



## NATIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING ROUNDTABLES



# PRACTITIONER PERSPECTIVES

## Community Policing in a Democracy

Ellen Scrivner, Ph.D.

Compiled and Edited by Albert Antony Pearsall III and Judith E. Beres

# **PRACTITIONER PERSPECTIVES**

## **Community Policing in a Democracy**

Ellen Scrivner, Ph.D.

Former Director, Leadership Academy, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Compiled and Edited by

Albert Antony Pearsall III

Senior Policy Analyst/Project Manager

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

and

Judith E. Beres

Editor/Contractor

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

---

This project was supported by Cooperative Agreement Number 2007-WX-K020 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions contained herein do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific agencies, companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement by the authors or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

# Contents

Letter from the Director.....	5
Acknowledgments.....	6
Introduction .....	6
Policing in a Democratic Society .....	7
Building Partnerships to Advance Effective Policing.....	12
Advancing Innovation: Experiences of Progressive Police Agencies.....	19
Preparing Tomorrow’s Officers: Opportunities, Challenges, and Change.....	27
Where We’ve Been and Where We Are Going: A Dialog.....	35



**The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office)** is the component of the U.S. Department of Justice responsible for advancing the practice of community policing by the nation's state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources. The community policing philosophy promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. In its simplest form, community policing is about building relationships and solving problems.

The COPS Office awards grants to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing professionals, acquire and deploy cutting-edge crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies. The COPS Office funding also provides training and technical assistance to community members and local government leaders and all levels of law enforcement. The COPS Office has produced and compiled a broad range of information resources that can help law enforcement better address specific crime and operational issues, and help community leaders better understand how to work cooperatively with their law enforcement agency to reduce crime.

Since 1994, the COPS Office has invested more than \$16 billion to add community policing officers to the nation's streets, enhance crime fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to help advance community policing. More than 500,000 law enforcement personnel, community members, and government leaders have been trained through COPS Office-funded training organizations.

The COPS Office has produced more than 1,000 information products, including Problem Oriented Policing Guides, Grant Owners Manuals, fact sheets, best practices, and curricula. More than 500 of those products are currently available, at no cost, through its online Resource Information Center. This user-friendly publication search engine is used to make ordering or downloading these documents simple.

The COPS Office has distributed more than 2 million topic-specific publications, training curricula, white papers, and resource CDs through the COPS Office Response Center and another 2 million copies were downloaded from the website, [www.cops.usdoj.gov](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov), in FY2010 alone. The COPS Office also distributes these documents at a variety of law enforcement and public-safety conferences throughout the nation. The COPS Office participated in 45 conferences in 25 states in 2010 in order to maximize the exposure and distribution of these knowledge products.

The COPS Office launched its new, improved website June 1, 2010. The website, which is a resource used by law enforcement personnel from every state in the union, is now easier to navigate and is fully up to date. When state, local, or tribal law enforcement officials are looking for COPS Office grant programs to support their community policing efforts, they'll be able to quickly find open programs, application instructions, and specific eligibility requirements. The website is also the grant application portal, providing access to online application forms. The COPS website is also a clearing house full of useful information. Publications on a wide range of community policing topics—from school and campus safety to gang violence—can be ordered for free through the website's resource library.

## Letter from the Director



Department of Justice  
Office of Community Oriented Policing  
Two Constitution Square  
145 N Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20530

---

Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to present this report about the results of the COPS Office National Community Policing Roundtables, which provided a unique opportunity to learn from, and share information with, key stakeholders—law enforcement practitioners and thought leaders, criminal justice academics, and policymakers, all with strong backgrounds in community policing.

The honest discussion and highly interactive sharing of information that occurred during the roundtables may assist you in your efforts to build relationships and solve problems through community policing in your jurisdictions.

I hope you will find this publication helpful in your local efforts, and we encourage you to share this publication, as well as your successes, with other law enforcement practitioners.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bernard K. Melekian".

Bernard K. Melekian, Director  
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

## Acknowledgments

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) thanks the roundtable participants for contributing their vast experience to the discussions. The generous use of their time and their thoughtful reflections as criminal justice leaders are greatly appreciated. We thank Ellen Scrivner, Ph.D., (then) Director of the Leadership Academy, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, for facilitating the roundtables and drafting the reports that serve as the basis for this document. We also thank COPS Office staff for their assistance and support, notably Deputy Director Sandra Webb, Ph.D., former Chief of Staff/Deputy Director Timothy Quinn, and Supervisory Policy Analyst Katherine McQuay. We also thank other key personnel of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Jeremy Travis, JD, President of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Judith Kornberg, Ph.D., Dean of Professional Studies, for her support of this project, and the Leadership Academy staff work of Steven Lopez, Keisha Ortiz, Marilyn Simpson, and Amelia Thompson.

## Introduction

In 2008, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) of the U.S. Department of Justice, in partnership with the Leadership Academy of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, convened four national roundtables throughout the United States. Participants were a mix of law enforcement practitioners and thought leaders, criminal justice academics, and policymakers, all with strong backgrounds in community policing. One hundred forty individuals participated across the four roundtables. Their goal was to advise the COPS Office on its initiatives that have furthered democratic policing and to provide direction on where the COPS Office needs to focus future efforts.

### **Policing in a Democratic Society**

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 26–27.

### **Building Partnerships to Advance Effective Policing**

Washington, D.C., April 8–9.

### **Advancing Innovation: Experiences of Progressive Police Agencies**

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 5–6.

### **Preparing Tomorrow's Officers: Opportunities, Challenges, Change**

Seattle, Washington, October 14–15.

A highlight of the Milwaukee roundtable was a dialog between Professor Herman Goldstein, the father of problem-oriented policing, and Dr. George Kelling, architect of the broken windows theory. See the last section of this document.



## Policing in a Democratic Society

The theme of the first Roundtable, *Policing in a Democratic Society*, is concerned with the principles of protecting the civil rights and human dignity of everyone. Community policing is fundamental to this. Roundtable participants placed a strong emphasis on the COPS Office as the champion of “we the people” policing through its focus on legitimate and lawful policing and efforts to promote transparency and accountability in policing. They considered the creation of the COPS Office as a customer-oriented enterprise within the U.S. Department of Justice as a key achievement and the foundation for all other accomplishments that have made significant contributions to reducing crime in the United States, building public trust, improving quality-of-life opportunities throughout the country, and creating credibility for community policing in the field.

### Achievements

Roundtable participants recognized the following achievements of the COPS Office:

- ◆ *Creating accessible grant programs.* Such programs provide grantees with direct access to funding, rather than to state formulaic programs, so that grantees can support local responses to local problems.
- ◆ *Adopting a strong customer orientation.* The COPS Office listens and is responsive to customers who identify what is needed to prevent and reduce crime.
- ◆ *Adopting a convener-facilitator role.* The COPS Office brings together and encourages collaboration among diverse stakeholders who otherwise would not be inclined or have the opportunity to collaborate.
- ◆ *Implementing programs with a strong focus on integrity and cultural diversity.*
- ◆ *Improving the responses of rural law enforcement and sheriffs.* The COPS Office includes them in community policing training that is accessible across the United States.
- ◆ *Encouraging customers to think out of the box.* Customers are able to create innovative solutions to reduce and prevent crime.
- ◆ *Supporting the use of civilians in certain jobs and the use of technology.* Such activities facilitate streamlined and better-prepared law enforcement organizations.

## Challenges

New challenges are straining law enforcement resources and the institutionalization of gains made by community policing. Participants outlined the following as major responses to the challenges.

