Conference Report
COMMUNITY POLICING STRATEGIES:
Sustaining Citizen Support and Leadership,
June 18-19, 1997
Dallas, Texas

CO-HOSTED BY:
Dallas Police Department
Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute

ASSISTED BY:
Department of Criminal Justice
University of North Texas

This document should not be reproduced or quoted without the permission of the Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project and report began because police leaders care about the future of law enforcement. Chief Bennie R. Click of the Dallas Police Department approached the Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute with the idea of a joint conference on community policing in major cities. Through discussions with academics and practitioners, it was decided that this Conference would take place as part of the 50th Anniversary Celebration of The Southwestern Legal Foundation in June of 1997.

The purpose of this event was not to extol the virtues of community policing, but to assess where this reform was headed and what it would take to strengthen the changes in police strategy and tactics defined as community policing. The advocates of change often exaggerate the benefits to be derived from change, but by the same token, the opponents of change often exaggerate and denigrate the costs of change. This Conference was designed to bring together police leaders responsible for implementing community policing and to have an open discussion about what problems and prospects they saw for sustaining this effort.

The University of North Texas Department of Criminal Justice joined this Conference to act as Ascribe in recording and developing this Conference Report. Dr. Robert Taylor, Dr. Eric Fritsch and Dr. Edward Reed should be thanked for their diligent effort in writing the summaries and interpretive articles.

A special word of thanks must be given to Assistant Chief Greg Holliday for his outstanding effort in helping to organize the Conference and his participation in all phases of development. Without the cooperation of a number of people in the Dallas Police Department and the Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute, especially Associate Director, Mr. Daniel Carlson and Staff Assistant, Mrs. Tracy Harris, this Conference and Report would have remained an idea without implementation. A special tribute must be given to J. David Ellwanger, President of The Southwestern Legal Foundation for his encouragement as well as his recommendation for financial support from the Foundation's *Research Fellows* to underwrite the costs of publication. The continuing support by the *Research Fellows* has helped to nurture

the Institute's on-going efforts to foster discussions within the law enforcement community on significant topics.

The final salute must be to the men and women who toil in the organizations of this country's law enforcement agencies. Sometimes unseen, unappreciated and overlooked, police managers and leaders care enough to take the career risks to improve and revitalize ideas and processes. This Report is a tribute to them for their efforts to lead policing in a democratic society where the police serve the community, rather than the other way around.

Gary W. Sykes, Ph.D.
Vice President for Law Enforcement Education
Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute
The Southwestern Legal Foundation

INTRODUCTION

A special meeting entitled, **"Community Policing Strategies Conference: Sustaining Citizen Support and Leadership"** was held in Dallas, TX on June 18-19, 1997. The program was co-sponsored by the **Dallas Police Department**, the **Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute**, with the cooperation and support of the **University of North Texas Institute for Criminal Justice**. The primary purpose of the conference was to address the issues: "What are the challenges and obstacles involved in implementing community policing (CP)?" and "How can CP initiatives be sustained over the long run?" The presenters were mostly practitioners and were selected to encourage problem-solving discussions based on their learning experiences. The Conference was also designed to share knowledge gained from program implementation and to explore future directions.

Community policing has captured the interest and imagination of both the law enforcement community and the informed public for more than a decade. Nationwide, police departments continue to define and implement this idea supported by major grants from the Office of Community Oriented Police Services (COPS) in the Justice Department. Any major reform effort, such as CP, must assess its progress and identify ideas that work, as well as focus on obstacles that are encountered during implementation and the on-going experiences within the agencies.

This report is an attempt to convey the substance of that gathering and to continue the dialogue about the nature and consequences of the various forms of CP. Rather than having academic researchers assess the merits of this reform, this Conference was held with the primary goal of providing a platform for police managers engaged in implementing the CP concept. The purpose of the program was to share the knowledge gained "in the trenches" by those who spend their efforts reforming police programs. What follows is their viewpoints, in their words, describing the sometimes "bumpy road" to policing in this era of change.

The presenters: noted police executives and academicians with expertise in community policing.

Assistant Chief Terrell Bolton
Dallas Police Department

Deputy Chief Mike Boyd
Metropolitan Police Department Toronto, Ontario

Chief Bennie R. Click
Dallas Police Department

Major Jeanne E. Forester
Metro-Dade Police Department

Ms. Nancy McPherson
Seattle Police Department

Chief Robert K. Olson
Minneapolis Police Department

Deputy Superintendent Charles H. Ramsey
Chicago Police Department

Superintendent Matt L. Rodriguez
Chicago Police Department (Luncheon Speaker)

Ms. Patty Smith
Vickery Meadow Management Company
Dallas, TX

Dr. Gary W. Sykes
Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute
Richardson, TX

Dr. Robert W. Taylor
University of North Texas
Denton, TX

Assistant Chief Michael Thaler
Houston Police Department

Commander Garrett Zimmon
Los Angeles Police Department

PRESENTATIONS

A synopsis of each presentation follows. The objective of this section of the report is to summarize each presentation with particular attention given to each presenter's response to the question: "Where Do We Go From Here?"

MS. PATTI SMITH
DIRECTOR - VICKERY MEADOWS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

Ms. Patti Smith serves as Director of the Vickery Meadows Improvement District (VMID) that manages approximately 15,000 apartments in a five square mile area of Dallas. She serves as a liaison between the VMID and city staff and the city council.

She described her role in assisting Interactive Community Policing (ICP) officers in her community and provided examples of how problem solving has worked. She identified several problems in implementing community policing including: (1) police officers do not see the value in security guards although they could serve as a valuable resource for patrol officers; (2) patrol officers do not see themselves as community policing officers even though they deal with the community; and (3) police departments set unrealistic expectations for citizens of the services they will provide.

