

NCJRS

157531  
C.2

FEB 16 1995

ACQUISITIONS

# Community Policing for Safe Neighborhoods

---

# 2000

*Partnerships  
for the 21st Century*

## Conference Proceedings

---



Sponsored by:

**National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice**

**Arlington, Virginia  
August 23–25, 1993**

## Table of Contents

### The New Policing: Confronting Complexity

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Herman Goldstein, Evjue-Bascom Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin at Madison ..... | 5 |
|---|---|

### Keynote Speakers:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Michael J. Russell, Acting Director, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice .....                 | 15 |
| John Wilson, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice .....         | 16 |
| The Honorable Lee P. Brown, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President..... | 16 |
| The Honorable Janet Reno, Attorney General of the United States .....  | 21 |

### Panel Presentations:

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Street Level Community Policing .....   | 27  |
| Community Policing Evaluations .....  | 33  |
| Street Level Drug Enforcement .....   | 37  |
| International Panel on Community Policing .....   | 41  |
| Use of Civil Remedies as Alternative Sanctions.....   | 45  |
| Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Education .....   | 49  |
| The Homeless in the Community.....  | 51  |
| Hot Spots of Crime .....  | 55  |
| Personnel Issues in Community Policing.....   | 57  |
| Bureau of Justice Assistance's Community-Oriented Policing Demonstration Program and Prototype .....  | 61  |
| How Abuse of Force Can Undermine Community Policing .....   | 65  |
| Training Workshop: First Line Supervision for Community Policing .....                                | 69  |
| Drug Use Forecasting and Community Policing .....   | 71  |
| Union Perspectives on Community Policing .....  | 73  |
| Partnership Panel: Local Efforts to Rebuild Communities .....   | 75  |
| Community Policing in Small Cities and Rural Areas .....  | 79  |
| Training Workshop: Alternative Dispute Resolution .....   | 81  |
| Training Workshop: Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act in Law Enforcement Agencies ..... | 83  |
| Executive Forum: Law Enforcement Executives Face the Issues .....                                     | 85  |
| Plenary Panel: Community Partnerships in American Cities .....  | 89  |
| Community Policing and Criminal Justice System Partnerships.....                                      | 93  |
| Drug Market Analysis .....  | 97  |
| Family Violence: Child Abuse and Community Policing .....   | 101 |
| Community Policing and High Risk Youth .....  | 105 |
| Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.....                                  | 107 |
| Training Workshop: Policing Immigrant Communities .....   | 109 |

Issues in Citizen-Police Partnerships ..... 113

Community Policing and Accreditation ..... 117

National Service: How It Can Help Community Policing ..... 119

Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ..... 121

Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Labor, Youth Fair Chance/  
Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) Program ..... 125

Training Workshop: Law Enforcement Response to Child Abuse ..... 129

Triad Program: Community Connections with the Elderly ..... 131

Varieties of Community Policing Around the Country ..... 135

Mobilizing Municipal Services for Community Policing ..... 139

Police/Public Health Partnerships ..... 141

Partnership Panel: Bureau of Justice Assistance ..... 143

Training Workshop: Performance Measurement and Appraisal of  
Community Policing ..... 145

Plenary Panel: Community Government ..... 147

Community Policing in Public Housing ..... 153

School Violence: Partnerships for Community Policing ..... 157

Mediating Disputes in the Community ..... 161

Technology and Community Safety ..... 165

Partnership Panel: Office for Victims of Crime ..... 167

Training Workshop: Introduction to Problem Solving ..... 169

**Appendix, List of Presenters**

## The New Policing: Confronting Complexity

---

### **Herman Goldstein, Evjue-Bascom Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin at Madison**

Community policing is well on its way to becoming a common term in households throughout the nation. That is a satisfying development for many, but it causes some anxiety and discomfort for others. What accounts for the mixed reactions?

Under the rubric of community policing, progressive police administrators and interested citizens have, for more than a decade, been working hard to design and implement a form of policing that better meets the extraordinary demands on the police in the 1990s. Within these circles, the term *community policing* has been used to embrace and intricately weave together initiatives that have long been advocated for modern-day policing. I think it fair to say that these explorations have stimulated more productive thought and experimentation than has occurred at any previous time in the history of policing in this country. These efforts, taken together, have created a new feeling of excitement and optimism in a field that has desperately needed an injection of both. It is understandable, therefore, why the current wave of popular support for community policing is so welcome in many quarters. It gives a tremendous impetus to these new initiatives.

The downside of this new-found popularity is that the title of the concept, community policing, is widely used without any concern for its substance. Political leaders and, unfortunately, many police leaders hook onto the label for the positive images it projects, but do not engage with—or invest in—the concept. Some police personnel, relying on little more than the title, fight initiatives bearing the community

policing label because they believe they constitute an effort to placate an overly-demanding and critical segment of the community intent on exercising more control over their operations. The popularity of the term has resulted in its being used to encompass practically all innovations in policing, from the most ambitious to the most mundane, from the most carefully

---

***“The downside of this new-found popularity is that the title of the concept, community policing, is widely used without any concern for its substance.”***

---

thought-through to the most casual. And in the larger public forum, the label is being used in ways that increase public expectations of the police, that create the impression that, somehow, on implementation, community policing will provide a panacea for not only crime, disorder, and racial tensions, but many of the other acute problems that plague our urban areas.

With such varied meanings and such broad expectations, the use of the term *community policing* creates enormous problems for those seriously interested in effecting meaningful change in the police. Carefully developed initiatives bearing the community policing label, fragile by their very nature, are endangered because superficial programs are so vulnerable to attack.

I understand the craving for a clear definition of community policing. I empathize with the officer who has instructions from his or her chief to

implement community policing in 60 days. And I feel for those in attendance here who may be expected—by those who have paid your way—to bring home a kit that will enable you to quickly put community policing in place. By the end of the conference, you will have learned much that will be helpful, useful, and even subject to immediate implementation. But at the risk of increasing levels of frustration, I want to argue that *the single, most important message you can take away from this conference is that the overriding need in attempting to effect change in policing is to confront the complexity of the task.*

We all value communicating about concepts clearly and in simplified terms. But simplification, in my view, has been the greatest enemy of progress in policing. The field already suffers severely precisely because so much in policing is oversimplified. Let me illustrate.