- ◆ *Revitalize the passion for community policing* to ensure that “we the people” policing is preserved and institutionalized.
- ◆ *Ensure mutual coexistence with other policing strategies* because community policing and aggressive policing strategies that control crime need to work in unison to reduce crime and prevent disenfranchising significant elements of the community.
- ◆ *Define the “community” in community policing* because the role the community plays is central to ensuring that policing is as lawful as it is legitimate. This focus not only needs to be internalized at all levels of an agency, but throughout the community, as well.
- ◆ *Establish accountability* by internalizing community policing as normal behavior at every level of an organization. This enhances the ability to hold the agency accountable for patterns and practices that are consistent with policing in a democratic society.
- ◆ *Adopt intelligence-led policing*. This is a natural outcome of the community policing capacity for building trust—policing that protects the civil rights, human rights, and dignity of all.

## Emerging Issues

Participants identified emerging issues that need to be addressed from a community policing perspective. These issues are having a significant impact on community policing strategies that are meant to build public trust, reduce crime, shape attitudinal responses to policing, improve information sharing, and enhance quality of life.

- ◆ *Unresolved issues of race, immigration, homelessness, mental illness, and youth crime* shape current living conditions in many communities and emphasize the need for public safety practitioners to develop strategies that are as effective in reducing crime as they are responsive to meeting community needs.
- ◆ *A growing leadership and staffing deficit* is reflected in the difficulties in recruiting and retaining culturally sensitive practitioners and has the potential to limit both the advances in community policing and gains made in building public trust.

- ◆ *The need for devising new training and development experiences* using new initiatives that draw on existing resources. One example is to create so-called “teaching hospitals” for law enforcement that bring together scholars, practitioners, and students to identify best practices and evaluate innovative experiments. Other examples include supporting training and development internships or fellowships where officers spend time in other agencies; supporting platforms that provide leadership development experiences for new chiefs that are different from current management and executive skills training; and supporting the cultivation of practices that reinforce integrity outside of the academy.
- ◆ *In media/public safety relationships* there is a gap in the mutual understanding of roles and responsibilities that plays out in ways that undermine the goals of both police and press.
- ◆ *Help for small to midsize agencies is critical*, although some of the more creative community policing work has been carried out in these agencies.
- ◆ *Develop a broader array of partnerships* including institutions that have an economic stake in preventing crime. Educate those institutions so that when pursuing their own self-interests they also can play an important role in assisting law enforcement in controlling crime in their communities.
- ◆ *Support a new business model for law enforcement* that incorporates knowledge-based perspectives, the latest in technology advances, and both an internal and external focus on procedural justice.
- ◆ *Develop outreach to other countries* to connect American policing with international and national police forces to share COPS Office knowledge resources and training as well as to learn how they are using community policing principles.
- ◆ *Position community policing as the umbrella philosophy* that links all other law enforcement strategies. Community policing has the capacity to take on this role because it incorporates a broad array of strategies that focus on community engagement and collaborative problem solving designed to control and prevent all crimes, including terrorism, within the framework of democratic policing. Other strategies that emphasize just crime control, for example, could benefit from a community policing focus on civil rights, human liberties, and dignity for all.
- ◆ *Take advantage of name recognition* that signifies an action-oriented, highly responsive, and value-driven agency. The COPS Office has become a “brand” that stands for policing in a democracy.

## Key Recommendations

Roundtable participants made several recommendations for action at the federal, state, and local levels.

Recommendations to enhance the federal government's ability to support the COPS Office:

- ◆ Encourage U.S. Department of Justice Monitors to provide technical assistance, training, information sharing, and research assistance.
- ◆ Create avenues for large and small police departments to share resources and ideas.
- ◆ Commit many of COPS Office achievements to writing, specifically the work that has been done on police integrity.
- ◆ Advocate for models that move beyond bureaucratic processes to those that support institutional change. Examples of advocacy positions include:
  - ◇ Expand accreditation: requires internal and external evaluation
  - ◇ Broaden sense of policing: Operation Boot Straps (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)
  - ◇ Narrow the gap between education and training
  - ◇ Develop new chiefs institutes
- ◆ Acknowledge the criticality of leadership development for 21st century public safety executives.
- ◆ Strengthen institutional capacity and agenda-building by funding topic-specific centers based on case studies that will narrow gaps in knowledge-building and infuse policy with evidence-based findings.

Both the state governments and local police departments have responsibilities for supporting other agencies in their efforts to institutionalize community policing. Local police departments, for example, could reinforce reciprocal relationships to strengthen policing.

For its part, the COPS Office could improve its state-level response by engaging in the following:

- ◆ Share resources with local/smaller departments
- ◆ Encourage more outreach between cities and the federal government
- ◆ Develop training to prepare state police to work in cities

Participants identified several areas where the media and community policing interests intersect and made the following recommendations:

- ◆ Provide reasonable access to information for community/ethnic media and broader media outlets to encourage effective reporting
- ◆ Partner with the media to suppress panic during crises
- ◆ Consider the emerging trend of police journalism
- ◆ Work to eliminate bias in print and broadcast reporting
- ◆ Enforce the importance of accuracy and context in responsible reporting
  - ◇ Contextualize news in accurate assessments of criminal justice policy
- ◆ Educate new reporters on law enforcement issues and educate law enforcement on demands faced by reporters

Participants also recommended continued support by the COPS Office of initiatives designated as most helpful and/or creating value:

- ◆ Sponsor regional roundtables that address law enforcement integrity issues such as:
  - ◇ Racial profiling
  - ◇ Training and education of recruits and supervisors
  - ◇ Use of force, and internal investigation
  - ◇ Recruitment, selection, and retention
- ◆ Develop more publications such as the *POP Guides*, that are useful for officers and stakeholders
- ◆ Continue the COPS in Schools program
- ◆ Develop a Weed and Seed philosophy that is emblematic of the COPS Office
- ◆ Publish more on the evaluation of outcomes of hiring grants and changes brought about by the COPS Office
- ◆ Use the COPS Office knowledge base to adopt a stronger focus on how community policing fights fear and how collaboration and communication create more blended responses to crime
- ◆ Institutional capacity demonstration and agenda-building: Fund topic-specific centers based on case studies to narrow gaps in knowledge-building and infuse policy with evidence-based findings.
- ◆ Promote more information sharing between practitioners and policymakers that does not focus solely on hiring grants to encourage funding for training and technical assistance



## Building Partnerships to Advance Effective Policing

In this Roundtable, participants in Washington, D.C., discussed the mechanics, constraints, and key elements necessary in creating lasting and effective community policing partnerships. The process of creating partnerships is complex and includes political and leadership implications. Roundtable participants saw the COPS Office as providing a framework for partnerships to become a fundamental base of community policing and noted that the COPS Office clearly established the standard by which law enforcement partnerships are measured because of a strong focus on partnerships in all activities as a central way to sustain community policing. This commitment is clearly reflected in the following COPS Office achievements and activities that have created credibility for community policing in the field:

- ◆ Legitimizing and encouraging partnership building within law enforcement and the Department of Justice, as directed by former Attorney General Janet Reno
- ◆ Taking a leadership role in developing a customer orientation that prioritizes responsiveness to partners and to issues that the community defines as important
- ◆ Supporting diversified outreach by law enforcement in communities across the country
- ◆ Providing leadership and resources to bring law enforcement agencies together to learn from one another, such as using leading law enforcement agencies as laboratories for learning
- ◆ Creating the capacity for improved information sharing across the criminal justice arena
- ◆ Creating high-quality knowledge products with online availability
- ◆ Promoting private security and public partnerships
- ◆ Providing guidance for managing short-term events that require strategic public safety solutions
- ◆ Supporting the evolution of long-term community policing strategies

Effective policing partnerships not only advance the field of policing, they also advance the day-to-day problem-solving paradigm. In this way, systematic partnerships are understood to inform change from the top, produce cultural change within participating agencies, and change how police do business through collaborative engagements with the community that are designed to prevent crime and enhance public safety.