In particular, Ms. Smith identified three areas that should be addressed in order to move community policing forward. First, she stated that police departments must **DEVELOP PARTNERSHIPS**. She advocated the development of partnerships with not only neighborhood associations but also schools, churches, and other community organizations. She stated that partnerships with the community should also involve crime prevention training. She stated that citizens need to take an active role in insuring they are not a victim of crime. The VMID provides eight hour seminars to all residents of their complexes on how to deal with crime, drugs, and gangs.

Second, she argued that police departments implementing community policing should **USE SECURITY GUARDS AS A RESOURCE**. There are many more security officers in comparison to the police, and she stated that partnerships should be developed between these two entities. Furthermore, police departments should train security guards in how they can assist the police and departments should encourage interaction between patrol and security officers. Although she recognized the resistance to this idea from many officers, she argued that this partnership will increase the ability of the police to serve community residents. She stated that security officers employed by the VMID meet with Dallas Police Department officers once a week to discuss problems which have occurred on the properties and develop strategies to resolve the problems.

Third, she stated that police departments must **TRAIN OFFICERS TO UNDERSTAND THE DIVERSITY OF NEIGHBORHOODS**. She stated that training should be provided to officers so they can understand how economic, social, and cultural issues effect the neighborhoods in which they work. This will greatly assist their problem-solving abilities.

DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT CHARLES H. RAMSEY
CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Deputy Superintendent Ramsey discussed five critical issues that must be addressed in order to move community policing forward into the next century. First, police departments must **SUSTAIN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY POLICING EFFORT**. Three challenges must be met to sustain community involvement including: 1) breaking down long-standing barriers between the police and community; 2) opening up avenues of information sharing between the police and community; and 3) understanding how to provide meaningful opportunity for partnerships and problem-solving. Deputy Superintendent Ramsey argued that barriers between the police and community can be broken down by formalizing community input mechanisms through monthly beat meetings and assigning officers to regularly work in the same neighborhood. In order to open avenues to share information between the police and community, departments should provide the community with access to data concerning crime and neighborhood disorder. He

cautioned that the community must realize that they need to share information also. Deputy Superintendent Ramsey stated that training is the key to providing meaningful opportunity for partnerships and problem solving. Officers must understand their new roles, but training must also include the community because they need to understand their new roles and responsibilities as well.

Second, Deputy Superintendent Ramsey noted that the **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE MUST CHANGE** if community policing is to be sustained in the future. He argued that community policing will not work in an environment of top-down decision-making. Instead, a contemporary organization is needed which supports the core processes of a police department and allows for bottom-up decision-making. He stated that the following changes must be made. First, the organizational structure must be decentralized, flattened, and streamlined. Second, the organizational culture must change, but he realized that this will take several years. Third, the concept of community policing must be institutionalized in the department so every officer is doing community policing, not just community policing officers assigned to a specialized unit. Fourth, non-patrol roles must be redefined including a movement toward generalization and removing specialized units.

Third, a major challenge which faces police departments in their effort to sustain community policing is the **NEED TO HARNESS TECHNOLOGY**. The challenge is to understand how to harness the power of new technology. The information cannot be complicated and must be easily accessible by officers, administrators, other city agencies, and community problem-solving partners. He cautioned that technology should not drive a department, instead, the department should drive the technology.

Fourth, Deputy Superintendent Ramsey stated that **MANAGEMENT STYLES AND PRACTICES MUST CHANGE**. Management styles must emphasize motivating and coaching and de-emphasize control over employees. In addition, performance evaluations must change because most departments are still using old performance measures. It is crucial to develop evaluation measures that take into account the new roles performed by officers under community policing and captures results, not simply activities. He also argued that it is important to measure community satisfaction. Furthermore, recruitment and promotion practices need to be modified to ensure a successful community policing model.

Fifth, Deputy Superintendent Ramsey argued that departments must **ALLOCATE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT PARTNERSHIPS AND PROBLEM-SOLVING**. Frequently officers have inadequate time for problem-solving. Departments must learn to manage the number of calls for service, prioritize dispatch, and manage the size of beats by making them smaller. If this does not occur, problem-solving will remain a secondary concern in comparison to answering 911 calls.

MS. NANCY MCPHERSON
COMMUNITY POLICING BUREAU — SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Ms. McPherson provided a brief overview of her work in San Diego and Seattle. She primarily focused on three major strategies that must be developed to bring the philosophy of community policing to life in the future. The first is a **CONTINUED COMMITMENT TO PROBLEM SOLVING**. In order to demonstrate a commitment to problem-solving a department must do several things. A department must implement department wide training, both basic and in-service. The need for training

was also mentioned by several other speakers. In addition, field-training officers must be held accountable for the problem solving applications of their recruits. Ms. McPherson noted that if FTOs do not buy into the community policing philosophy, they can hinder the process because they will communicate to their recruits that it is not important. She also recommended that departments should implement a tracking and monitoring system for problem-solving efforts. Problem-solving efforts should be listed on a monthly basis, not for counting purposes, but to reduce duplication of effort and to reward officers who are actively involved in the problem-solving process. Ms. McPherson also recommended that in order for problem-solving efforts to grow in the future, state of the art crime analysis must be developed. Lastly, she stated that in order for problem-solving efforts to continue, performance evaluations must reflect analysis of problems and there must be both formal and informal rewards and recognition for problem-solving.

The second strategy which must be developed to continue community policing in the future is a **COMMITMENT TO PARTNERSHIPS**. Although she recognized the difficulties in developing and maintaining partnerships, she mentioned several things which can facilitate the development of partnerships. The first was training. Ms. McPherson noted that community members must be trained in problem-solving skills and officers must be trained to facilitate and mediate partnership activities. Since the development of partnerships is not common under traditional policing, both citizens and officers must be trained. In addition, departments must create meaningful opportunities for community involvement. A department cannot just give lip service to partnerships and expect the partnerships to be sustained over a long period of time. However, with meaningful opportunities to become involved, the community will remain engaged in the partnership. It is also important to recognize, formally and informally, community members for their partnership efforts.