The police labor heavily under the burden of being held responsible for dealing with enormous generic problems such as crime, violence, and disorder. These are simple, convenient terms. But their common and indiscriminate use hides the enormous complexity of the police task. How are the police supposed to deal with these amorphous, overwhelming problems? Through equally generic responses—like law enforcement or patrol—simple terms commonly used by the public without any awareness of the methods they embrace and their value. If community policing takes its place alongside law enforcement as still another simplistic, generic response to a simplistic characterization of the police function, not much will have been gained and the concept will quickly lose its credibility. One understandable reaction to this dilemma is to press for definition and simplification, to seek to reach agreement on a pure model of community policing so that the impostors, on being measured against it, will be exposed. This pressure for

simplification is joined by well-intentioned practitioners who, left behind after the cheerleading, understandably want to know—in specific detail—what they are supposed to do.

I find it helpful to go back to basics—to acknowledge, at the outset, what is rarely acknowledged. The policing of a free, diverse, and vibrant society is an awesome, complex task. The police are called upon to deal with an incredible array of quite different behavioral problems, each perplexing in its own way. The police have tremendous power—to deny freedom and to use force, even to take a life. Individual officers exercise enormous discretion in using their authority and in making many decisions affecting our lives. The very quality of life in this country and the equilibrium of our cities depend on the way in which the police function is carried out.

Given the awesome, complex nature of the police function, it follows that designing the arrangements and the organization to carry it out is equally complex. Yet, not enough systematic attention has been given to meeting these needs over the years. We are now in a period in which more such attention is being given to the police function than at any prior time. We ought not to lose patience because we have not yet come up with the perfect model. And we ought not get hung up on trying to simplify change primarily so that we can give uniform meaning to a single, catchy, and politically attractive phrase. *We*

---

***“We ought not to lose patience because we have not yet come up with the perfect model.”***

---

*are engaged in nothing less than rethinking, in all of its multiple dimensions, the arrangement for the policing of our society. We ought to use this unique opportunity to*

move more aggressively to confront the complexity in what we are trying to do. We need to open up explorations, rather than prematurely close them down. We need to better understand the complicated, rather than search for the simple.

Some might argue I've overstated the need, that we can get going without taking on the enormous task of developing a master plan for redesigning policing in this country. I agree that you can get going. Many of you have. And I would urge the others among you to do so. I would exhort you to implement some of the most common changes associated with community policing, as, for example, the permanent assignment of officers to specific beats with a mandate to get to know and relate to the community. I sense there is now widespread and very persuasive support for decentralization, permanent assignments, and the development of partnerships with the community. But in implementing these changes, I would urge you to do so with at least an awareness of the larger picture.

Meaningful, lasting change in policing cannot be achieved in isolation. Policing is like a large, intricate, complex apparatus with many parts. Change of any one part requires changes in many others and in the way the parts fit together. For example, you may be able to quickly alter the way in which officers are assigned and how they patrol. But for the full value of such changes to be realized, and for them to be sustained, you will ultimately need to make changes in the organization and leadership of a police department; in its staffing, supervision, training, and recruitment; and in its internal working environment. Thus, a change in direction requires more than tinkering; it requires, if it is to be effective, simultaneously orchestrating change in many areas affecting the enterprise. This requires careful planning and coordination, and perhaps most

important, it requires time, patience, and learning from our experience.

I've painted a rather broad perspective (and a very ambitious, difficult agenda for change), but even this perspective is not sufficiently broad. To succeed in improving policing, we need to move beyond focusing exclusively on the police agency. We need urgently to alter the public's expectations of the police, and we need to revise the fundamental provisions that we as a society make for carrying out the police function. We need, for example, to refine the authority granted the police (to curtail it in some areas and expand it in others). We need to recognize the discretion exercised by the police and provide means for its review and control. We need to provide the police with the resources that enable them to get their job done. We need, in other words, without any compromise in our commitment to democratic values, to bring *expectations* and *capacity* more into

---

***“We need urgently to alter the public's expectations of the police, and we need to revise the fundamental provisions that we as a society make for carrying out the police function.”***

---

sync so that a job increasingly labeled as *impossible* is *possible*.

Having dumped this rather heavy load on you, let me try to clarify what I mean by the multi-branched nature of change in policing by examining, in some detail, five different branches along which we are currently moving. They are illustrative. I am not, by any means, trying to be comprehensive. I intend to describe the specific development and identify some of the complexities it raises. In the course of doing this, I hope to illustrate the

interrelationship and interdependence of the many factors affecting change in policing.

*1. Refining the police function and public expectations.*

The new forms of policing broaden the police function from crime fighting, without any abdication of that role, to responding to the broader range of functions in which the police are engaged. Maintaining order, dealing with quality of life offenses, and fixing the "broken windows" are now recognized as much more important than previously thought to be. The police have become more proactive, committed to preventing incidents rather than simply reacting to them. These shifts in emphasis appear to have gained widespread support.

But we need to open our eyes to the avalanche of business that this open-ended definition of the police function invites, lest it constitute a serious self-inflicted wound. The volume and nature of the miscellaneous tasks that accrue to the police are infinite. Current cutbacks in other government services are steadily adding to their number. In areas that are starved for social services, the slightest improvement in police response generates more business for the police. As a flooding river finds the lowlands, the incredible array of miscellaneous problems that surface in a large urban area will find their way to the agency most willing to accept them.

If you have not personally experienced this phenomenon, talk to the officer assigned to a specific neighborhood with a broad mandate to improve service. Within a very short period of time, the officer is overwhelmed by a need for services that—despite the greatest creativity and resourcefulness—far exceeds his or her capacity to deliver.

Very often, the police can do more to satisfy citizen needs. They can identify problems and take actions that result in mitigating or solving them, when they are

given the time and license to do so. But in the larger scheme of things, the need to *reduce* public expectations is every bit as important as the need to broaden the police function—not simply to make limited resources fit the demand, but for more complex reasons. Many of the most troublesome aspects of policing stem from the pressure that has been exerted on the police to appear omnipotent, to do more than they are authorized, trained, and equipped to do. Police tend to like challenges. The challenge to fill needs—to live up to one's image as omnipotent—has led to the taking of short cuts, the stretching of authority, and, as a consequence, the potential for abuse of that authority. It is dysfunctional to compound this syndrome. And it is demoralizing to the thoughtful, dedicated officer to create the expectation that he or she can do more than take the edge off of some of the more intractable problems that the police confront.

