59 offered respondents the opportunity to share additional details of their arrest. No CDP employees responded.

6 respondents answered question 59.

“There is no panhandling laws in Cleveland. All police should know this. People shouldn't be targeted for asking for help.”

- Mr. SS, a middle aged Black man, living in the Second District

60. During the encounter, did the officer seem knowledgeable about the neighborhood?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Yes	64.17%	77	94.21%	114
No	35.83%	43	5.79%	7

61. Can you provide an example of how they demonstrated this knowledge or lack thereof?

Question 61 is a qualitative question that asks respondents to offer some details on how CDP officers demonstrated their knowledge, or lack thereof, of their neighborhoods.

Non-CDP Employees

63 respondents answered question 61.

“No. Me and a group of my friends were stalked by 4 cruisers for multiple city blocks, to a residence of my friend, where they then questioned his residency at that locale.”

- Mr. TT, a young white man who frequently visits his friends in the City.

“Again, this was related to my complaint regarding wrong way traffic on the streets directly surrounding our home. The officer knew the area and asked the right questions about time of day, types of vehicles, etc.”

- Mr. UU, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“An officer came to investigate theft offense which occurred at my home, along with potential menacing and robbery charges. I mentioned where I thought the suspect lived. The officer stated he was familiar with the suspects residence as a potential problem for the neighborhood.”

- Mr. VV, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“Not realizing that there's a turning lane from which the turn was made.”

- Ms. WW, a middle aged Black woman living in the Fifth District

CDP employee responses

56 respondents answer question 61.

“They were aware of complaints going back 6 months.”

- Mr. XX, a middle aged white man living in the Second District

“Recommended places, nearby, where items could be purchased to entertain children during this Covid-19 Stay Home situation.”

- Ms. YY, a younger Black Woman living in the Fifth District

62. Overall, how satisfied are you with this encounter with a Cleveland police officer?

	Non-CDP employees		CDP employees	
	Percent	Total	Percent	Total
Very satisfied	24.59%	30	57.85%	70
Satisfied	36.89% (61.48%)	45 (75)	36.36% (94.21%)	44 (114)
Dissatisfied	20.49%	25	4.96%	6
Very dissatisfied	18.03% (38.52%)	22 (47)	0.83% (5.79%)	1 (7)