The third strategy which must be developed to continue community policing in the future is **ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSFORMATION**. Ms. McPherson stated that it is crucial to examine departments from top to bottom to see how every system supports or hinders problem-solving and partnerships. All systems including the leadership system, management system, supervision system, records system, and communications system must be examined and changes must be implemented to fix "broken" systems.

SUPERINTENDENT MATT L. RODRIGUEZ
CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Superintendent Rodriguez was the luncheon speaker. He provided an overview of the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) program as well as provided five recommendations of what needs to be done in the future in order to sustain citizen support and leadership in community policing.

First, Superintendent Rodriguez recommended that agencies need to **UPDATE AND EXPAND STRATEGIES**. He noted that strategies need to change in response to the changing dynamics of the community. Just because a strategy is currently effective, does not mean it will be in the future unless the strategy is flexible. In addition, if a strategy is seen as effective, it is important to expand that strategy to other neighborhoods and communities to see if it will be effective there as well. In particular, Superintendent Rodriguez discussed court advocacy as an effective community action tool. This is a program in which neighbors and community leaders,

working with the police, identify and track court cases and attend court sessions that are of concern to the community. It is believed that attendance at court shows support for the police as well as victims and witnesses of crime, and lets everyone involved in the judicial process know that the community is concerned about the outcome of the case.

Second, Superintendent Rodriguez recommended that agencies should **ALWAYS SEARCH FOR NEW STRATEGIES**. This can be accomplished by exploring strategies employed by other jurisdictions as well as being willing to experiment with new strategies. For example, in 1996, the City of Chicago passed an ordinance that allows the City to hold landlords responsible for criminal activity occurring in and around their building. The ordinance encourages landlords and property managers to monitor closely their tenant selection and the activities that take place on their property.

Third, Superintendent Rodriguez recommended that agencies must **DEVELOP CUSTOM STRATEGIES FOR EACH PROBLEM AND EACH NEIGHBORHOOD. Agencies must recognize the social, cultural, and economic diversity of their neighborhoods and realize that a cookie cutter or "one-size-fits-all" approach to solving problems in each neighborhood is doomed for failure.**

Fourth, Superintendent Rodriguez recommended that agencies need to **TRAIN CITIZENS, LANDLORDS AND OTHER GROUPS** in order to sustain community support in the future. In 1995, the Chicago Police Department began to implement the Joint Community-Police Training (JCPT) project. The JCPT project pairs up police and civilian trainers who go out into Chicago's neighborhoods to offer training, beat by beat, on the CAPS strategy and the particulars of the five-step problem-solving model. On each beat, the training consists of an introductory session, followed by a series of workshops in which residents apply what they have learned in solving a real crime problem on their beat.

Fifth, Superintendent Rodriguez recommended that agencies need to **RECOGNIZE COMMUNITY LEADERS AND CITIZENS WHO HAVE ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED IN COMMUNITY POLICING**. In order to sustain community support and leadership it is important for police agencies to give citizens who are active in community policing efforts a "pat on the back ". Recognition of their efforts will provide citizens with encouragement to continue their efforts because they realize that their participation is appreciated by the police department and the community.

MAJOR JEANNE E. FORESTER
METRO-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Major Forester provided a historical overview of the Metro-Dade Police Department and its community policing efforts. In particular, she discussed the evolution of community policing in the Carol City Patrol District, which is the first Metro-Dade patrol district to fully implement community policing. Furthermore, Major Forester mentioned numerous difficulties and obstacles faced by the Metro-Dade Police Department in implementing community policing. These obstacles included negative perception on the part of officers that community policing was not real police work, lack of support for community policing from some of the command staff, fighting with other units for departmental resources, and lack of appropriate evaluation tools.

Major Forester provided four recommendations for the future of community policing. First, she recommended that **ALTERNATIVES TO FEDERAL FUNDING MUST BE FOUND TO SUSTAIN COMMUNITY POLICING** in the next century. In particular, she suggested that partnerships should be sought with private businesses to provide funding for some community policing components. It was noted that many businesses are actively involved in community service and could be a potential funding source for certain community policing programs. Also, expansion of citizen volunteers should be pursued. Major Forester noted that college students and young professionals could serve as mentors to youth.

Second, Major Forester recommended that agencies must **SEE COMMUNITIES AS A GROUP OF NEIGHBORHOODS THAT VARY**. This point is similar to the one addressed by Superintendent Rodriguez. Community policing strategies must be tailored to the targeted neighborhood. A cookie cutter approach to community policing which attempts to make every strategy work in every neighborhood is doomed to failure. She also recommended that if a strategy is not working in a particular neighborhood; do not think the strategy is a failure never to be used again. Instead, the strategy should be modified and tried in a different neighborhood to determine its potential effectiveness.

Third, Major Forester recommended that it is important to **HIGHLIGHT SUCCESSES**. It is crucial to let officers, citizens, and the media know about successes and to show appreciation to those who are doing a good job in implementing community policing. By highlighting success, participants are encouraged to continue their commitment to community policing efforts and their interest is maintained. Implementing community policing takes time, but small steps eventually lead to big changes. Taking time to show appreciation to participants maintains support for community policing.

Fourth, Major Forester recommended that **TRAINING** is vital to the success of community policing in the future. This same recommendation was noted by many presenters. In particular, Major Forester noted the need to train supervisors on how to evaluate community policing officers and the need for training to focus on diversity issues.

ASSISTANT CHIEF TERRELL BOLTON
DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Assistant Chief Terrell Bolton provided a historical overview of the development of community policing within the Dallas Police Department. In addition, he discussed various community policing strategies used by DPD such as graffiti abatement and job fairs. He also discussed several obstacles faced by the Dallas Police Department in implementing community policing. Among the obstacles discussed were: 1) officer resistance to community policing, especially among veterans; 2) concern among the command staff that the line officers would rebel against the implementation of community policing; and 3) difficulty in slowly implementing community policing because neighborhood groups and politicians wanted community policing in their neighborhoods immediately.