The new policing seeks to make the police job more achievable by realigning what the police do and do not do by giving higher priority to some tasks and lower priority to others, by reducing public expectations and leveling with the public about police capacity, by engaging the public in taking steps to help themselves, and by connecting with other agencies and the private sector so that there is someone there to whom to throw the ball. We need to invest much more, in our individual communities, in working through the questions that arise in trying to achieve this better alignment.

*2. Getting involved in the substance of policing.*

A common theme in initiatives under the community policing umbrella is the emphasis on improving relationships with the citizenry. Such improvement is vital in order to reduce tensions, develop mutual trust, promote the free exchange of

information, and acquaint officers with the culture and life style of those being policed.

Improved relationships are important in and of themselves. They would constitute a major advance in some cities. But many would argue that they merely lay the groundwork and create an environment in which to strive for more. When citizens ask if community policing works, they are not so much interested in knowing if the community likes the police or if the police are getting along with the community. Rather, they usually want to know if the community policing initiative has had an impact on the problems of concern to them—their fear of using the streets, the abandoned cars in the neighborhood, or the gang that has been intimidating them. If the initiatives that have been taken do not go beyond improving relationships, the risk is created that community policing will become just another means by which police operate without having a significant, demonstrable impact on the problems the police are expected to handle.

This tendency in policing to become preoccupied with means over ends is obviously not new. It was this concern that gave rise to my own work on problem-oriented policing. I continue to feel strongly that the police must give more substance to community policing by getting more involved in analyzing and responding to the specific problems citizens bring to their attention.

This calls for a much heavier investment within policing in understanding the varied pieces of their business, just as the medical field invests in understanding different diseases. This means that police, more than anyone else, should have a detailed understanding of such varied problems as homicides involving teenage victims, drive-by shootings, and carjacking, and it means that, at the micro level, a beat officer should have in-depth knowledge about the corner drug house, the rowdy

teenage gang that assembles at the convenience store each Friday night, and the panhandler who harasses passersby on a given street corner. Analyzing each of these quite different problems in depth leads to the realization that what may work for one will not work for the other, that each may require a different combination of responses. That is the beginning of wisdom in policing; one size clearly does not fit all.

Problem-solving, as I have described it, is being integrated into community policing initiatives in many jurisdictions. It dominates the commitment to change in some jurisdictions. The need to focus on specific substantive pieces of police business is commendably reflected in this conference, where workshops have been scheduled on such problems as the homeless, family violence, high risk youth, immigrants, child abuse, the elderly, and school violence.

We need to direct more of the momentum associated with community policing to focusing on these and similar problems. Smarter policing in this country

---

***“...it means that, at the micro level, a beat officer should have in-depth knowledge about the corner drug house, the rowdy teenage gang that assembles at the convenience store each Friday night, and the panhandler who harasses passersby on a given street corner.”***

---

requires a sustained effort within policing to research substantive problems, to make use of the mass of information and data on specific problems accumulated by individual police agencies, to experiment with different alternative responses, to evaluate these

efforts, and to share the results of these evaluations with police throughout the country. I wish we could do more to reorient the work of research and development units in police departments and to entice some of the best minds in the field of criminology and related specialties to assist in these efforts. The police should not only make greater use of research done by others; they should themselves be engaged in research.

3. *Rethinking the relationship between the police and the criminal justice system.*

Buried in all of the rhetoric relating to community policing is the fact that, with little notice and in subtle ways, the long-standing relationship between the police and the criminal justice system is being redefined. This is a radical change. But it is given scant attention in the literature on community policing, and the full consequences of the changes—and their relationship to some of the developments most commonly associated with community policing—have not been adequately explored.

Since the 1960s, it has been customary to refer to the police as an integral part of the criminal justice system. It has long been recognized that the role of the police in enforcing the criminal law has an overwhelming, pervasive influence on the police—on the shape of their organizations, the attitudes and priorities of personnel, and their relationship to the community. Police officers are referred to, significantly, as "law enforcement officers." The public expects a police officer, first and foremost, to be committed to enforcing the criminal law. The felt need for objectivity and neutrality in law enforcement results in the police being characterized as having no discretion. And the commitment to enforcement carries with it a commitment on the part of the police to inflating their capacity to enforce the law in the hope that their image, if not their real

capacity, will reduce crime and disorder to a minimum.

Advanced forms of community policing reject many of these characteristics of present-day policing. A neighborhood police officer, for example, is expected to have a much broader interest than simply enforcing the criminal law—to exhaust a wide range of alternatives before resorting to arrest for minor offenses, to exercise broad discretion, and to depend more on resourcefulness, persuasion, and cajoling than on coercion, image, and bluff.

Reconciling these different perspectives has always been difficult. Some would even argue the two postures are incompatible. Simplistically, they are often

---

***"A neighborhood police officer, for example, is expected to have a much broader interest than simply enforcing the criminal law—to exhaust a wide range of alternatives before resorting to arrest for minor offenses, to exercise broad discretion, and to depend more on resourcefulness, persuasion, and cajoling than on coercion, image, and bluff."***

---

distinguished as the "hard" and "soft" approaches in policing. But as a result of a sequence of developments in the past decade, the tension between the two approaches has been narrowed.

What has happened? So long as the police were so intricately intertwined with the criminal justice system, they came to depend more heavily on the system. Thus, as violence and especially crimes associated with drugs increased, the police made more

and more arrests of serious offenders. To deal with disorder on the streets, they arrested thousands of minor offenders as well—often stretching their authority somewhat, as police are pressured to do—in order to restore order. Predictably, the criminal justice systems in most large urban areas—and many smaller ones as well—have been overwhelmed to the point that it is no longer possible for the systems to accept some serious offenders, let alone minor ones.

The consequences of facing up to the limited capacity of the criminal justice system are more far-reaching than is commonly recognized. Police can no longer use arrest, as they so freely did in the past, to deal with a wide variety of ambiguous situations. Moreover, the amorphous aura of authority on which the police have so heavily depended for getting so much of their job done, rooted in their capacity to arrest, has been greatly diluted. Police officers today are simply not as powerful and threatening, in the eyes of those who most frequently come in contact with them, because they can no longer use the criminal justice system as they once did.

What does this mean for some of the central themes under the community policing umbrella? It means that there are new, pragmatic reasons for searching intensively for alternatives to the criminal justice system as the way in which to get the police job done.