**The Mechanics of Partnering.** Partnerships mean more than just sitting in the same room and sharing work space. The need to develop trust is the lifeblood of partnerships. The following are the critical elements that are necessary for successful long-term partnerships and for creating a climate of trust:

- ◆ Select partners and topics carefully to ensure the likelihood of achieving results, making sure that all partners do not see the issues in the same way.
- ◆ Provide continuity and follow-up with all partners. A successful partnership cannot be based on one-time events that respond to a single issue.
- ◆ Define roles in the partnership clearly, including who is responsible for what and the resources that different partners have to create solutions.
- ◆ Be willing to get out of comfort zones and rise above territoriality.
- ◆ Recognize that even though each partner may have a different agenda, it is possible to put differences aside and work with each other to solve a common problem.
- ◆ Recognize that partnerships are based on mutual interests and that there needs to be a mutual accountability for success.
- ◆ Collaborate with stakeholders because collaboration is the glue that sustains partnerships. Interactive engagements drive collaborations with stakeholders so that all who have a common interest in solving a community problem remained engaged over time.
- ◆ Build trust, take down walls, and create mutual understanding. This will result in long-term collaborations and signify how the systematic use of partnerships leads to significant change.

**Current Constraints.** The above critical elements were defined by the group as necessary for achieving dynamic, effective partnerships and responding to the COPS Office focus on *systematic use of partnerships* in community policing. It was clear from the discussion, though, that many see a drift away from some of the important benchmarks that define community policing partnerships, and they expressed concern that theme-oriented partnerships may be replacing goal-oriented partnerships.

Many participants have engaged in theme-oriented partnerships with the COPS Office and have produced products that advance policing in general, but have not always been specific to community policing. Consequently, participants urged the COPS Office to consider refocusing and guiding the field toward achieving dynamic, effective partnerships. There was concurrence that a renewed emphasis on the criticality of partnerships, along with the expanded definition of community policing, would help to answer questions such as the following:

1. How are partnerships defined?
2. What is the goal of partnering?
3. Who are the stakeholders?
4. How do partnerships function?
5. How can they be improved?
6. What role do they have in legitimizing community policing?
7. How should the field move beyond theme-oriented partnering in favor of goal-oriented partnering?

**The Community as a Key Partner.** Despite a fairly sophisticated level of awareness that a goal of community policing is to engage the community as a key partner, roundtable participants were less emphatic about detailing current efforts to do this. Many endorsed the notion that building mutually beneficial relationships between the police and community demands that the police take the lead in functioning in a problem-solving capacity. Conversely, others agreed that both the community and police should bring the agency into play to identify problems, develop a methodology for responding to problems, and create solutions. The lack of a strong, unified direction could be a reflection of other dynamics at work, such as: some erosion in support for community engagement as departments struggle with resource issues and expanding portfolios that now include homeland security; the lack of participants at the table who represented community advocacy groups who actually are working with the police; or, the previously referenced issue of increases in theme-oriented partnerships, in contrast to those that are goal-oriented.

Current community issues that require attention from the community policing perspective and have strong implications for engaging unique sectors of the community as partners include the following:

- ◆ The need to negotiate strategic relationships with community members and groups including youths, immigrants, formerly incarcerated and court-involved individuals, and the faith-based community.
- ◆ Building trust to prevent isolating the perception of crime to communities of color, as insensitivity to the implications of racially biased attitudes and perceptions of the criminal justice system are important concerns that create distrust of law enforcement.

- ◆ The current law enforcement recruitment and hiring crises, as well as workforce changes that affect all occupations, may result in hiring officers who are less-sensitive to communities of color and who have no clear understanding of the importance of engaging in critical partnerships in these communities. Consequently, community policing initiatives that have been carefully developed could be seriously jeopardized.

Roundtable participants encouraged the COPS Office to provide the support for local police departments to proactively seek opportunities to engage all community groups in mutually beneficial partnership-building opportunities that protect the best interests of all members of the community. Further, they urged the COPS Office to listen to others who represent community partnerships such as advocacy groups or partnering agencies within the criminal justice system, including probation and parole.

**The Politics of Partnering.** Partnerships cannot be sustained without the support of elected and appointed officials. City government buy-in and cooperation on the part of the mayor and/or city manager, the city council, and others contribute to a well-functioning policing culture. If city governments become dysfunctional, the police department may be expected to assume responsibility. Law enforcement has to view itself as part of the government team and develop partnerships with all city government agencies. Effective government partnerships require stakeholders to assess each other's strengths and weaknesses and align themselves in ways that produce more effective governance for all. In so doing, policing becomes a visible, proactive institution that is rooted in continuity and good governance.

Political elections and changes in administration have a direct effect on priorities and funding; therefore, this is another reason for an effective law enforcement executive to seek partnerships with government executives and agencies. Further, funding goals should be linked to the interaction of public safety and counterterrorism goals that resonate strongly on the national register.

**Research Partnerships.** Roundtable participants acknowledged that there is a critical need to encourage partnering with researchers to build the capacity to collect and analyze crime data and establish evidence-based models for public safety. University partnerships are a favorable option to fill the void in policing research.

*Ten principles for successful police–research partnerships.*

1. The research should address an area of practice that is currently important and that matters to the department.
2. The research should add value and meet a need that the police department cannot satisfy internally.
3. Research objectives should be well-defined and limited. No fishing trips.
4. The research timetable should be realistic but reasonable.
5. A comprehensive, reviewable research design should be developed and approved so that a police department knows what it is getting into.
6. All affected organizations should commit at “command” levels and get everyone on board.
7. A formal memorandum of understanding should be developed and signed by the organizations that will be involved and affected to satisfy the lawyers.
8. The department should establish and monitor procedures for protecting human subjects.
9. Researchers should keep the police department informed, while the police department should provide timely response and review to researchers.
10. The police department should review draft reports before they are disseminated so that there are no surprises or ambushes.

The researchers at the roundtable encouraged the COPS Office to create partnerships with other components of the Department of Justice and weigh in on the kinds of knowledge and evidence that needs to be supported and informed by research.

**Leadership and Policing.** Recruitment problems pose formidable challenges to a police department’s ability to maintain effective levels of responsiveness. A concerted effort is needed to recruit, train, and prepare officers to responsibly grapple with challenging issues such as race, mental illness, poverty, gangs, trafficking, and violence.

In addition, many chiefs are facing a significant loss of infrastructure and institutional knowledge accompanying the retirement of staff members who have more than 25 years of experience. In many parts of the country, police departments are in need of guidance on key leadership issues.

Differences between rural and urban law enforcement also affect leadership options. The average term of a police chief is 2 to 2 1/2 years and is dependent largely on changes in the local political climate, whereas the average term for a sheriff is 12 years.

Leadership and training are significant factors that have both short- and long-term effects on crime-prevention possibilities. Further, differences in rural and local law enforcement require a nuanced strategy in an effort to widen and strengthen learning in the professional law enforcement pipeline. Investments in recruitment and training are necessary and should be regular features of the national community policing landscape. Roundtables such as those convened by the COPS Office were acknowledged as an opportunity to bring both experienced and newer leaders together to develop partnerships among law enforcement agencies.

**Opportunities and Recommendations.** Roundtable participants reaffirmed the basic realization that drives the development of community policing reform—that crime is not just a police issue and that police can not control crime by themselves. They need to partner with others because crime is a community issue. As such, the nature of partnership with the community is critical.

Participants agreed that to leverage the COPS Office’s success and achieve clearly defined and fully articulated partnerships, they made the following recommendations:

- ◆ There needs to be a “return to the fundamentals” of community policing—training and professional development opportunities should be standardized.
- ◆ Major police departments should serve as regional information and leadership hubs to which smaller and rural departments may turn for direction.
- ◆ Crime needs to be defined, measured, and contextualized in contemporary and community-based terms.
- ◆ Consideration should be paid to diversity within law enforcement; for example, rural versus urban law enforcement differences.
- ◆ Encourage law enforcement to consider new business models that are more responsive to human resources and funding issues.

