



Village of Oak Park

Essential CFS Evaluation Presentation

Agenda

- ▲ Introduction
- ▲ Methodology
- ▲ Process Outputs
- ▲ Key Recommendations
- ▲ Questions



Essential CFS Evaluation Process

▲ Methodology

- Discussed assessment approach with Oak Park project team
- Reviewed CAD Data
 - Finalized Essential CFS Evaluation tool internally
- Conducted community feedback sessions
- Survey distribution; community and stakeholders

▲ Analysis

- Evaluated responses
- Additional feedback from OPPD

▲ Industry Research

▲ Recommendations



Evaluation Grid

CFS Activity	Police Mandate	Risk/Potential Danger	Immediate Response	Type: Crime, Traffic, Service	Other Resources Available	Alternative Response	Volume in FTEs	Community Value	Custom Field
Alarm									
Theft									
Domestic									
Medical									
Mental Health									
Traffic									



Evaluation Legend

Category	Rating	Explanation
Police Mandate	Yes, No (Y - N)	Legal requirement for response (or reporting)
Risk/Potential Danger	High, Possible, Limited (H - P - L)	As assessed by call type and category
Immediate Response	Yes, No (Y - N)	24/7 response necessary/expected
Type: Crime, Ordinance, Traffic, Service	Category (C - O - T - S)	CFS category assigned
Other Resources Available	Yes, No, Limited, TBD (Y - N - L - T)	Current (Y or N), Limited (to some extent), or TBD (possible)
Alternative Response	Yes, No (Y - N)	Telephone Response Unit (TRU) or online reporting options
Volume in FTEs	Calculated Value (CAD DATA)	Based on CAD analysis
Importance Rating 1 – 10 (10 = Most Important; 1 = Least Important)		
Police Department Value	Calculate Value (Internal)	Based on department input (1 – 10)
Acceptance Rating 1 – 5 (5 = Most Accepting; 1 = Least Accepting)		
Community/Stakeholder Value: Open to Alternative Response (Phone/Online)	Calculated Value (External)	Based on stakeholder input (1 – 5)



Survey Results (excerpt)

CFS Type	Police Mandate	Risk/Potential Danger	Immediate Response	Type: Crime, Traffic, Service	Other Resources Available	Alternative Response (TRU/Online)	Volume in FTE's	Police Department Value	Community Service Officer (response averages)	TRU/Online (response averages)	
									Stakeholder	Stakeholder	Alternative
Telephone Scam	Y	L	Y	C	Y	Y	0.01	4		4	
Station Report	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	1.19	5		4	
Sick or Injured Animal	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.03	3	4	3	X
Stray Animal	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.41	3	4	3	X
Bond/Bank Run *	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.22	2	2	2	None
Landlord Tenant Dispute	Y	P	Y	S	Y	Y	0.07	5	3	3	X
Lock In/Out	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.10	3	4	3	X
Repossession	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.00	3	3	3	None
Train Complaint	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.00	3	4	4	X
Information for the Police	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	1.37	4	4		None
Mental Health !	Y	P	Y	S	Y	Y	0.03	6	4		X
Neighbor Dispute	Y	P	Y	S	Y	Y	0.18	5	3		X
Panhandler !	Y	L	Y	S	Y	Y	0.15	4	4		X
Suspicious Substance	Y	P	Y	S	Y	Y	0.00	5	3		X



* - Compressed category

! - Indicates a category that may include multiple CFS types, including mental health, unhoused, or juvenile complaints.

Resource Suggestions (Community)

Category	Suggested Resources
Landlord Tenant Dispute	Village, Oak Park Housing Authority, Community Relations, Social Worker, Legal Representation, Mediation,
Lock In/Out	Village Works, Locksmith (Village-funded), AAA, Fire Department, Housing Department
Mental Health	STARS Program (like Denver), Social Worker, Mental Health Expert, Thrive, Mental Health Crisis Team, Other Health Paraprofessional
Neighbor Dispute	Social Worker, Community Relations Department, Mediator
Panhandler	Social Worker, Housing Forward
Sick or Injured Animal	Animal Control, Animal Care League, Wildlife Control
Stray Animal	Animal Control, Animal Care League
Suspicious Substance	Social Worker, Mental Health Professional, Fire Department
Train Complaint	Train Conductor/Train Worker, Department of Public Health
Unconscious/Fainting	Health Professional, Fire/Ambulance, Department of Public Health
Vagrant	Social Worker, Housing Forward
Vehicle Fire	Fire Department