It also means that there is now an added incentive to cultivate positive relationships with the community. The police need to replace the amorphous authority that they previously derived from the criminal justice system and on which they have depended so heavily in the past. What better way to do this than arm themselves with what Robert Peel characterized in 1829 as that most powerful form of authority, the "public approval of their existence, actions, and behavior." The

congested state of affairs in the criminal justice system means, too, that the police must conserve their use of that system for those situations in which it is most appropriate and potentially most effective. This latter need should lead the police and others committed to community policing to enthusiastically join Attorney General Janet Reno in speaking out for a more sensible national criminal justice policy—one that curbs the indiscriminate overuse of the system which, unchecked, will draw scarce funds away from the police and from preventive programs where they can do more good.

#### 4. *Searching for alternatives.*

The diversification of policing—the move from primary dependence on the criminal law to the use of a wide range of different responses—is among the most significant changes under the community policing umbrella. It enables the police to move away from having to "use a hammer (the criminal justice system) to catch a fly." It enables them to fine tune their responses. It gives them a range of options (or tools) that, in their number and variety, come closer to matching the number and variety of problems they are expected to handle. These may include informal, common-sense responses used in the past but never formally authorized.

The primary and most immediate objective in authorizing the police to use a greater range of alternatives is to achieve greater effectiveness. Quite simply, mediating a dispute, abating a nuisance, or arranging to have some physical barrier removed may—without making an arrest—be the best way to solve a problem.

But there are additional benefits in giving police officers a larger repertoire of responses. Currently, for example, one of the greatest impediments to improvement in policing is the strength of the police subculture. That subculture draws much of its strength from a secret shared among

police: that they are compelled to bend the law and take short-cuts in order to get their job done. Providing the police with legitimate, clear-cut means to carry out their functions enables them to operate more honestly and openly, and therefore has the potential for reducing the strength—and, as a consequence, the negative influence—of the police subculture.

The diversification of options is also responsive to one of the many complexities in the staffing of police agencies. It recognizes, forthrightly, the important role of the individual police officer as a decision maker—a role the officer has always had but that has rarely been acknowledged. Acknowledging and providing alternatives contributes toward redefining the job of a police officer by placing a value on thinking, on creativity, and on decisionmaking. It credits the officer with having the ability to analyze incidents and problems and, rather than respond as a robot, gives the officer the license to choose among appropriate responses.

But how do we move into this idyllic world in which we formally invest so much responsibility in the lowest-level employee, usually operating independently on the streets? Not quickly, that's for sure. Absent sufficient preparation, the results may be troublesome. This is especially so if officers, in their enthusiasm, blend together community support and their desire to please the community to justify using methods that are either illegal or improper. The empowerment of officers in a department that has a record of abuse or corruption is obviously much more problematic. Concern about control can dampen one's enthusiasm for all new forms of policing—until one recognizes that the controls on which we currently depend are much less effective than they are often thought to be.

The need to assure adequate controls of a more independent decision maker provides a good illustration of the

interconnection between and among needed changes in policing. Satisfying the need requires changes in recruitment standards and training, requires setting out guidance for the exercise of discretion, and requires, above all else, inculcating values in officers that, in the absence of specific directions, guide their decisionmaking. Meeting these needs, in turn, connects with the fifth and final dimension of change that I want to set before you.

##### *5. Changing the working environment in a police agency.*

If new forms of policing are to take hold, we must get much more serious about changing the working environment within police agencies. Much has been written about new management styles supportive of community policing. But with a few remarkable exceptions, relatively little has been achieved on the ground. And where modest changes have been made, they are often lost with a change in administration or when the handling of a single incident brings embarrassment to a department—resulting in a reversion to old styles of control.

By working environment, I refer primarily to the atmosphere and expectations that superiors set in relating to their subordinates.

We know all too well the environment in a tradition-bound department where managers, supported by a hefty book of rules, tend to supervise through a tight paramilitary, top-down form of control—perhaps reflecting the way in which they have historically sought to achieve control in the community.

*The initiatives associated with community policing cannot survive in a police agency managed in traditional ways.* If changes are not made, the agency sets itself up for failure. Officers will not be creative and will not show initiative if a high value continues to be placed on conformity. They will not be thoughtful if they are

required to adhere to regulations that are thoughtless. And they will not aspire to act

---

***“Officers will not be creative and will not show initiative if a high value continues to be placed on conformity. They will not be thoughtful if they are required to adhere to regulations that are thoughtless.”***

---

as mature, responsible adults if their superiors treat them as immature children.

In my observations of officers working in a newly defined mode, I've constantly been impressed by their enthusiasm—by their grasp of the concept, their appreciation of its many dimensions, and the skill with which they fill their new roles. I've watched officers flourish when they have been cut loose and assigned to a given neighborhood. They solve problems, motivate citizens to join together to do things for themselves, and create a feeling of security and goodwill. Equally important, the officers find their work demanding but very satisfying. We have, in rank-and-file officers, an enormous supply of talent, energy, and commitment that, under quality leadership, could rapidly transform American policing.

The major impediment to tapping this wellspring is our failure to engage and elicit a commitment from those having management and supervisory responsibilities. It is disheartening to witness a meeting of the senior staff of a police agency in which those in attendance are disconnected from and often openly hostile to changes initiated by the chief executive and supported by a substantial proportion of the rank-and file. It is equally disheartening to talk with police officers on the street and officers of lower supervisory

rank who cite their *superior*—rather than the *complexity of their job*—as their major problem.

Because this problem is of such magnitude and so frustrating, one is tempted to propose some bold—even radical—steps that legislative bodies and municipal chief executives might take to address it. Should early retirement be made more attractive for the recalcitrant? Should consideration be given to the proposals recently made in England—calling for the elimination of unnecessary ranks, with continued service in rank conditioned on periodic review, and a system of performance-based bonuses?

But before one can expect support for such measures, the public will need to be satisfied that police executives have exhausted whatever means are available to them for turning the situation around. And when one looks at what has been done, it is troubling to find that a department's investment in the reorientation of management and supervisory personnel often consisted of no more than "a day at the academy"—and sometimes not even that. How much of the frustration in eliciting support from management and supervision stems from the fact that agencies have simply not invested enough in engaging senior officers, in explaining why change is necessary, and in giving these supervisors and managers the freedom required for them to act in their new role?

