

CITY OF OAKLAND



1 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

Office of the City Auditor
Roland E. Smith
City Auditor

(510) 238-3378
FAX: (510) 238-7640
TDD: (510) 839-6451

June 23, 2000

IGNACIO DE LA FUENTE, PRESIDENT
CITY COUNCIL
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

PRESIDENT DE LA FUENTE AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

RE: CITY AUDITOR'S REPORT ON THE AUDITOR'S CITIZEN SURVEY OF
THE COMMUNITY POLICING AWARENESS AND RELATED ISSUES

Enclosed please find a report prepared by my office on the Community Policing Program. We conducted a survey of the citizens of Oakland from March 14, 2000 until April 29, 2000. 526 households were surveyed and the concluding findings are enclosed.

Prepared by:

Issued by:

Vivienne Crawford
Manager, Survey Systems

Roland Smith
City Auditor

CITY OF OAKLAND



1 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

Office of the City Auditor
Roland E. Smith
City Auditor

(510) 238-3378
FAX: (510) 238-7640
TDD: (510) 839-6451

June 23, 2000

IGNACIO DE LA FUENTE, PRESIDENT
CITY COUNCIL
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

PRESIDENT DE LA FUENTE AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

RE: CITY AUDITOR'S REPORT ON THE AUDITOR'S CITIZEN SURVEY OF
COMMUNITY POLICING AWARENESS AND RELATED ISSUES

On April 29, 2000, the Survey Systems Division of the City of Oakland Auditor's Office concluded its telephone survey of the Oakland population regarding Community Policing. The survey addressed: (1) citizen awareness of the program; (2) general understanding by the populace of the components of the program; (3) recognition of community empowerment to reduce crime; and (4) willingness of the community to participate in activities that can reduce crime.

Introduction

This report is organized into three sections, an Executive Summary, Addendum A and Addendum B. The Executive Summary includes a description of the methodology, the statistical findings and the concluding analysis of the data. Addendum A gives a breakdown of cross-tabulated information using age as the control factor and juxtaposing it against each question used in the survey. Addendum B is the basic statistical information gleaned from administering the survey. Each question used on the survey is included in Addendum B and the community response results are illustrated in charts and graphs.

Methodology

Survey associates, using a standardized questionnaire,¹ conducted a telephone survey during the months of March and April 2000. Oakland telephone prefixes were coupled with random numbers to produce a cross-section of numbers from all parts of Oakland. The survey was conducted over a six-week period by survey associates, many of whom are clients of the City of Oakland's Aging and Health Services Department.

Findings

- 59%² of surveyed residents are aware of community policing.
- Although community policing is present in all districts in the City of Oakland, only 41% are conscious of its existence in their neighborhoods.
- Given that the majority of the population surveyed are cognizant of community policing in general, very few are informed about the particular components of the program. 45% do not know if they have a Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council; 53% don't know their Neighborhood Services Coordinator; and 46% do not believe that their neighborhood has a regular Community Policing Officer.
- 81% of the surveyed participants believe that they, with the help of their neighbors, can make an impact on crime reduction. But only 19% had attended a crime prevention meeting in their neighborhood.
- 61% of the citizens stated they would participate in neighborhood watch efforts and 59% affirmed they would attend monthly meetings to reduce crime. But this willingness dwindled when a specific hourly commitment was requested. Only 45% would work on special projects for 2 hours a month and only 35% would work on projects more than 2 hours a month.
- 59% of the surveyed population were female with the remaining 41% male.
- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----|------------------|
| 43% | African-American | 2% | Other |
| 29% | Caucasian | 1% | Pacific Islander |
| 11% | Asian | 1% | Native American |
| 3% | Multi-Racial | | |
- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----|------------------|
| 40% | East Oakland Flatlands | 8% | West Oakland |
| 17% | Oakland Hills | 6% | Rockridge |
| 12% | Lake Merritt | 3% | Adams Point |
| 11% | North Oakland | 3% | Downtown Oakland |

¹ All documents referenced appear as attachments to this report.

² All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

- 41% of participants were in the age range of 20 to 40 years
35% of participants were in the age range of 40 to 65 years
17% were over 65 years
8% were 19 or under

Conclusion

There is a sense of empowerment among Oakland residents that they can reduce crime in their neighborhoods. This sensibility is coupled with a desire to participate in neighborhood crime prevention activities. However, the lack of information in the community about the specific components of the Community Policing program blocks accessibility to this vehicle for community participation.

The citizens of Oakland would benefit from more comprehensive information about the Community Policing program. Education regarding the parameters of this program include, specifics about the program goals, frequency and meeting dates for the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council, identity of the Neighborhood Services Coordinator, types of problems addressed by the Community Policing program, and method by which a citizen can become active. Implementation of such an educational component may galvanize an activist potential lying dormant within many citizens living in the City of Oakland.

ADDENDUM A
Age as it Impacts Community Policing Survey

Addendum A
Age as it Impacts Community Policing Survey Conclusions³⁴

Issues Regarding Community Policing	19 and under	20 – 40 years	40 – 65 years	65 and older
Constituents are aware of community policing.	8.6%	37.1%	39.1%	15.2%
Citizens are aware of community policing in their neighborhood.	9.9%	38.0%	39.0%	13.1%
People are aware of the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) within their own neighborhood.	3.3%	34.1%	45.1%	17.6%
Members of the public that know their Neighborhood Services Coordinator (NSC).	2.0%	34.0%	52.0%	12.0%
Residents that have attended a neighborhood meeting regarding crime.	3.1%	28.6%	48.0%	20.4%
Constituents are aware of their Community Policing officer.	4.4%	36.7%	48.9%	10.0%
Citizens believe that they, along with their neighbors, can reduce crime in their communities.	7.1%	41.7%	37.7%	13.5%
People that would attend monthly meetings.	7.6%	43.2%	40.3%	8.9%
Citizens would participate in neighborhood watch efforts in their community.	8.5%	40.7%	39.7%	11.0%
Members of the public that would work on special projects for two hours a month regarding crime prevention in their neighborhood.	8.7%	42.0%	40.7%	8.7%
Residents that would work on special projects more than two hours a month regarding crime prevention in their neighborhood.	8.7%	40.8%	41.8%	8.7%

³ The highlighted numbers illustrate the largest percentage in the grouping.

⁴ Some data is missing from these statistics and may cause the sums to not equal 100%. Missing data occurs when the citizen does not answer a question or the survey taker fails to note the response on the survey form. Specific figures regarding missing information is included in Addendum B.