The group made several additional broad-based recommendations:

- ◆ Roundtables are excellent networking and learning opportunities. Including both experienced and relatively new leaders in future roundtables is a way to institutionalize the *thinking* that leads to change.
- ◆ Develop and sustain strategic partnerships that align disparate groups around a common resolve to improve public safety outcomes.
- ◆ Group differences highlight the important concerns of trust, accountability, shared understandings of roles, resources, and mission. The COPS Office needs to support the type of partnership building that may be similar to what occurred with racial profiling initiatives. These initiatives involved a systematic use of unique partners and created strategies for solving persistent problems that were highly sensitive in communities. The COPS Office should consider how to use its knowledge of partnership building to enhance this kind of problem solving.

- ◆ As evidenced in this roundtable discussion, there is considerable knowledge about what needs to be done to satisfy the critical elements of developing partnerships, but there is far less knowledge about *how to do* what needs to be done. The group recommended that the COPS Office consider ways to support this kind of focus to strengthen partnerships and reignite a passion for community policing partnering.
- ◆ Seek opportunities to promote the outstanding array of knowledge products that are available online. In addition, consider building on them or taking them to the next level.
- ◆ Focus on key areas that represent partnership-building opportunities that have the potential to reinforce the permanency of the COPS office.

Other recommendations pertained to identified groups that require specialized effort. They include the following:

- ◆ Continue support for tribal needs because they are unique and frequently not captured in programs that apply generally to law enforcement.
- ◆ Create opportunities to form partnerships with groups that represent immigrants.
- ◆ Support cyber approaches to create youth outreach such as the initiative launched in Boston, Massachusetts: the Text-A-Tip program, which marries public safety goals and the prevalence of cell phone technology to reach youth. It exemplifies how innovation on the part of law enforcement practitioners and thought leaders can create greater opportunities for partnerships that include members of the larger community.
- ◆ Explore comparable partnerships with programs for ex-offenders, support groups, and ex-offender groups.
- ◆ Consider conducting summits, such as on youth crimes and hate crimes, as a way to spread knowledge at a time of diminishing resources.

**Moving Forward.** The COPS Office has been challenged to vie for permanency in the American sociopolitical landscape and to reignite passion for many of the ideas that literally reversed the course of policing. Roundtable participants confirmed partnership building as a basic element of the COPS Office mission and acknowledged the COPS Office’s history of functioning as an institution where innovation, effectiveness, and accountability are valued. Further, the COPS Office will continue its effort of guiding organizational change throughout national and local law enforcement bodies. The COPS Office can become a voice for expanding local government and community oriented partnerships that are effective in advancing the field; improving on-the-beat strategies, particularly with unique but under-represented groups; and supporting robust research—all in the quest to prevent and reduce crime in communities across America.



## Advancing Innovation: Experiences of Progressive Police Agencies

Milwaukee’s Roundtable addressed concerns raised at the earlier events about struggles to institutionalize community policing. Roundtable participants from a number of law enforcement agencies reflected on their progress in implementing and institutionalizing community policing innovations in their communities and on the challenges they encountered. The multiple trains of thought that emerged are captured under three major themes:

1. Successful initiatives that support institutionalization
2. Impediments to institutionalizing community policing
3. Current needs for sustaining institutionalization

### Successful Initiatives

Participants demonstrated how a range of complex activities are required for successful institutionalization; how a full implementation of these activities takes considerable time to implement; and how prolonged involvement at many levels of the agency is necessary to have a full impact on the operations of the agency. This multilevel approach embodies seven elements:

1. Strong communications strategy
2. An internal and external message: this is the way we do business
3. Cultural renorming (change)
4. Using terminology that reflects a change in norms
5. Clear identification of roles, responsibilities, and accountability
6. Organizational changes
7. Problem-solving training at all levels of the organization

*Strong communications strategy.* First and foremost is the requirement for a strong communications strategy that generally involves a four-pronged approach:

1. Sell the concept to, and educate community about, community policing.
2. Give every officer the message that he or she has the opportunity to do community policing.
3. Communicate with elected officials and the community about a changing and differential police response.
4. Use multimedia to tell the story and advance institutionalization. One department, for example, listed the status of current problem-oriented policing projects on its website and continually updated the information.

*An internal and external message: this is the way we do business.* Accepting community policing and problem-solving policing as “the way we do business” is a critical dimension of institutionalization. This message has implications for other organizational elements, for example: Is the organization aligned to empower officers to conduct problem-solving activities? Is it reorganized into teams to compel problem solving? Is it reorganized by time of day and geography on a 24/7 basis? Does the agency employ a vertical staffing approach? Does the agency conduct problem-solving training sequentially, coherently, comprehensively across all ranks? Have evaluations been restructured based on a current system of outcomes?

Everyone in the organization should understand and speak the same language. Roundtable participants endorsed the idea of developing the new generation of leaders in the “Nordstrom model.” (In the Nordstrom model or “way,” Nordstrom department store employees work in a culture in which they have the freedom to make decisions and are supported by management in those decisions.) That is integral to the “way we do business” message. One agency’s success story reported that it took 11 years to ingrain the message of shared responsibility and ownership across all levels of the organization, as well as to the external community.

*Cultural renorming.* In another success story, an agency engaged in a seven-step process of cultural renorming that systematically changed its organizational norms:

1. Trained all law enforcement personnel on problem solving
2. Moved from a specialist to a generalist approach where everyone practices problem-oriented policing as part of the strategic plan
3. Restructured the job performance appraisal process and included the union in the design of the evaluation process
4. Revamped promotional processes, which also addressed roadblocks at the midmanagement level; the process now includes an assessment center process that involves problem-solving role-playing
5. Revamped an awards program and instituted an internal Goldstein-type award that was submitted as an official Goldstein award candidate
6. Reconsidered the hiring process
7. Implemented a CompStat-like session that focused on problem-oriented policing projects

*Using terminology that reflects a change in norms.* The terminology that defines effective policing has a significant effect on the mindset of officers and supports the institutionalization of community policing. In addition to implementing a strong communication strategy, cultural renorming, intensive training, and changing organizational practices, one success story agency adapted the term “co-active” to signify that police and community are jointly engaged in problem solving.

*Clear identification of roles, responsibilities, and accountability.* The role of the police chief is critical in mobilizing local government to address the social problems that lead to crime. The chief executive needs to seek opportunities for police to engage in work that is truly preventive and to work with community partners and other managers outside the department. In working with these groups through the network of assistant city managers, the chief reaches those who are accountable for reducing the conditions that lead to crime. In another success story, the chief joined the local community business council to open a dialog with members of the business community and to let them know what the department was doing, as well as to better assess their needs.

At best, roundtable participants agreed, community policing should be the city's program rather than the police department's program. It cannot depend simply on extraordinary and talented individuals; rather, it needs to become routine at the city level. This may help when changes in leadership in the department occur and may also allow community policing to survive crises within the department. The city's accountability system can also support the community policing philosophy and practice.

*Organizational changes.* Implementing community policing affects all elements of an organization. Starting with hiring processes and extending to performance appraisal and promotion, recognition for engaging in problem solving and community policing becomes essential. An agency success story described how this extended to succession planning that was coupled with generational training. Nevertheless, other organizational changes may be necessary, particularly as the process begins to mature.

Within this context, another success story discussed how an agency that had practiced community policing since 1985 faced the challenge of taking itself to the next level and dealing with balancing proactive and reactive strategies. This agency elected to reach its full potential by becoming "preemptive." One example involved looking at hot spots and asking, what did this hot spot look like before it became a hot spot? Subsequently, the agency developed a predictive formula (sociocultural variables), the Neighborhood Strength Index (NSI), and worked with assistant city managers who take on the issues geographically and marshal multiple agencies to stem the indicators of decline. To date, they have designated four areas of the city as NSI sites and crime is down in those sites.

Still another success story determined that it was feasible to have officers provide technical assistance and advice over the telephone. Light-duty officers manned computers and telephones and were empowered to call complainants and work with them to resolve their problems. As a result, more than 40 percent of Priority 3 calls are being handled over the telephone, thereby reducing the call load and giving officers more time for preventive problem solving.