Some efforts to deal with the problem have been encouraging. The adoption of total quality management (TQM) in policing has demonstrated very positive results and holds much promise. It ought to be encouraged. We should take an important lesson away from these experiences with TQM. Training to support changes of the magnitude now advocated in policing requires more than a one-shot effort consisting of a few classroom lectures. It requires a substantial commitment of time in different settings spread over a long period;

a special curriculum; the best facilitators; and the development of problems, case studies, and exercises that engage the participants. It requires the development of teamwork, in which subordinates contribute as much as superiors. And it requires that the major dimension of the training take the form of conscious change in the day-to-day interaction of personnel—not in a training setting—but on the job. That's admittedly a tall order.

#### *Conclusion*

I have described five different dimensions of change associated with community policing. I've tried, in doing so,

---

***“Training to support changes of the magnitude now advocated in policing requires more than a one-shot effort consisting of a few classroom lectures. It requires a substantial commitment of time in different settings spread over a long period. . . .”***

---

to illustrate the need for greater depth in our current change efforts, to illustrate the interrelationships and interdependence of the many pieces in the puzzle, and to illustrate, overall, the complexity of bringing a new configuration of policing into being.

Dwelling on complexity is risky, for it can be overwhelming and intimidating. It is difficult. It turns many people off. But for those who get involved, the results can be very rewarding.

I've been impressed by the

extraordinary accomplishments in policing in the past two decades by police agencies that have taken on some of these difficult tasks. We tend, in my opinion, to underestimate the reservoir of ability and commitment in police agencies—especially among rank-and-file officers. And we tend, also, to underestimate the willingness of individual citizens and community groups at the grass-roots level to engage with the police and to support change. Viewed collectively, these achievements should be a source of optimism and confidence as now, building on past progress and capitalizing on current momentum, we seek more aggressively to effect change that is deeper and more lasting.

But there is an even more compelling, overriding incentive to struggle with these complexities. In this country—this democracy of ours—we are being challenged today, as we have never been challenged in the past, to commit ourselves anew to our unique character—to the high value we as a nation place on diversity, on equality, on protecting individual rights, and on protecting the freedom of all citizens to move about freely and to enjoy a tranquil life. The social problems that threaten our character as a nation are increasing, not decreasing. It will take major changes—apart from those in the police—to reduce these problems. In this turbulent period, as we struggle with these problems, it is more important than ever that we have a police capacity that is sensitive, effective, and responsive to our unique needs—a police capacity that, above all else, is committed to protecting and extending democratic values. That is a high calling—and one that should inspire all of us to intensify our efforts.

## Keynote Speakers

---

### **Michael J. Russell, Acting Director, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice**

On behalf of the Institute and the U.S. Department of Justice, welcome to this national conference, "Community Policing for Safe Neighborhoods: Partnerships for the 21st Century." The key word in the conference title is "partnerships." The National Institute of Justice works in close partnership with bureaus in the Office of Justice Programs to serve state and local agencies. Those bureaus include the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Office for Victims of Crimes. NIJ also works in close partnership with police departments and criminal justice agencies across the country, with state, county, and local governments, and with executive branch departments such as Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Labor, and Education.

At this conference today are more than 700 participants from across the United States along with representatives from a number of foreign countries. Participants in this audience include chiefs of police and sheriffs from more than 50 cities and counties; line officers; and representatives from community organizations and all levels of government. Our purpose is to develop partnerships to fight crime and drugs and make communities safer places in which to live, to work, and to raise families. One of the keys to this joint effort is community policing.

The National Institute of Justice is the research and development arm of the Department of Justice. It was established by

Congress in 1968 and has worked to provide support for research and demonstration programs that will have the maximum impact to prevent and reduce crime and improve the criminal justice system.

Congress expanded the Institute's mandate under the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act and the 1990 Crime Control Act to identify what works and why among anticrime and antidrug programs nationwide. NIJ celebrates its 25th anniversary this year, 25 years of service to criminal justice. Much of that work has been devoted to determining which programs are succeeding in combating crime. More and more communities are now investing in community policing as a way of strengthening the critical tie between police and their communities.

The Institute has supported an ambitious research agenda in community policing and is now exploring measures of performance in community policing, recruitment of patrol officers, and case studies of model community policing programs. These are priority topics for NIJ under its 1993 program plan. The Institute is finalizing reports on community policing efforts in Madison, Wisconsin, and Houston, Texas, for publication later this year.

Identifying issues that will face the criminal justice community in the 21st century is a priority at the Institute. NIJ has established focus groups with police, corrections, and prosecutors to identify emerging issues. That way, federal resources can be focused now for maximum impact on those problems in the future. Recently, for example, the Institute brought together a group of newly appointed police chiefs and newly elected sheriffs from across the country to provide insights on emerging

issues. The Institute also is establishing a new Health and Justice Working Group to bring together the health and criminal justice communities on a number of health-related issues facing corrections, law enforcement, and victims' services. The Institute is also working on the development and transfer of technologies to make communities safer.

NIJ has been studying community policing for many years. Through the partnerships developed at this conference, we can transfer this research to action for communities across the country.

**John Wilson, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice**

This conference gives us the opportunity to take stock of what we know about the theory and practice of community policing. It comes at a time of heightened interest in the interaction of the community and the police. The police alone cannot solve the problems of crime and drug abuse that have been ruinous to many urban communities. Rebuilding neighborhoods requires the entire range of community resources to address unmet needs that contribute to crime and violence. Community-based approaches to delinquency, crime, and violence can restore the well-being of crime-ridden neighborhoods in this country.

Supporting community-centered solutions to problems is not a new concept. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), for example, has used this model in its gang violence, child abuse and neglect, missing and exploited children, school safety, and gang and drug policy programs. Each of these programs focuses on partnership-building, the development of an appropriate law enforcement response, problem-solving, networking, resource management, and job skills enhancement. OJJDP has also developed a comprehensive strategy for

addressing serious, violent, and chronic delinquency in our communities. The strategy calls for family support, community involvement, comprehensive delinquency programming, and an accountability-based system of intervention and graduated sanctions for delinquent youth.

OJJDP's community planning model includes active police involvement to identify problems, determine service needs, and develop program solutions. The National Institute of Justice has led the way in developing the theoretical basis and establishing the validity of the community policing model. The Bureau of Justice Assistance has implemented community policing in a variety of programs including the Weed and Seed program, in which law enforcement was linked to other municipal and social services to remedy neighborhood conditions that breed crime and deterioration. The program incorporated community policing strategies for both crime suppression and community-building, with community policing serving as a bridge to neighborhood-based services. Other BJA community-based programs included an innovative neighborhood-oriented policing program, the development of a comprehensive model for community oriented policing, and the new police hiring support program.