Assistant Chief Bolton identified four areas for future direction in order to move community policing forward. First, **CORE CURRICULUM TRAINING** must be implemented. Community policing training many times focuses only on those officers

actively involved in community policing, neglecting other line officers, supervisors, and detectives, among others. In order for a department to fully implement community policing, it is important to provide training to all officers. Over the next two years, the Dallas Police Department will provide all departmental personnel with eight hours of training in community policing. It is believed that this aspect of program implementation is very important for transition from traditional policing to a community policing organization.

Second, **EXPANSION OF CITY SERVICE INVOLVEMENT** must take place. Currently, the brunt of community policing implementation has been the responsibility of law enforcement. Assistant Chief Bolton argued that the next step in community policing is to get city government actively involved in problem solving. It is argued that community policing can only go so far unless the remaining city departments also change. In other words, it is important to not only have community policing but it must evolve into community government.

Third, **BUSINESS COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION** must take place. Assistant Chief Bolton argued for the continual expansion of the Weed and Seed Program to revitalize neighborhoods through private business support. Businesses should be drawn upon to provide support for economic growth and investment in the community. If businesses are brought into areas being revitalized, continued growth will be insured.

Fourth, police departments implementing community policing need to **LEARN TO DO MORE WITH LESS**. As federal funds are being restricted and competition with other city agencies for budget allocations increases, administrators must learn to manage better. Assistant Chief Bolton noted the increased difficulty in securing budget requests from the city council because crime is decreasing and public safety is no longer the number one problem concerning citizens. He emphasized the importance in marketing what a department is doing and realizing that a better job can be done.

CHIEF ROBERT K. OLSON
MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Chief Olson discussed several obstacles to implementing community policing including: 1) union contracts breed mediocrity not entrepreneurship; 2) political micro-management of the community policing effort from the mayor or city council; 3) poor leadership from the chief; 4) lack of support from command staff; 5) the natural tendency of traditional police officers to not want to change; 6) prosecutor and media pressure to solve crimes and; 7) the failure of the criminal justice system to not evolve into community oriented perspective.

Chief Olson discussed three phases of implementation of community policing and steps that need to be accomplished in each phase in order to progress to the next. Chief Olson noted that no city has completed each of these phases. It is important for a jurisdiction to recognize where they are in the implementation process and then understand what must be accomplished in the future in order to fully implement community policing. Most agencies implementing community policing are still in Phase I.

In Phase I, several things must occur. First, the **ORGANIZATIONAL HIERARCHY MUST CHANGE**. He argued that departments must decentralize, civilianize, and hold

precinct commanders accountable for what goes on in the department. Second, agencies must **HIRE BETTER**. Chief Olson stated that we no longer need John Wayne-type attitudes in law enforcement, but instead need customer service people. Third, agencies must **REDESIGN TRAINING**. He criticized current academy and in-service training because 90% of the training focuses on 7% of the duties actually performed by a police officer. Instead, he recognized the need to emphasize customer service training. Fourth, agencies need to **MAKE BETTER ADVANCEMENT DECISIONS**. He noted the importance of assessment centers rather than memorization tests. This recommendation flows from the last two regarding the need to hire better and redesign training. Fifth, he noted that agencies implementing community policing must **HAVE AN APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE**. Knowledge is power and if community policing is going to be implemented, officers must have access to real time information regarding what happened yesterday, where, and under what circumstances.

In Phase II, two things need to be accomplished. First, Chief Olson pointed out that the **SEPARATE COMMUNITY POLICING UNIT MUST BE ABOLISHED**. This will give ownership to individual officers. He noted that an agency must be comfortable with being a community policing department before doing away with the community policing unit. However, if an agency wants to take the next step and fully integrate community policing, this step must be taken. Minneapolis Police Department is about to embark on the implementation of this phase. Chief Olson has created a new precinct (5th precinct) in which to implement Phase II before expansion to the entire city. Second, the **REST OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM MUST BECOME COMMUNITY ORIENTED**. He has developed the Community Oriented Law Enforcement System (COLES) in the 5th precinct which is an attempt to get the same judges, prosecutors, probation officers, and other system personnel to be responsible for cases in a limited geographical area. This will allow the system personnel to work cases from the same area of the city. Chief Olson sees this as an important first step in moving toward community oriented government.

In Phase III, jurisdictions should **EVOLVE FROM COMMUNITY POLICING TO COMMUNITY ORIENTED GOVERNMENT**. Other governmental agencies must implement the tenets of the community policing philosophy and help people take control of their neighborhoods. If this phase is reached, Chief Olson argued that citizens will be actively involved in improving their neighborhoods and will decrease their reliance on law enforcement to solve their problems.

COMMANDER GARRETT ZIMMON
LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

Commander Zimmon provided a historical overview of what the Los Angeles Police Department has done in implementing community policing. He discussed the major steps taken by LAPD including the Christopher Commission in 1991 which mandated LAPD implement community policing. Commander Zimmon also recognized several obstacles or challenges to implementing community policing including: 1) problems with the split force model of community policing which hinders the ability of patrol officers and community policing officers to work well with each other; 2) resistance from officers and command staff; 3) problems in marrying community policing with computer aided dispatch; 4) lack of support from other city agencies; and 5) problems with the current reward system in most law enforcement agencies.

Several implementation plateaus were discussed by Commander Zimmon. He argued that the challenge for the future is to develop strategies and mechanisms to handle these plateaus. The first plateau discussed was **RECOGNITION OF THE ABILITIES, SKILLS, AND KNOWLEDGE NEEDED TO PERFORM THE JOB UNDER COMMUNITY POLICING**. Commander Zimmon argued that it is crucial to understand what officers need in order to do community policing and then provide them with the skills to accomplish their tasks.

The second plateau discussed was the **NEED TO CHANGE ACADEMY CURRICULA**. This was discussed by several other presenters and highlights the fact that many academies are still based on traditional curriculum and are not producing community oriented officers.