*Problem-solving training at all levels of the organization.* Various success stories emphasized the need to require community policing and problem-solving training at all levels of the organization to reduce the gaps between officer, middle managers, and executives. Roundtable participants generally agreed that middle managers are key to institutionalizing community policing. They need to be involved from the outset because they control so much that is critical to institutionalizing problem solving and community policing. Frequently, officers receive the training but supervisors do not and then they fail to understand what the officers can do.

To implement problem solving at all levels of an organization, many agencies reporting success stories found that training has to occur at those same levels and that vertical training throughout the organization is preferable. Further, providing training for communities throughout the state has to be supported because best practices in various parts of the state may be unknown. Accordingly, new police officers should be encouraged to read community policing and problem-solving literature, particularly if they are being mentored by people who were not trained in during the community policing era.

### **Summary of Success Stories**

- ◆ Community policing as the way we do business is communicated throughout the department and within the community.
- ◆ A strong communication strategy also involves cultural renorming, with changes in terminology that develop the capacity to change the mind-set of officers.
- ◆ Creative management of calls for service and balancing proactive and reactive strategies is critical to success.
- ◆ Police agencies share the responsibility and accountability for solving community crime and disorder problems with other community organizations and stakeholders. Engaging others in owning crime problems and participating in solving social problems that may lead to crime is the backbone of institutionalizing community policing.
- ◆ First-line supervisors and middle managers are critical to the institutionalization of community policing and must be the focus of training on engagement in community policing practices
- ◆ Performance evaluation systems need to be redesigned to reflect problem solving and community policing. Measuring outcomes—that is, what matters—is essential.
- ◆ Recruiting new officers who will have the capacity and desire to practice community policing requires an intensive focus and a change in traditional approaches.
- ◆ Community policing is not a program; rather, it is the methodology of effective or good policing.

## Impediments to Institutionalizing Community Policing

Seven trains of thought emerged from roundtable discussions of impediments to institutionalizing community policing:

1. Pressure to respond to calls for service
2. Resistance to the use of civilians
3. Internal resistance
4. Gaps in law enforcement leadership training
5. Community policing training is not being mainstreamed
6. External resistance and misinterpretation
7. Linking research and practice

*Pressure to respond to calls for service.* Participants defined the extraordinary pressure of the calls-for-service system as a major barrier to implementing or institutionalizing innovation, especially problem solving. How to manage the effective deployment of officers is a continuing challenge and supporting opportunities for them to do proactive police work requires creativity. Consequently, some departments have questioned if any of this work could be done by civilians.

*Resistance to use of civilians.* Other than working as analysts, most agencies found that elected officials are reluctant to hire civilians for a broader problem-solving role. A big element is selling the concept because most people appear satisfied with the service when the problem is solved, but it takes some time to get there. Further, departments that conducted focus groups with citizens to determine their comfort level with civilians indicated that civilians preferred dealing with officers.

*Internal resistance.* Resistance from midlevel management, first-line supervisors, and special units results in the failure to internalize the knowledge and skills necessary to affect community policing. This is a threat to long-term institutionalization because these groups have the capacity to sabotage officers and chief executives. Consequently, agencies need to create opportunities for middle managers to support community policing by training and by rethinking and redesigning performance evaluations.

*Gaps in law enforcement leadership training.* The American system of developing police leaders affects the institutionalization of community policing. Within this context, there is no national entity to train the future leaders of policing. The military was offered as an example of the kind of emphasis that is needed because the military makes a serious effort to groom leaders throughout their careers. Their focus is learning from history and teaching that history to a new generation of leaders who will develop doctrine that guides people's actions. For police, however, there needs to be a leadership focus on integrating community policing throughout the department while managing competing demands and expectations.

Policing has been slow to recognize the need for leadership training. Despite recognized management programs, for the most part police leaders are developed in an ad hoc manner through a decentralized system of learning that has no national focus. Consequently, chiefs may continue to run community policing out of their own office, or use special units, or refer to community policing as a program rather than as the way they do business. Leadership training with a focus on community policing would counter those practices.

*Community policing training is not being mainstreamed.* Whether community policing training is lacking or it is simply misdirected was a concern of roundtable participants, as were questions about police training really emphasizing community and problem-oriented policing. There was the impression that it may evolve as an add-on or luxury and may not be mainstreamed in many police training settings. This impedes community policing as being seen and accepted as the methodology of doing police work instead of something you do when you have extra time. Statewide mandates may limit the time needed in police training to make problem solving and community policing the central focus of effective policing. Consequently, the message is that community policing is not at the center of the business of policing. That has to be corrected and training needs to expose new officers to the concept that problem solving and community policing are effective policing and emphasize to them the daily, practical aspects of community collaboration and problem-solving. Roundtable participants recommended encouraging state training commissions to incorporate problem-solving training into all aspects of recruitment and other training curricula.

*External resistance and misinterpretation.* Effective police practices are often defined by external groups such as the media, political leaders, or advocacy groups. As the police mandate expands to areas beyond traditional policing roles, there is a concomitant need to educate the public and other relevant groups. Public understanding becomes essential during critical incidents, such as police misconduct, which can further complicate the issue, create community distrust, and divert the attention of leaders and politicians in what often becomes a media free-for-all.

Conversely, there was a consensus among roundtable participants that law enforcement has not done a great job of taking control of the profession. There needs to be a stronger advocacy for the positions that need to be made and professional police organizations need to call for the necessary changes that will educate external groups and foster the institutionalization of community policing.

*Linking research and practice.* Roundtable participants cautioned that we not lose site of the important ties between researchers and practitioners in fostering the institutionalization of community policing. There is a need to engage local university programs within the department and to nurture the relationship with the academic community to help to head off the possibility that officers who may have been well-trained have stopped learning.

## **Current Need for Sustaining Institutionalization**

Despite efforts to weave community policing into the structure and functions of law enforcement organizations, one critical variable remains: the need to sustain community policing and transition it effectively when a new chief is hired. Information presented at the roundtable confirmed the need to learn how to make the transition from one chief to another. There has been very little information about this process but it is clear that the transition may be more difficult when the new chief comes from the outside, does not share a community policing perspective, or has no community policing history.

A collateral issue discussed was the selection process for law enforcement chief executives. Roundtable participants expressed a strong belief that the hiring process for chief executives needs to be revisited. Mayors and city managers need to understand that the current process prohibits people from applying for CEO positions because many of these searches appear to be beauty contests that serve the recruiters and elected officials far more than the candidates for the chief's position. City officials must work with groups like the International City/County Management Association and other organizations to become educated about the process of hiring a chief executive and having information on what policing is like today—what the field looks like, what officials need to look for in a candidate, and ways to search effectively.

Roundtable participants, many of whom had been through selection processes, had both horror stories and successful experiences in the search process. They recommended having the hiring process done by someone or an organization not in the business of conducting police chief searches. They also recommended that the COPS Office compile participants' search experiences into a guide to help prepare prospective chiefs, as well as mayors and city managers, to conduct an effective, respectful search and to support a national leadership program that addresses the needs of new chiefs within the framework of community policing.

Law enforcement agencies need to recognize the political reality that problem-solving approaches may not garner support from the other city and county agencies. The political perception of what the police should be doing may conflict with a prevention approach; for example, if drug prevention-efforts affect the productivity of the district attorney's office by reducing drug prosecutions, district attorneys may not be supportive. There is a need to foster the continuous sharing of information among chiefs, foster peer-to-peer exchange, and circulate knowledge from the field.

## **Sustaining Community Policing**

Roundtable participants recognized that the policing profession has made substantial progress in community policing, but they expressed concern about the field losing the passion for community policing as embodied by the COPS Office in its formative years.

The COPS Office has made significant contributions through programmatic initiatives with target groups where capacity has been built to sustain community policing in unique environments that are critical to institutionalizing community policing. The COPS Office support of training and technology in addition to its many publications were also cited by participants.