**The Honorable Lee P. Brown, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President**

Many of you this morning have been telling America what it may not want to hear: Our children are dying. They are killing and being killed. It is a problem for the general population, but it is a calamity in the African-American community. No less than 70 studies and editorials published in June 1992, by 10 scientific journals of the American Medical Association, point to a worsening of violence among our youth. In

the same month, headlines revealed that gunshot wounds were the second leading cause of death among all high-school-aged children in America. Auto accidents were the first cause of death in the general teenage population, but not in the African-American community. For over a decade now, homicide, usually by handgun, has been the number-one cause of death of young black males. A recent survey on gun violence reported that among suburban high-school-aged children, the homicide and suicide rate by gun was one per 100,000; in the inner cities, the rate was 28 per 100,000.

Many of you are familiar with another report issued in April 1992 by the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. It found that on an average day in 1991, 42 percent of African-American males aged 18 to 35 who lived in Washington, D.C., were in jail or prison, awaiting trial or sentencing, on probation or parole, or being sought under warrants for their arrest. That is a national shame. With respect to safety in the African-American community, federal health officials have identified six specific problems: immediate access to firearms; alcohol and drug abuse; drug trafficking; poverty; racial discrimination; and, most disturbing, a cultural acceptance of violent behavior. The federal Centers for Disease Control have cited these problems as contributing factors in making homicide the leading cause of death among young black men.

As the leading cause of death for any segment of the population, so widespread that it is tracked like a communicable disease, homicide should be put on the top of our domestic agenda. The problem, however, is not new; it is just worse. Marian Wright Edelman, in a recent publication, states that absent definitive action by this nation during the next four years, over a million American babies will be born at low birth weight, multiplying their risk of death or disability; over 140,000

babies will die before their first birthday; some 4.4 million babies will be born to unmarried women; some 2 million babies will be born to teen mothers; over 15,000 children, 19 or younger, will die by firearms; over 2,700 children under 5 will die by homicide; over 9,000 children, 19 or younger, will commit suicide; some 1.6 million young people, aged 16 to 24, will fail to complete high school; almost 600,000 children under 18 will be arrested for alcohol-related offenses, some 350,000 for drug offenses, and over 300,000 for violent crimes; some 7.9 million public school students will be suspended; and about 3.6 million infants will be born into poverty.

Such data should be used as a catalyst for change, not to reinforce stereotypes. People of good will will see in these data an argument for a massive national campaign to address the causes of violence in our society. However, we should be wary of those who would use the data to reinforce the belief that disadvantaged citizens are solely responsible for their powerlessness and should forever be relegated to the bottom rung on the ladder of opportunity and success.

Looking at the general increase in gun violence among children, the editor of the American Medical Association journal said, "Violence in America is a public health emergency." If that is so for the general population, then violence in the African-American community is a national disaster that is literally killing large portions of this generation. It is more than a public health emergency; it is a national scandal. Many of you have been beating the drum for years on this issue. It appears that you are beginning to be heard, at least by the medical profession. That is significant, because now, more than at any other time in the history of America, the police are being asked to cope with the collapse of a wide range of social institutions, a collapse that would have seemed unimaginable to our nation just a

generation ago. The consequences include a brisk gun trade and the ongoing AIDS epidemic.

Cops today are policing the debris of social and institutional collapse. The collapse includes the failure of primary and secondary schools in many of the nation's urban centers. It includes the lack of affordable health services and housing. It is marked by a dearth of residential care for people who are severely mentally ill. The ultimate safety net, the family, has also collapsed in many places. More and more American households are headed by single women with children, living in poverty.

Historically, there has been a direct correlation between wealth and crime. The less wealth one has, the more likely he or she is to be victimized by crime or convicted of a crime. In 1967, President Johnson's National Crime Control Commission stated that "studies of the distribution of crime rates in cities and of the conditions of life most commonly associated with high crime rates have been conducted for well over a century in Europe and for many years in the United States. These findings have been remarkably consistent: burglary, robbery, and serious assaults occurred in areas characterized by low income, low levels of education and vocational skills, high unemployment, and high population density." Clearly, that is as much a problem today as it was a quarter of a century ago. In fact, data from the Federal Reserve Bank and the Internal Revenue Service suggest the problem could get worse. Their data show that the top 1 percent of the American population has more combined wealth than the bottom 90 percent. In other words, 1 percent of America is richer than nearly everyone else combined. Unattended differences of this magnitude can turn police forces into occupation armies. No police officer in America wants his job relegated to that of border guard on the frontier between the rich and the poor.

The single most important crime prevention measure to guarantee the safety of our children, as they approach their teen years, is employment. Provide meaningful employment for everyone willing and able to work, and the crime rate in America will probably decline. That is why the recent passage of the President's economic plan was so important for this country and criminal justice.

Meaningful employment will save more lives than emergency rooms will. Over the years, it has become obvious that whatever the successes of traditional policing, police officers cannot work alone in the face of massive social dysfunction. Therefore, the police must form partnerships in the community and use all the resources of government, business, and schools to try to solve recurring problems. Otherwise, police will function only as responders to incidents, never getting to the causes of crime and violence. That is why I believe strongly in the concept of community policing.

When I served as police commissioner in New York City, we implemented community policing to let neighborhood people help identify and solve their own problems. Community policing also gives officers a chance to be more

---

***"Over the years, it has become obvious that whatever the successes of traditional policing, police officers cannot work alone in the face of massive social dysfunction."***

---

creative, to be independent in their approach to police work, and to use their intelligence in solving problems. Community policing is a partnership between the police and the law-abiding people to prevent crime, arrest

offenders, and find solutions to repeat problems.

Community policing is still being implemented in New York City and other cities throughout the nation. While it may be too early to draw firm conclusions, after one year of community policing, New York City experienced decreases in every major crime category for the first time in 36 years.

If crime grows, however, there will be a temptation to revert to the superficial reassurance of a paramilitary response. The police will be asked to maintain a repressive posture and prepare for battle. If urban conditions continue to worsen, pressure may mount to abandon community policing and use the police as occupying forces to put down disturbances. Sometimes overwhelming police numbers are required to ensure the peace, but more often they are not. An effective community-oriented police presence is a deterrent to neighborhood violence in the first place. Police officers should become permanent, highly visible fixtures in the neighborhood, known personally to the people who live or work there, especially to the young people. To revert to an "us against them" posture will make things worse, for both community residents and the police. A police officer permanently assigned to a neighborhood is a better deterrent to unrest than a SWAT team waiting in the wings.