The third plateau was the **NEED TO EVOLVE INTO COMMUNITY BASED GOVERNMENT**. It is important to get other city agencies involved in community policing efforts. Commander Zimmon argued that 80% of the things that effect fear of crime and quality of life fall outside the responsibility of the police.

The fourth plateau in implementing community policing he discussed was the **NEED TO DEVELOP EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES**. Commander Zimmon argued that we lack good quantitative measures of the effectiveness of community policing, but they need to be developed. Agencies need measures of whether they are doing a good job and how community policing is working.

The fifth plateau discussed by Commander Zimmon was the **NEED TO DEVELOP COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH SUPPORT FOR TERRITORIAL IMPERATIVE**. He argued that it is difficult to implement community policing with a CAD system because it breaks down territorial imperative. CAD sends calls based on priority not territory, and Commander Zimmon argued that 80% of all priority calls are not really priority calls. Citizens know what to say in order to get a fast police response. He recognized the need to develop strategies in order to provide officers with a sense of ownership for beats in spite of CAD. If CAD is not harnessed, officers will be chasing radio calls and responding to 911 calls only.

The sixth plateau discussed was the **NEED TO MOVE AWAY FROM THE TITLE OF COMMUNITY POLICING**. Commander Zimmon argued that community policing is just policing and should be recognized as the way the police do business. The label of "community" policing should be dissolved eventually, otherwise there will always be the impression that this is a fad that will some day go away.

ASSISTANT CHIEF MICHAEL THALER
HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Assistant Chief Thaler provided an overview of the progression of Neighborhood Oriented Policing in Houston from 1982 through 1996. He discussed six issues that the Houston Police Department has struggled with while implementing community policing. These issues must be addressed in order to move community policing forward. First, Assistant Chief Thaler argued that an **ACCOUNTABILITY CHANGE MUST OCCUR**. He stated that many departments believe they are accountable primarily to the mayor and city council. However, departments implementing community policing must recognize their first commitment is to the citizens. In

addition, accountability for the quality of life in neighborhoods must be shared with the public and other city agencies.

Second, departments must **DEFINE QUALITY OF LIFE AND UNDERSTAND HOW THEY CAN IMPACT IT**. Assistant Chief Thaler argued that departments have not spent time defining quality of life and understanding how they can impact the different components. Among the quality of life issues that can be addressed by police departments are public safety, health services, education, and transportation. Departments must understand their role in each quality of life issue. It is also important to recognize that a commitment to increasing the quality of life for citizens will effect police operations.

Third, departments implementing community policing must **REDEFINE THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF OFFICERS**. Assistant Chief Thaler stated that a department must write down what they expect from officers and must develop performance evaluations based on the new roles and on how officers impact quality of life issues.

Fourth, departments must **DEVELOP STRATEGIES TO SUSTAIN PARTNERSHIPS**. Assistant Chief Thaler noted that the roles and responsibilities of partners change depending on the seriousness of the offense. If the problem being addressed is a serious offense, then citizens should be less involved in the problem solving process. On the other hand, if the problem does not involve crime, then the police should be less involved. It is the less serious crimes that require partnerships and active participation of both the community and the police. He also recognized the difficulty in sustaining partnerships because the development of partnerships is usually issue driven. Once the issue has been resolved, then the partnership dissipates. He stressed that it is critical to identify additional issues that can be addressed through the partnership to sustain the momentum.

Fifth, the **AGENCY STRUCTURE MUST BE CONDUCIVE TO MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS**. Departments should focus on three systems to ensure they are conducive to maintaining partnerships including the professional development system, behavioral system, and the information management system. In the professional development system, training must be provided to officers, performance evaluations must change, criteria for promotions must be modified, and recruitment techniques should be evaluated. In the behavioral system, the discipline process must be changed to allow for a few mistakes but still be able to deal with willful misconduct. In the information management system, departments must make a commitment to crime analysis.

Sixth, departments **MUST LEARN HOW TO MEASURE SUCCESS**. Assistant Chief Thaler argued that we have not identified and defined what we mean by success in community policing. He also recognized the difficulty in measuring problem-solving, but noted that measures must be constructed for the continued development of community policing.

DEPUTY CHIEF MIKE BOYD
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT - TORONTO, ONTARIO

Deputy Chief Boyd provided a brief historical overview of the development of community policing in Toronto which began in 1992. He also discussed some of the

crimes that have been addressed in recent years through the problem-solving process including robbery, prostitution, and graffiti. He identified four issues that must be addressed in order to continue the implementation of community policing in the future and related them to his experiences in Toronto.

First, the **CHIEF MUST LEAD THE PROCESS**. When the implementation of community policing was in its initial stages in Toronto, the chief was not fully committed to the concept. However, a new chief, who was committed to community policing, was eventually appointed. Deputy Chief Boyd noted that it is difficult to sustain community policing efforts unless the chief is committed to the philosophy and process. Therefore, leadership from the chief is crucial for the continued development of community policing.

Second, **DEPARTMENTS MUST BE WILLING TO FIGHT TOUGH FISCAL RESTRAINT**. Deputy Chief Boyd stated that his department has lost 800 officers in recent years due to budget cuts, and there is minimal grant money for community policing in Canada. Therefore, if community policing is going to be sustained in the future, departments must make community policing the highest priority in their department in spite of fiscal restraint. If a commitment to community policing is not made, departments will go back to traditional policing in the face of budget cuts.

Third, the **IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING MUST BE A SLOW PROCESS**. He argued that there will be less resistance from officers if community policing is implemented slowly. It is important to make minor modifications to the organization which will eventually lead to big change instead of trying to do everything at once.

Fourth, Deputy Chief Boyd noted that in order to sustain community policing **FIVE DIFFERENT GROUPS MUST ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN PROBLEM-SOLVING**. He argued that the terms "the police" and "the community" are misleading. Instead, he discussed the Big Five which included the residential and business community, government and social agencies, media, politicians and political groups, and police. In order for community policing to work, a jurisdiction must have these five groups working together.

CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING

Dr. Eric Fritsch, University of North Texas

Dr. Wilson "Ed" Reed, University of North Texas

Dr. Gary W. Sykes, Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute

Since the early 1980's, there has been a highly visible effort to promote police reforms labeled community policing. In response, hundreds, if not thousands of police agencies embarked on implementing some form of this concept and tried to change many important components of police practices and strategies. However, after nearly a decade of programming, several concerns have surfaced which must be understood if reform efforts are to have a lasting impact. Several speakers at the Conference openly explored the complexities their departments encountered in developing and executing CP-based plans and ideas.

There were significant similarities among the presenters when they outlined the difficulties they experienced during CP initiatives, especially internal resistance from various quarters to both change itself and to the concepts of this reform. There was also a significant amount of agreement among them when they were asked the question, "What is needed to address the problems of CP?" These similarities occurred despite the fact that departments were in different phases of implementation and sometimes defined CP in idiosyncratic terms. Additionally, commonalities were expressed even when there were disparities in programs and projects in the length of time agencies were committed to the concept; however, each agency had a unique perspective on what CP meant in their context and virtually all believed that important successes were being achieved.

There were three issues that surfaced repeatedly and were mentioned by several presenters: First, high on most everyone's list was the internal "resistance" from officers to the concept of CP itself. Whether this was essentially due to "normal" organizational inertia (i.e., the fear of change) or due to a philosophical antagonism toward CP grounded in experience seemed to vary. Most speakers gave examples of some level of employee reluctance to "buy into" CP reforms. While some Conference representatives suggested that the source of this resistance came from line officers, others allowed that their agencies had faced resistance from middle and upper management levels during the implementation of community policing. Chief Robert Olson from Minneapolis Police Department noted that this resistance seemed grounded upon the natural tendency of traditional officers to resist change. This resistance was also thought by others to be based on a misguided perception on the part of officers that community policing is not "real police work" but social work, and therefore, falls outside of their area of responsibility (i.e., "its not my job!"). At least one speaker pointed out that patrol officers were resistant to change because they believed that there was little genuine support for the concept by supervisors and command staff.

A few presenters offered recommendations on how to overcome this obstacle. For example, Assistant Chief Terrell Bolton, Dallas Police Department, suggested that officers need to be shown that problem solving works, especially the veteran officers whose careers have largely been built on a more traditional approach. He illustrated this through a narrative about neighborhood bar/nightclub which posed several problems for patrol officers, but was closed for code violations resulting in fewer calls for service and a decline in crime related to that location. This example demonstrated to the officers that problem solving was an effective approach and led to results that were linked to their own experiences. Communicating such a success became an important way to convince reluctant officers that CP-based programs do have worth.

Commander Garrett Zimmon, Los Angeles Police Department, offered an interesting model as an alternative strategy to overcome officer resistance. He suggested as a general observation that about one-third of all officers tend to support the CP approach from the beginning, another third seemed to be largely undecided, and a final third will likely never give their endorsement to the program. Zimmon said that too many resources were spent trying to encourage the latter group to support CP concepts and programs. He recommended that focusing on the recalcitrant group tended to divert resources that could be better used to nurture positive attitudes among the officers who are undecided. If approximately two-thirds of the officers embrace CP approaches, at least to some extent, then the chances for successful

implementation will be increased. In short, some level of resistance can be tolerated and by-passed without jeopardizing the entire program itself.

Several presenters not only highlighted resistance from patrol officers as an obstacle, but also negative attitudes from command- and supervisory-level personnel that in turn impoverished the leadership for change. The vision of CP is often articulated by the police chief, but opposition from a significant portion of the command staff or at least a reluctance to fully "buy into" the program seemed to be fairly common among the departments. In fact, several agency representatives pointed out examples of instances they faced in obtaining command staff acquiescence for CP programs. One factor that explains this lack of support from command-level staff reflected bureaucratic politics: it was perceived to be "the Chief's program," thereby linking the concept and "buy-in" to a particular person (for example, the perception in the LAPD that CP was essentially the "brain child" a new outside Chief, Chief Williams, rather than a more generic effort at reforming endemic problems with the basic police strategies and practices.

Other agency spokespersons highlighted the difficulty in trying to get the command staff to realize that community policing was here to stay, regardless of who was Chief. Assistant Chief Bolton stated that some of the command staff in DPD were concerned that the line officers would rebel because crime was decreasing before the implementation of community policing. DPD wanted officers to change their way of doing business, despite the fact that crime was decreasing. The adage A"don't fix what isn't broken" explained some of the attitudes that surfaced during the initial phases of CP.

A second major obstacle to implementing community policing which was described by several presenters was the **LACK OF APPROPRIATE EVALUATION TOOLS**. Deputy Superintendent Charles Ramsey from the Chicago Police Department asked, "How do you evaluate police effectiveness and performance under community policing?" This struggle to define and measure both efficiency and effectiveness addresses two issues: How do you evaluate the impact of specific CP programs? and How do you evaluate police officer's performance with this different approach to policing? This age-old difficulty rests largely on the fact that reward systems have been traditionally-based, measuring activity rather than performance or outcomes.

Most police departments still assess officers' and their department's success based on the number of arrests, citations, calls for service answered, and response time, despite the rhetoric to the contrary. Such problematic measures for departments implementing community policing do not seem to be "withering away."The Conference speakers concluded that the challenge is to develop evaluation tools which can measure problem-solving, innovation, and results. Unfortunately, these evaluation tools are difficult to construct and their use in police departments is not widespread. Therefore, this is not only an obstacle, but also a challenge for the future of community policing. If the community policing effort is going to be sustained, appropriate evaluation tools must be developed.