## Preparing Tomorrow's Officers: Opportunities, Challenges, and Change

Throughout the previous Roundtable sessions, the issue of the “new generation” of officers continued to surface. While much has been done in the realm of recruitment and hiring, retention remains the untouched issue for law enforcement agencies; in particular, retaining this “new generation” of employees who will be responsible for carrying on policing in a democracy. Roundtable participants noted that policing often looks to the experiences of the private sector, especially around organizational issues. There also is concern about whether the younger generation of officers will stay in policing or see it as just a current job or stepping stone to something else.

Private- and public-sector representatives at the roundtable saw commonalities in their approaches to hiring and retaining the new generation; nevertheless, there were distinct differences. Service mentality was a common theme and corporate participants talked about the importance of seeking candidates who share the company's vision, are committed to the mission, and appreciate the value of giving back. They noted that an organization's reputation precedes it and attracts the right kind of candidates who identify with the organization. They also seek candidates who are “people smart” rather than “book smart.”

Differences showed up when it came to the interview process. Private-sector participants recommended bringing candidates back a number of times and exposing them to different divisions and people before making a decision. Such selection becomes a subjective process that is inconsistent with standards for public employment. The process also is not subject to constraints such as meeting police academy class deadlines.

### Recommendations from the Private Sector

*Recruiting: seek those who possess the following qualities:*

1. Are genuinely excited about doing well and doing good work
2. Able to connect with the feeling that they can make an impact
3. Are willing to work hard
4. Can make a commitment to the organization and its mission
5. Can weather the ebb and flow of the organization

*Retention: the four most successful ways to retain employees:*

1. Provide training and the opportunity to learn and grow in one's career.
2. Have a system in place for performance feedback. Younger employees, especially, seek constant feedback and welcome continuous acknowledgment of their work. They are much more open to constructive criticism and will work hard to improve in areas that need attention. An employee feedback survey shared among managers may be an effective tool.
3. Spend more time mentoring employees on their careers and not just on project tasks. The new generation employees respond better when placing the focus on their careers and how a particular project or series of tasks will enhance and grow their skills and careers.
4. Schedule routine one-on-one meetings with employees at every level of the organization.

## **Who Is Tomorrow's Officer?**

### *A Perspective on the New Generation of Employees*

- ◆ Although generally one finds four generations in the workplace, in law enforcement, there may be just three generations: the "Traditionalists" who shaped the policies and procedures that have an impact on the new generation and are largely retired from law enforcement; the "Baby Boomers" who are the power-brokers of most organizations (public and private) and who thrive on work—their identity is their work; "Generation X," perhaps the smallest proportion of the workforce but who currently hold leadership positions in organizations and will most likely stay in their positions; and "Generation Y," the new employees or tomorrow's officers. These groups tend to be defined by seminal events such as Generation Y being highly influenced by September 11, 2001.
- ◆ Workforce shortages are looming, with retirement a threatening issue in most organizations. Generation X is the smallest group, meaning that there will not be enough employees to fill all the positions.
- ◆ Generation Y is the largest generation ever but they are not yet ready to assume the positions vacated by retirements.
- ◆ Many of the new generation of employees will not seek leadership roles because they do everything in packs, they are not traditional, and have distinct communication styles (cell phones, texting, etc.)
- ◆ It is possible that many of the careers that these new employees will seek have not yet been invented.
- ◆ Organizations need to brand themselves in ways that will make people want to work for them. For policing, that could mean recruiting people who are more in tune with both sides of law enforcement: customer service and enforcement.

## Generation Y: What We Know about Them

A general discussion among roundtable participants revealed what they know about Generation Y.

- ◆ They were treated as “very special” when they were children. Their parents were latch-key kids who over-compensated by “hovering” over them; therefore, they have felt very protected and special—make me feel important about myself.
- ◆ They want to be called by their first names; they are very personalized.
- ◆ They have been told they were “great” and are a very confident generation who bring strong expectations into the organization. They want to be able to monitor their progress in meeting those expectations.
- ◆ They are team-oriented, multicultural, and diverse, and have a global perspective.
- ◆ They have a strong sense of commitment to public service, are committed to giving back, and are very philanthropic.
- ◆ They like rules and constructive discipline but want to know the reasons behind the rules. They accept constructive criticism and want to know how they can improve, instead of learning only from punitive measures. Consequently, they could experience some stress in the workplace and no one is sure how this will play out. Data are not definitive about whether this group has higher rates of suicide and depression compared with other generations.
- ◆ They believe in continuing education and opportunities to learn new skills and to improve themselves.
- ◆ They are very patriotic and eventually could become similar to the “greatest generation,” ending up being more similar to their grandparents’ generation.
- ◆ They have been shaped by technology and expect to stay connected in the workforce through various forms of electronic communication and social networks.

## How Is Your Agency Responding to the New Generation of Officers?

Generations X and Y pose a number of challenges to law enforcement agencies. Generation X roundtable participants, for example, consider themselves the “worker bees” who are internally driven. In contrast, the Generation Y approach is, what’s in it for me and who is going to recognize it? Further, the expectations of Generation Y are significantly higher.

*Challenge: expectations.* There is concern about the mindset that says you can circumvent the usual way to achieve success in law enforcement. Past history suggests that there is no way to circumvent the rise through the law enforcement ranks. Recruits may come into law enforcement with high expectations for promotional opportunities or for very specific goals related to policing functions (e.g., narcotics or tactical). The challenge is how to explain to the new recruit the difference between having high expectations and goals versus building experience and requisite skills to reach the goals. Recruiters, therefore, need to paint a realistic picture of the organization, the role of the policing function, and convey that the measure of success may not be a promotion as much as being the best officer one can be.

*Challenge: balancing career and family.* Family values are very much a part of the new generation of officers and they do not see the job as their life. Achieving this balance will have an impact on 24/7 police coverage, special assignments, overtime, and police socializing.

*Challenge: factors in attracting good candidates to law enforcement.* Beyond recruitment techniques, other factors are important—such as marketing the message and interacting with groups in the community that the department is seeking to attract. The COPS Office-funded project, Hiring in the Spirit of Service, documents how five departments used marketing to develop a brand that would change the message they wanted to deliver to the community and included delivering the message in different languages. All agreed, however, that working with youth early so that they see the police in a positive way and create positive interactions with law enforcement personnel can be the most critical factor in framing a perspective that law enforcement helps rather than harms. One police department is considering advocating for developing a public safety high school to reach potential candidates.

*Challenge: availability of electronic communication.* While it is a given, could electronic communication also be divisive? Typically, technology is seen as a positive, but questions emerged whether the reliance on technology to facilitate instant communication could also compromise squad integrity. This challenge poses the need to recognize the criticality of face-to-face-interaction.

*Challenge: encouraging innovation in a paramilitary organization.* How does a department sponsor innovation and creativity in a paramilitary organization? One option is to consider creating both generalists and specialists within the patrol function. It would require examining operations to determine opportunities for patrol officers to become engaged in a specialized role and also allow time for their exposure to a specialized area. At the same time, we should not sell patrol short. Given the right supervision and support for problem solving, patrol becomes a specialized position.

Other options to encourage innovation include rethinking the organization chart to allow creative officers to do their best work. This might also include adapting the 360-degree performance assessment process focused on helping young leaders become better leaders. Currently, very few police organizations allow young officers to provide feedback to superiors as would happen with a 360-degree assessment. The approach would satisfy the critical feedback needs of the new generation and would certainly provide better performance feedback across the organization.

### **Internal Changes: Making the Department More Responsive to Officers**

A discussion that centered on internal discipline presented examples of how three police departments handle problems.

1. *Phoenix Police Department: Discipline System.* The maximum time off for infractions was reduced to a new maximum of 40 hours off with the goal of changing behavior. The side benefit of this change is that it helped with Generation Y employees who were not responsive to the stronger punishment and it no longer punished a squad or a family who often suffered collaterally. As a result, the department has not had the surge of repeat offenders in 18 months that some may have predicted, and the number of internal affairs investigations/disciplinary review board activities have dropped by half.