The ultimate deterrent to crime and violence involves addressing some of their underlying causes. Clearly, that is a role beyond the police, but at least community policing invites everyone into the process. Community policing recognizes something that "can-do" organizations like police departments sometimes will not readily admit. It acknowledges that the people most affected by crime may be the best people to help the police attack the problem and find solutions. It is through community policing that we can work together to save the lives of our children.

What is the drug scene in America today? The latest surveys indicate that about 11.4 million people used some illegal drugs at least once a month last year. About 1.3 million people used cocaine at least once a month last year. Casual drug use is probably on the decline but may not be safely behind us. The most recent survey of young people's attitudes and actions regarding drug use shows that the decline in drug use by young people has stopped. The use of some drugs, such as marijuana and LSD, is actually increasing. Moreover, fewer eighth graders in 1992 than in 1991 perceived that cocaine or crack use was harmful. One in four high school seniors, one in five 10th graders, and one in seven 8th graders reported binge drinking in the two weeks before the survey was conducted.

But casual use is the easiest to deal with; it shows the most immediate results when you tackle it. What about hard-core drug use? Hard-core cocaine and heroin use has fluctuated between 2 million and 2.5 million people over the last few years. But in the last couple of years, the number of hard-core users has probably grown. Most hard-core users evade the traditional surveys used to measure drug use in America. The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse uses self-reported data from people in households. Common sense says that a lot of people, maybe most drug addicts, are not in stable households. Other sources, such as the Drug Abuse Warning Network, the Drug Abuse Forecasting Program, our own fieldwork, and other information sources, round out the picture and tell a different story.

They show significant increases in the number of people needing emergency medical treatment for overdoses and other problems associated with drug abuse. In fact, hospital emergencies involving heroin may be at an all-time high. The price of a pure gram of heroin has been dropping, as has the price of a pure gram of cocaine.

That shows there is an abundance of drugs on the street, and 75 to 80 percent of drugs on the street are consumed by the hard-core users. The supply may even be increasing. It is time to turn our attention to hard-core drug users; they fuel the drug market that seduces new users every day.

As the health care system undergoes reform, remember that hard-core drug users account for a huge cost. Recent estimates suggest that one out of every four dollars in Medicare costs is related to substance abuse. Hard-core drug use causes violent crimes—crimes committed by users to finance their life styles and crimes committed by traffickers in fighting for territory. Such drug use drains money from the economy, evades taxation, and corrupts families, and political, and civic organizations.

This country has an unprecedented level of incarceration, with the bulk of the inmates coming from disadvantaged communities. In federal prisons, more than a third of the inmates are African-American and more than a fourth are Hispanic. What we have been doing is not getting the job done. We have to look at other options. However, some options are wrong. One of those is legalization.

Some suggest that we can reduce, if not eliminate, much of the violence and crime as well as criminal justice system burdens by legalizing some or all drugs. Legalization of illegal drugs would be the moral equivalent of genocide. Legalization would result in increased drug use principally in the communities and among the people who can least afford to lose what they have.

I believe we must first address the problem of hard-core drug use. That requires strengthening and revitalizing communities so that people there can live meaningful lives filled with hope. We need to provide opportunities in education and jobs. We need to make sure that everyone is a full partner in the American dream. We

need to support families, schools, and religious institutions. We need to encourage businesses to invest in our neighborhoods. We must expand the drug court concept. We must promote boot camps and drug treatment in the criminal justice system. We need to expand outreach programs and treatment research.

Second, we must reduce violence in America. We must make sure communities and schools are safe so that people can walk the streets and children can learn without fear. We need to increase the certainty of punishment for those who commit crimes. Currently, the risk of being arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and incarcerated for a crime, particularly a drug crime, is very low. We need to devise speedier, more creative punishments. Studies show that increasing the certainty of punishment works better than increasing the severity. We need better gun control legislation, such as the Brady

---

***“As the health care system undergoes reform, remember that hard-core drug users account for a huge cost. Recent estimates suggest that one out of every four dollars in Medicare costs is related to substance abuse.”***

---

Bill, and legislation that will prevent the selling of assault weapons for civilian use.

Third, this Administration will promote and support community policing. Community policing will be a major emphasis of the new drug control strategy because community policing discourages all forms of criminal behavior, including drug trafficking. It helps reclaim the streets for law-abiding citizens. It promotes community cohesion. By preventing crime,

it reduces the burden of prosecution and incarceration.

Fourth, we must emphasize prevention and treatment. Drug education is needed in all schools from kindergarten to 12th grade. We must also close the gap between treatment need and treatment availability.

Finally, we need to pass the President's crime bill. The President proposes to put up to 100,000 more police officers on the streets, working with neighbors as partners against crime under the concept of community policing. He has proposed a program to give college scholarships and police training to as many as 5,000 students who are willing to make a four-year commitment to serve their communities as police officers. He has proposed the creation of the Community Partnerships Against Crime program, which will put an additional 5,000 sworn and nonsworn officers to work. He has proposed to put 25,000 young people to work as nonsworn personnel for local police departments, working in crime prevention and other public safety efforts through the National Service Program. The economic plan the President signed into law August 10th will create jobs in depressed urban and rural areas around the country and will provide up to 7,000 officers to do community policing in empowerment zones and enterprise zones.

There is reason to be optimistic about the future. We can make a difference, and that will be the objective of this Administration. A poem by Robert Frost captures the choices we have before us today. The poem describes a man who reaches a fork in the road. The man has to decide which road to travel. He sees that one road has been walked before; it is the easier, more familiar road. The other road looks more difficult and not as frequently traveled. Frost closes the poem with these words: "Two roads diverged in a wood, and

I—took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference."

American policing is at a fork in the road. One choice is to take the traditional road. The other choice is to try a new approach. The stakes are very high. Let us hope we have enough energy to make positive efforts to win the battle that confronts us. If we commit ourselves to the challenge ahead of us, somewhere down the road we will be able to say we took the road less traveled and, indeed, it made all the difference.

### **The Honorable Janet Reno Attorney General of the United States**

What are we talking about in terms of community policing and America? This is a nation of communities, of neighborhoods, of people working together and caring. But think about what happened in this nation in this century. It suddenly grew to a great nation with long life expectancy and great, huge cities. People left neighborhoods, communities, and farms and came to those cities. A depression and a war followed.