In addition to the two major issues: resistance from traditionally-minded officers (both line and command-level) and the lack of organizational support in administering a different reward system based on CP performance criteria, several speakers emphasized the problem of economic limitations they encountered in sustaining efforts for long-term establishment of CP programs. Embedded within

COPS funding mechanisms, as well as localized funding problems, the initial phases even if successful encountered funding problems. Major cities still face severe problems owing to a slowly growing tax base and finding the essential public resources to support and to sustain programmatic efforts aimed at institutionalizing CP efforts. This issue is perhaps the most complex and troublesome if lasting reforms are to be accomplished. A follow-up conference that explores both the national and local solutions was suggested by virtually all of the speakers.

CORE CHALLENGES STILL FACING COMMUNITY POLICING

Robert W. Taylor, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Criminal Justice
University of North Texas

For the past decade, we have witnessed the rhetoric and reality of changes in American law enforcement stemming from the implementation of community policing. Fueled in large part by a few select works and studies beginning in the late 1980s, such as "Broken Windows" (Wilson and Kelling, 1985), "Policing Houston: Reducing Fear and Improving Services" (Brown and Wycoff, 1987), <u>Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News, Virginia</u> (Eck, Spelman, et. al, 1987), and <u>Problem-Oriented Policing</u> (Goldstein, 1990), law enforcement has been trying to change from a closed, incident-driven, and reactive bureaucracy to a more open, dynamic, quality-oriented partnership with the community. No one can argue with the virtues of quality service expressed in the tenets of community policing, nor can they disagree with the mission and philosophy of a proactive, information-based organization committed to community problem-solving, to safeguarding basic human and constitutional rights and to public scrutiny and accountability. After all, these are the lofty goals that police in a democratic society have always heralded.

Indeed, the philosophy of community policing is value-laden with all of the "good" virtues expressed by people governing themselves. The problems with community policing are <u>not</u> with the philosophy and mission, but rather with the implementation of change (Taylor and Kenney). Interestingly, the same core challenges facing community policing today were identified, in part, as those faced by team policing during the 1970s (Wycoff and Kelling, 1978). Lack of planning and a thorough understanding of the concept itself, failure to provide structural changes to mesh with changed direction, new programs being seen as "organizational add-ons", ideas imposed from the top or from outside the organization without support from lower ranks, and costly ventures yielding little or no empirical evidence to show success were all cited as reasons for the failure of team policing. Hence, as with team policing, the core challenges facing community policing are not with the concept but rather with the definition and implementation process.

Illustratively, we still argue as to the definition of community policing. In some cities it is the addition of a bike patrol or extra officers assigned to the gang unit, in others it is officers assigned to the DARE program or being the leader in a neighborhood crime watch meeting. The problem of course, is that community policing has been defined in so many different ways that the evaluation of specific programs has been benign. The result is that "what works" in community policing is relegated to a few initiatives highlighted in a few, select cities across the country.

Do we really see most of the changes once espoused by community policing advocates? How many departments have actually changed the entrance requirements for new officers to reflect changes in the police role? How many departments have flattened their organizational pyramid and placed more decision-making in the hands of the officers? How many chiefs have turned the organization "upside down" and have committed to participatory dialogue with officers as a major part of their management style? How many departments have actually changed their organizational culture? How many departments have structurally changed on a city-wide basis? Unfortunately, I submit to you …. only a very select few!

Once again, it would be fool-hearty to argue against the concept or philosophy of community policing. Who could be against a closer working relationship between the police and the community, against proactive and preventative policing, against information-based and participatory management, against the responsiveness of the government to public demand. Unfortunately these are only words which have found themselves in mission and value statements, but rarely in meaningful, structural and long-lasting changes reflected in police departments across the country. To be successful, community policing must confront and hurdle four core challenges in the future.

There is precious little empirical evidence that supports the idea that community policing has a positive impact on community perception of the police or crime reduction.

Few studies point to successful programs of change. Even the millions of dollars recently spent by the COPS office on evaluating community policing focuses on specific programs rather than holistic studies of the concept itself. A problem which hints to the politicalization of the concept itself. But much more importantly, how do we measure prevention of crime? How do we document all that has gone on in the last ten years? How can we be sure that "community" policing ventures were more important in reducing a specific crime over more "traditional" tactics like saturation patrol, directed investigations, zero tolerance, and strong enforcement of curfew and truancy laws. Quite simply, we cannot.

Community policing is a "reform" movement for urban policing having vague conceptualization and limited empirical testing. Murphy (1988) writes that a combination of methodologically limited research and reform ideals has allowed community policing advocates to effectively discredit the ideology, organization, and strategies of conventional policing. In reality, the empirical evidence that traditional policing methods have failed is at best mixed. To be successful, we must be able to design empirically strong studies which "test" community policing. These studies must evaluate the concept itself holistically and not simply a special program implemented under the rubric of community policing.

Community policing demands a systemic change in all of city government.

Community policing requires changes in not only the police but also in the other components of the criminal justice system. Indeed, community policing requires an entire city-wide change toward community government. City services must be coordinated and cooperative ventures between governmental agencies. The police cannot be an isolated group within a city trying to address major social problems without the combined commitment and resources of the entire city. Police must be

able to pass the "baton" to other agencies more appropriately designed to address many social problem, often times, first encountered by the police. Contrary to public opinion, the police <u>cannot</u> be all things to all people. They have a very specific set of skills and accompanying training, and are well equipped to handle crime-related problems. Long term counseling, social work, trash pick-up, and inspirational speaking may not be the best fit for the police. These are most certainly not reflective of current police training academies. As we discussed, police still hire the same type of individuals, and to the most part, train them the same way as twenty years ago.

Much more importantly, police continue to promote based on the same criteria used under traditional policing methodologies (i.e. civil service examinations, adherence to affirmative action policies). Personnel evaluation systems have not reflected changes in the police role nor do rewards for police follow community policing standards. Of course there are exceptions, but these are rare and far between. The realities speak the truth -- few police departments have actually changed. The organizational culture within policing still reflects a punitive-based, top-down hierarchy which is very cloistered and inflexible. In order to take the next step, city governments must become much more decentralized and responsive to community needs. Teams of city agencies (which include the police) must be managed together in a problem-solving, goal-oriented methodology.