In retrospect, the 40 hours off discipline may not have been the sole factor in reducing negative behavior. What seemed to matter most was that the commanders told each offending officer that if an infraction occurred again, the officer would not be working in the department.

The department now is experimenting with a “last-chance agreement” concerning any disciplinary problem that occurs during the next 5 years.

2. *Los Angeles Police Department: Strategic Discipline.* The department thinks that when an offense happens, strategy rather than penalty—and the way people feel due to how they are treated—is a key part of the disciplinary system, and results in the following:
  - ◇ Try to develop rather than discharge the officer.
  - ◇ Penalty may not be best strategy: the question to ask is what was going through the officer’s mind when he or she made the decision to commit the offense.
  - ◇ Fears, objections, and questions get answered: if you can’t persuade people to think differently at the command level, you won’t make progress.
  - ◇ Ask the employee what he or she is going to do differently from now on.
  - ◇ Change the way the officer is thinking and behaving.

- ◇ Standards-based assessment—commanding officers should consider the question: what have you done to address the problem?
  - ◇ Values that underlie the rules may not be remediable, whereas behavior is changeable.
3. *Pasadena Police Department: Value-Based Review Board.* The Value-Based Review Board looks at violations as a violation of the department’s values (more so than of the specific rule or policy) and makes the employee part of the choice to change his or her behavior. This approach is supported by academy training on value-based decision-making instead of focusing solely on teaching the rules.

### **Promising Changes in Law Enforcement Organizations: Police Executive Perspectives**

Although much of the roundtable focused on the new generation of employees and how to recruit and retain them, a parallel issue involved the need for change in law enforcement systems. Even if successful in shaping new employees to fit the organization, the question remains of whether a department can retain the best of the best in an organization that does not keep pace with economic, social, and technological change. Consequently, both the organizations and the people who staff them may have to change.

Beyond the changes to discipline systems previously discussed, executives at the roundtable endorsed a growing awareness of the need to change their systems not just to accommodate employees, but to create more effective organizations. Many have been trying new approaches that would have been unheard of just a short time ago. They discussed the following approaches, some of which are a work in progress, given the tradition of resistance to change in law enforcement agencies.

- ◆ Creating new processes for recruit orientation that devotes significant time to the “front end” of the system similar to college and professional “first-year experience” programs designed to prevent attrition.
- ◆ Presenting, as one department does, a 2-week residential pre-academy orientation that involves team-building exercises, leadership, ethics, fiscal matters, and physical fitness. Although it represents a sizeable investment in up-front staff, those who are not suited for the career generally self-select out before they begin the expensive process of training.
- ◆ Finding ways to allow creative officers to do their best work and encouraging problem-solving approaches.
- ◆ Making internal changes so that the department is more responsive to the officers.
- ◆ Developing targeted training programs so that officers can be exposed to specialized training early in their careers and become what one roundtable executive called “Renaissance” officers with knowledge, and eventually experience, in different specialties.

- ◆ Enhancing an awareness of how law enforcement is evolving and creating new and different types of jobs within the profession (cybercrime is an example), and expose officers to the skills that they need to develop to function in those new jobs.
- ◆ Changing discipline systems so that a goal of behavior change is achieved in contrast to a traditional “days off” focus and with a stronger emphasis on strategic discipline, which emphasizes strategies to change behavior rather than simply imposing a penalty.
- ◆ Incorporating value-based review boards that look at a violation through the lens of department values instead of a specific rule or policy.
- ◆ Teach value-based decision-making in the academy rather than focusing solely on teaching the rules.
- ◆ Making the employee part of the choice to change his or her behavior.
- ◆ Creating a different mind-set at the executive level requires leadership development that stresses the need for different thinking at the command level if a department expects to make progress.

### **The New Generation Perspective**

To ensure that the stakeholders of the new generation were heard, a panel of younger officers and Department of Justice and John Jay staff provided their perspective on their experiences.

Acknowledging that their growing up experiences may have been decidedly different, the panel did not feel they were necessarily contraindicative to successful police careers. This bright and talented group of young people spoke of being committed to making a difference in their communities and saw policing as analogous to enjoying what you do and that working in patrol is far more attractive than working in a cubicle. There was general agreement that recruitment needs to target younger age groups earlier so that a positive image of policing is conveyed early on in the lives of youths. Many were uncomfortable with the fact that some youths resent the police. They thought that could be corrected and have sought to do so in their work.

The panel clearly identified with the discussion on need for feedback but rejected any notion of needing constant recognition. They framed feedback as constructive criticism that goes with good mentoring and career support. Within that context, they appreciate ongoing performance evaluations rather than the annual report that is often perceived as a punitive assessment. They seek to know the principles and values behind the rules they learn because many know the rules but not why they exist. Finally, while they feel that ongoing feedback shows interest in an individual, they think that it also provides a reality check for those with “illusions of grandeur.”

The panel members also took issue with many of the labels that are applied to them and agreed that, although they have been shaped by technology, they are far more than the “point-and-click” generation. Within this context, they see themselves as team-oriented, multicultural, and diverse, with strong commitments to public service and to “giving back.” They have equally strong commitments to family and they talked of the difficulties of balancing work and family, particularly those who are single parents. Some said they would postpone seeking promotions until their children were older.

All roundtable participants expressed appreciation at the panelists’ willingness to share their ideas. The real value was clearly articulated through the recommendation from participants that the COPS Office include similar panels of new-generation officers in all future roundtables. It was a fitting conclusion to a set of roundtables that produced valuable information for the COPS Office.

### **Current Initiatives and COPS Office Resources**

*IACP Recruitment Toolkit—A Call to Community Service* (Kentucky Regional Community Policing Institute, Eastern Kentucky University) is specifically designed for developing promotional materials for rural law enforcement agencies. [www.kycops.org](http://www.kycops.org)

*Discover Policing* is an IACP virtual website project funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the COPS Office where candidates can post resumes and learn more about policing. It is based on the *Discover Nursing* campaign. [www.discoverpolicing.org](http://www.discoverpolicing.org)

*Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention Resources for Law Enforcement* is a CD produced by the COPS Office. [www.cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=450](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=450)

*Hiring in the Spirit of Service* is a COPS Office-funded project available on CD. [www.cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=390](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/ResourceDetail.aspx?RID=390)

The RAND Corporation—Center for Quality Policing. [www.rand.org/ise/centers/quality\\_policing](http://www.rand.org/ise/centers/quality_policing)

## **Where We've Been and Where We Are Going: A Dialog**

A highlight of the Milwaukee roundtable was a dialog between two icons of community policing: Professor Herman Goldstein, the father of problem-oriented policing, and Dr. George Kelling, the architect of the broken windows theory. The following is a summary of their discussion, which was facilitated by Chief Edward Flynn of the Milwaukee Police Department.

Professor Goldstein talked about his observations of policing during the past 53 years. Despite progress of various kinds, the major thing he observed was that officers at the lowest rank of the organization are an untapped resource that has not been consistently recognized as such. Progress in policing, therefore, has been slow, not necessarily linear, and has not progressively built on itself. In cities, progress in policing has gone up and down and “old” problems continue to emerge. We continue to question where we should put our efforts—on organizational structure, training, or personnel. The reality is that they all need attention. The larger issue, though, is the conflict for the police as an institution: how the police job is defined and how policing strategies, resources, and authority are inadequate for what the police are asked and expected to do.

Professor Goldstein said that there is a need to redefine the police institution in a realistic manner and develop response strategies that include systems beyond the criminal justice system. Those who can do the most to prevent some of the most significant social problems in our communities are not the police, but other community or government agencies.

He suggested broadening the definition of community policing to include engaging private corporations, social control agencies, and others to prevent the kind of behavior(s) that subsequently become problems for the police. Law enforcement needs to speak out forcefully and tell other stakeholders how to become advocates for preventive actions that reduce crime.