Resource Suggestions (Department)

Category	Suggested Resources*
Landlord Tenant Dispute	Community Relations; CSO, Fire Department; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement; Neighborhood Services
Lock In/Out	CSO; Fire Department; Community Relations; Social Worker
Mental Health	Thrive Counseling Services; CSO; Fire Department; Parking Enforcement; Community Mental Health Services
Neighbor Dispute	Online; Chicago Center for Conflict Resolution; CSO, Fire Department; Parking Enforcement; Community Relations; Neighborhood Services; Thrive; Social Worker
Panhandler	CSO; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement; Housing Forward
Sick or Injured Animal	Animal Control; CSO; Fire Department; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement
Stray Animal	Animal Control; CSO; Fire Department; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement
Suspicious Substance	Fire Department
Train Complaint	METRA Police; CSO; Fire Department; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement; Railroad Police
Unconscious/Fainting	Fire Department; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement
Vagrant	CSO; Fire Department; Thrive; Social Worker; Parking Enforcement; Social Services; Housing Forward
Vehicle Fire	Fire Department; CSO





Questions / Discussion

Industry Research – Models

- ▲ Alternative service models can be broken out into three main categories:
 - Use of specifically trained sworn police personnel (CIT)
 - Use of a co-response model with the police and professional personnel trained as social workers and/or mental health staff
 - Contracted services, which operate largely independent of the police department, but which may request assistance based on certain conditions



Key Benefits

- ▲ The research is clear that utilizing alternative CFS response methods have the potential to produce important benefits that include:
 - Freeing up sworn law enforcement time to manage other pressing CFS
 - Providing more appropriate mental health interventions to those in crisis
 - Reducing trauma (and UOF) for those in need of services



Important Considerations

- ▲ Clarity of scope and mission
- ▲ Data collection and reporting
- ▲ Accountability measures and monitoring
- ▲ Professional standards



Current Model in Oak Park

- ▲ The Village currently uses a co-responder model with Thrive Counseling Center to provide mental health and crisis services to the community.
 - CFS Routing
 - Generally, requires officer involvement
 - Use of 988



Industry Research – Implementation

- ▲ Keys to developing a successful unit to deal with mental health issues (and other alternative responses):
 - Developing a solid leadership foundation between all partners/stakeholders to utilize this new engagement methodology
 - Standardized policies and procedures which demonstrate the duties, roles, and responsibilities (including communication center protocols)
 - Clear contracts for services between partners that also demonstrate duties, roles, responsibilities, and costs
 - Appropriate data coding, reporting, and analysis, to evaluate program success



Implementation Strategies

- ▲ Developing policies and procedures, both internally and externally (with partner agencies)
- ▲ Developing protocols for dispatch and other staff who are at the intake level for CFS
- ▲ Training police department staff on these new processes
- ▲ Educating the community about these changes
- ▲ Receiving approval from government leaders on proposed changes





Questions / Discussion

Recommendations

- ▲ Provide CIT training to all primary police response personnel
- ▲ Develop a comprehensive alternative CFS response plan and seek approval from the Village Board on the new model
 - The plan should consider additional professional non-sworn staff (e.g., mental health worker, social worker), as well as hybrid/collaborative response, contracted response, and on-call response models
- ▲ Establish a TRU
- ▲ Add non-sworn personnel (similar to CSOs) to staff the TRU, and to manage other in-person responses that do not require a sworn officer
 - Staffing for the TRU and non-sworn services should consistently cover two shifts per day
- ▲ Develop CAD CFS types that clearly categorize certain incidents (e.g., mental health, unhoused) so that these data may be easily monitored in the future



Recommendations

- ▲ Evaluate hybrid and collaborative responses for appropriate CFS types, and identify whether there are existing resources for response, or if these need to be created and/or augmented
- ▲ Develop policies and procedures for the diversion of CFS to the TRU, non-sworn personnel, and other external resources; procedures should consider customer preferences and provide accommodations for those, whenever requested
- ▲ Train agency personnel, dispatch, and community partners on the new model
- ▲ Provide community education on the new model, including the various reporting capabilities, and how to provide feedback
- ▲ Monitor the success of the new model and make appropriate adjustments
 - Program monitoring will rely heavily on documentation of all alternative CFS response; any agreements or contracts with external resources should include a requirement for data collection, and reporting the results to the Village



Questions and Further Discussion

Michele Weinzetl

Manager: Consulting Team
mweinzetl@berrydunn.com

207-842-8120
763-286-5623



berrydunn.com