Community policing has been too "politicized"

Unfortunately, community policing has become the "buzz" word of the last decade. If a department was not involved in community policing then it was labeled backward, stationary, or non-progressive. And for those few scholars and practitioners that questioned the concept, they were branded "heretics". In today's world of federal grants and the wake of the 1996 Crime Bill, police chiefs and academicians have too much at stake in criticizing community policing. One chief of police recently indicated (on a private basis) that he believed community policing was "bull ___" invented by a few well-meaning individuals to try something new. Unfortunately, he also admitted that he (like many of his colleagues) could not afford to be public about community policing. There simply is too much at stake….free officers and free federal money for those involved in community policing. Community policing is now big business, and those individuals managing police departments understand, all too well, the political ramifications of heading a movement against what is deemed as somehow more progressive and better than the status quo.

It is interesting that we needed to invent a new concept … community policing. Good police management always included breaking down the barriers between the community and the police, changing the organizational culture to be more participatory and less punitive, flattening the structural pyramid, decentralizing when necessary, and developing key partnerships with other community organizations. And good policing always included being information driven, using crime analysis to develop short and long-term strategies, safeguarding and protecting constitutional rights of individual citizens, emphasizing quality over quantity, and being proactive and preventive. It seems that somewhere along the line, people forgot that good policing and hence, good police management did many of the "things" we attach only to community policing. Maybe, we need to drop the rhetoric of "community" policing and focus on good policing and good police management!

Unfortunately, the buzz words of community policing (and there are a thousand acronyms for community policing) have a tendency to infer a short-term fix to a problem -- a time-proven political technique designed to address symptoms rather than root causes of major social problems. Community policing was never envisioned to be short term. Sadly, few initiatives have been adequately evaluated, and many good efforts implemented under the community policing rubric will eventually go the way of "team policing" -- passing quietly into the night a yet another new "movement" begins under a different political posturing. And make no doubt about it.....community policing is headed on the path of being a political scapegoat just as its predecessor (team policing) did in the late 1970s.

What will happen when Federal grants which support community policing cease? Since the passage of the Crime Bill in 1994, over $3.3 billion have been awarded directly to police departments to hire an additional 61,000 officers dedicated to community policing in about 9,000 agencies . An additional $1.5 billion has been spent on new, specific community policing programs and projects. High costs in terms of money and people appears to be an indicative feature of community policing, especially if officers are to have a small enough beat to make a difference or if a department is to maintain a high level of response while developing a new strategy for each neighborhood. As federal money becomes much more difficult to obtain and cities start to bear the burden of financing extra officers and programs themselves, community policing will face much more scrutiny and criticism. New political leadership will most assuredly point to the great financial costs of community policing in an attempt to justify their own position. Community policing will be further politicized as national debate focuses on the search for a new president. What will be the empirical evidence of success? What did we change with a $25 billion Crime Bill? How did we spend all of that money and what do we have to show for it?

Community policing is riding the facade of success.

Politically, community policing can only be justified as "successful." Crime is down, violent acts in most major cities are down, unemployment is down, the number of youth between 14 and 21 years is down, and the general economy is doing well. Unfortunately and most dangerously, some police chiefs and most politicians are taking credit for these statistics. Policing needs to be very careful! What will happen after we have built a public expectation that the police can do all things for all people? What will happen when the wave crests....when unemployment starts to creep-up, the economy shrinks, inflation builds, cutback management highlights the federal agenda, and the new "boom" generation hits the criminal justice system? Will tension further increase between minorities and police and erupt in frustration and riot? During these times, will the police still be able to afford store-front operations, graffiti patrols, crime watch , DARE programs, and other community policing projects? Or, will the police be mandated to respond more effectively to 911 calls?

The issues facing community policing are no different than the issues confronting policing in general. Where do we go from here? The answer is quite simple, we continue to press forward in a positive manner, understanding that change is difficult and evolutionary. Police need to refine the concept of what good policing is and "tweak" their departments to meet existing cultural and organizational demands. We no longer need the buzz words of community policing, but we desperately need the strong leaders that have taken bold risks in an attempt to find out "what works and

what doesn't." We still need those individuals courageous enough to try something new, to bridge a new communication and information age, and to open-up a new dialogue with communities of the future. In essence, we need to understand that team policing of the 1970s and community policing of the 1990s represent only the beginning stages of change and that the process has only just begun. Community policing advocates a necessary and important reform. Its recognition of the close relationship of crime to other social problems is a big step in the evolution of American policing. Our immediate job is to safeguard the many worthy efforts of the community policing movement by squarely facing the challenges posed, understanding the inherent nature of police in our society.

REFERENCES

Brown, L. & Wycoff, M.A. (1987). Policing Houston: Reducing fear and improving service. Crime and Delinquency, 33 (1), 71-89.

Eck, J., Spelman, W., Hill, D., Stephens, D., & Murphy, G. R. (1987). Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News, Virginia. Washington, D.C.: The Police Executive Research Forum.

Goldstein, H. (1990). Problem Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing.

Murphy, C. (1988). Community Problems, Problem Communities, and Community Policing in Toronto. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 25 (November), pp. 392-410.

Taylor, R. W. and Kenney, D. J. (1991). The Problems with Problem-Oriented Policing. Nashville, Tennessee: Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Science Annual Meeting.

Wilson, J.Q. & Kelling, G.L. (1985). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. In J.Q. Wilson (Ed.) Thinking About Crime. New York: First Vintage Books Edition, Random House, Inc. p. 77.

Wycoff, M.A. & Kelling, G. L. (1978). The Dallas Experience: Organizational Reform. Washington, D. C.: The Police Foundation.