Dr. Kelling said that one of the reassuring things that we have learned is that the police alone cannot and do not own society's problems. To the extent that police own a societal problem, they will fail. The police, responding to community-based problems, adopted a strategy that basically sent citizens the message: “go back to the porch—we can handle it.” That attitude and strategy is a deadly trap. Rather, we should have been, and should be, asking the question, what have our community institutions done, rather than simply what have the police done?

He discussed how the 1970s Kansas City Experiment (deploying officers in community teams to prevent crime, giving rise to the “team policing” concept) produced changes in policing when Chief Clarence Kelley sought input from line officers on the best use of new officers being hired. About half of the officers recommended using the officers for preventive patrol. One key lesson learned from that experiment was to pay attention to line officers because they, not supervisors or administrators, came up with the idea of preventive

patrols.

The Kansas City Experiment also suggested a new paradigm of policing. At the time, team policing and preventive patrol could be seen as comparable to community policing, but team policing could not be molded into the framework of the “professional policing” model. The complexity of the business, as well as the wisdom associated with what police officers do, was starting to emerge and laid the groundwork for the emergence of five “big ideas” that had an impact on community policing.

Different actions may be required when line officers respond to complex community problems that may have escalated to a more serious point by the time they arrive at the scene. Recognition of this brought up questions about how those different actions should look. The concept of “problem solving” became the first big idea and the “broken windows” or “quality-of-life” movement became the second big idea, with both operating “on the line.” Problem solving provided the language for what police officers do under these circumstances.

As the demand for order encroached on police officers, a third big idea was born—“police can’t do it alone”—which recognized the need for partnerships and collaboration because those who can do the most are not the police. The fourth big idea has been CompStat, which deals with organizational accountability and analytical capability and uses data to hold police accountable for reducing crime problems. Finally, Dr. Kelling said that David Kennedy’s approach—recognizing that a relatively small number of offenders commit a large number of crimes—needs to be considered. Reaching out to the “hangers on” or noncriminal associates and influencers of offenders and encouraging them to persuade offenders to change behavior has been shown to reduce crime, especially interactions with youth who are at risk.

According to Kelling, the bottom line is that every big idea has come from local law enforcement rather than the federal agencies or state police agencies. Consequently, the local police organization can be seen as the “hotbed of thought.”

*Supervising the complex police role.* The discussion moved to questioning whether traditional styles of supervision and leadership have been keeping pace with innovations and making problem solving effective. Is there a disconnect between the reality of police work and current systems of accountability? And, if so, what are the implications for liability?

In Professor Goldstein’s view, supervision has not measured up to empowering officers to apply problem-solving strategies to solve problems. In organizations where administrators have given them a license to be creative, however, rank-and-file officers have done great things.

While line officers are the heroes in problem solving, sergeants are critically important because without their support, officers will be discouraged from engaging in problem solving. In many departments, management has not supported the advances made by officers who are committed to problem solving. Conversely, progressive law enforcement administrators who support them function in a complex system of liability. Police chiefs can lose their jobs for a host of reasons, including a bad decision by a single 911 operator or a

rookie officer on the street. How do we balance liability to the organization and the chief executive while empowering officers to take action?

Dr. Kelling sees much of the work in law enforcement agencies as focused on avoiding liability. Police departments are still organized as they were in 1905 and he questions whether they actually reflect what officers really do in their communities. Creative officers are out there on their own, with very little guidance, supervision, and support.

He also said that, given the complexity of the police roles and responsibilities, traditional styles of supervision cannot work in a way that can make problem solving effective.

Telling police officers to “use common sense” in their actions is interpreted as “personal determination” rather than a “value-driven” organizational mandate. Police departments and police labor unions are run by rules and regulations and a factory mentality has developed. There appears to be little focus on “service” in the field and this produces a disconnect between policing practices and police organizations with an over-emphasis on rules and regulations. This can turn police officers into “dirty” workers where the typical response is to cover up not only bad work but good work, as well.

The discussion also focused on how an array of police policies have been developed to address every possible contingency. This has nothing to do with the quality of service in the field, but instead with trying to maintain control over officers. If something became a subject of challenge, “we have a policy” was the response. Professor Goldstein pointed out that although other professions have an allowance for risk, no risk is allowed in policing.

To develop and build the kind of relationships that police and communities need, we need to systemize the knowledge that we already have to inform the community about the decisions and strategies of the police. Although citizen police academies were a start, they cannot reach all citizens. It is important to take every opportunity to educate the community about what the police do. This includes educating the media about the complex issues facing police organizations as well as marketing the police to the community. Building and sustaining community relationships and partnership needs to become an everyday occurrence because a democracy assumes that people can govern and police themselves. An important goal of policing, therefore, involves invigorating the community to do what it should be doing all along—policing itself.

Professor Goldstein added that as a society, we have developed social norms that allow us to function together. When things go wrong, what is or should be the police posture? The police should help the community identify the community networks that can be mobilized to solve the problem. The role of the police is to build the capacity of the community to respond to the problem. It takes the total community—including corporations and businesses—to solve the problem. That makes the police role more achievable rather than expecting the police to solve everything.

Professor Goldstein and Dr. Kelling agreed that the community policing paradigm stems

from democratic policing—citizens policing themselves. Problem-oriented policing is the language of community policing as well as a significant tactic. Both redefine the role of police and shift ownership of the problem to the larger community.

Society has punted problems to the police and many communities have a little community capacity to solve problems. The question becomes, how do we (the police) not own the problem?

In Dr. Kelling's view, it is possible to reach a tipping point without the direct help of other agencies by encouraging other agencies to pursue their own self-interests, particularly their economic self-interests. Police agencies may need to educate the community about issues related to self-interest. In that respect, Professor Goldstein sees information as one of the most powerful tools that police can use to convince community organizations to take action.

Roundtable participants questioned whether we are setting up contradictions. If we make crime totally the responsibility of the police without the community partnership, then police are being set up to fail. As the police profession, we create policing innovations to address crime problems. Why should we share the ownership of the crime problem or be reluctant to own the crime problems? As the professionals, we need to drive the train.

Professor Goldstein responded by saying that perhaps we have lost sight of the institutions that have an interest in solving crimes. Rather than having as many community partners as possible, it may be wiser to look critically at those institutions or agencies that have a vested interest in solving crime problems. The ability for police to conduct analysis becomes critical and there is a need for more social science techniques to help with data analysis and using analysis to guide police response.

Dr. Kelling applied the medical analogy of “informed decision-making” to engaging the community. In medicine, physicians engage the patient to make their own decisions in partnership with doctors. The police need to consider providing better information to the community about what the problems are and then give the community options for responding to the problems.

Professor Goldstein agreed that the medical analogy may be valid but we need to recognize that medicine is much more knowledge-driven than policing, which means that medical specialists can convey that knowledge to the consumer. Policing is at a much more primitive stage. We need to get to the point of how to deal with specific problems. There are chiefs who know how to deal with problem X, but there is the concern about how to harness and disseminate that knowledge to our peers.



**PRACTITIONER PERSPECTIVES: COMMUNITY POLICING IN A DEMOCRACY**

is the result of a partnership effort by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) and the Leadership Academy of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. In order to keep a finger on the pulse of community policing in law enforcement, the COPS Office convened four Roundtables around the country—bringing together a mix of law enforcement practitioners and thought leaders, criminal justice academics, and policymakers. Participants worked together to identify emerging issues that need to be addressed from a community policing perspective, while also making several recommendations for action at the federal, state, and local levels. State governments and local police departments have responsibilities for supporting other agencies in their efforts to institutionalize community policing, and Roundtable participants reaffirmed the basic realization that drives the development of community policing reform—that crime is not just a police issue and that police cannot control crime by themselves.



U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services  
Two Constitution Square  
145 N Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details about COPS Office programs, call  
the COPS Office Response Center at 800.421.6770.

Visit COPS Online at [www.cops.usdoj.gov](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov)

December 2010  
e12102322