Then people started going from the cities into suburbia. The solidarity of a community no longer existed for many Americans. They lost the sense of the police officer they knew, the school teacher who had taught their brother and their mother, and the family physician who knew all their problems.

With World War II and this nation's growth, we saw the proliferation of federal agencies. Those agencies too often acted like they knew best and could tell local and state officials what to do. We now have 34 different agencies that touch on drug enforcement in the federal government. We have seen the proliferation of task forces that lost sight of the fact that cooperation was most needed on the street and in the community, not in some artificial structure.

Because of this proliferation of government, both at a state and federal level, people have come to think, "Well, government will solve our problem." If government did not solve a problem, giving it more money would certainly solve the problem. But everything got too big. Social service agencies transformed from community groups into large, state umbrella agencies that did not understand their people. School teachers who had exercised independent judgment on how to teach a class became controlled from the state capital.

We lost the personal sense. A person who was in public health 30 years ago told me, "Ms. Reno, I used to go knock on the door of the people that I was working with. I'd sit and have a cup of coffee at the kitchen table and talk to that new mother about how to raise her child and about nutrition and about infant care. I'm afraid to go there now."

A school teacher told me that 30 years ago she would go to the home and find out why a child was truant, but she, too, was afraid to go there now. Police started doing one thing, and teachers were doing something else, with the feds going in one direction and locals in another. In the middle of all this, we often waited for a crisis instead of developing prevention programs. We would rather spend money on foster care than develop family preservation programs. We would rather wait and build jails than put money into juvenile justice systems that make sense. We would rather have remedial programs in our community colleges than put our dollars into programs in elementary schools that give children a strong basis for learning.

There is a new feeling upon this land. As it has begun to run out of money, the federal government has said to the states, "Here's the program; you manage it," without giving the states the money. The states have turned to local communities and

said, "Here's the program; you manage it," without giving them the resources to do the job. With their backs against the wall, communities have demonstrated the creativity and the boldness that made this nation great. Of necessity, we have come back to the people. In developing community policing efforts and partnerships, we must trust the people and understand that if they are released from the ties of bureaucracy, they can make a difference.

We must begin with a national strategy. Police agencies in the Department of Justice and related departments have not really sat down together to talk about national crime strategy. One agency is going in one direction, another agency is going in another, and then half of one agency is going in a different direction. These agencies are supposedly working together, but they are all torn apart by turf battles, credit-claiming, fragmentation, and duplication.

But even if we develop a common approach, we will face a shortage of prison cells. I come from a state where the average time served is only 20 to 30 percent of the sentence. I then come to a federal government that is imprisoning people on minimum mandatory sentences for crimes that are far less severe than those for which people are getting out of jail in various locales throughout this nation. We must develop a partnership between state and federal prison officials to make sure we have enough prison cells to house the truly dangerous, the career criminals, and the major traffickers for the length of time to which the judges are sentencing them.

We must then develop a partnership among local, state, and federal law enforcement and prison systems to develop alternative programs for persons coming back to the community. We must link law enforcement, prison systems, and alternative sanction programs so that we properly

process the people that police officers arrest. To do that will require local prosecutors to work with federal prosecutors to determine what should be charged in state court versus federal court.

---

***"We must link law enforcement, prison systems, and alternative sanction programs so that we properly process the people that police officers arrest."***

---

We must then figure out how the federal government can best help local communities. Local communities and police agencies understand the needs of their communities better than any federal person in Washington, including the Attorney General. They can better assess their needs and resources, and they understand what works and what does not.

In addition to telling local agencies how to solve their problems, federal agencies have been vague about how long federal funding for specific programs would last. But to make a program work, a local agency needs a track record of more than a year or two and some expectation that the funding will continue.

That leads to community policing. It does not help for the police chief and the mayor to storm into a neighborhood and say, "This is what we're going to do for you." People will look at them blankly and say, "What do you know about our neighborhood? This is the first time you've been out here in two years." It's amazing what citizens can tell you when you sit around a table and talk with them.

Last week I went to a juvenile detention facility in Omaha, Nebraska, and sat around a table with one young woman and seven young men who were considered

serious offenders. They did not want to talk at first, but finally they started. The governor and a senator listened to them talk about the need for evening and after-school programs that would have kept them out of trouble. They wanted programs that would give them self-respect, limits, opportunities, and guidance. If we can learn that much from young people, think what we can learn by asking communities what they need to get the job done.

The best care giver, rule giver, police officer, and social worker is a strong family. We must do whatever we can to support families. Most American families have the basic foundation, if only we can reweave the fabric of society around them and give them the opportunity to exercise authority in the best ways possible.

Most people, if we reach out and help them, can be pulled back. There are what I call the mean/bads, the bads, the wanna-bes, and the goods. You can get most of those wanna-bes back from being bads if you quickly give them alternatives and examples. Therefore, we must free our officers to deal with people.

Police officers are becoming the heroes and heroines for communities. They are on the cutting edge of everything good that is happening in communities, whether by reaching out themselves or by escorting a public health nurse on a home visit that could not be made five years ago because the nurse was afraid.

Police officers can help the school teacher try to find out why a kid is truant. Police partnerships can make a difference—not in task forces, protocols, or memos of understanding, but with people talking and working together, based on trust and respect.

But we have to develop an approach that takes account of what it is like to grow up in America today. The most formative years in a person's life are the years from zero to age three. Fifty percent of all learned human response is learned in the first year of

life. The concepts of reward and punishment and conscience are developed in those years. Thirteen years later, when a child puts a gun against somebody's head, what good is punishment if he or she does not understand what punishment means?

Law enforcement must help social service agencies, the public health system, and others to reach the community in order to help young families get their children off to a good start. When we see a three-year-old child wandering across a housing development with nobody following him or her and nobody caring, we must intervene and ask, "Where are you going? What's happening?" We must follow through and make a difference. We may be getting that child off to a new and better start.

Why do we wait? Police officers traditionally conducted truancy prevention programs to reduce daytime burglaries. If police officers, school teachers, and social workers together started going to the house to try to find out why the child was truant in the first place, then future, more serious

---

***"Police partnerships can make a difference—not in task forces, protocols, or memos of understanding, but with people talking and working together, based on trust and respect."***

---

crimes could be prevented.

In the past, some police officers had to be dragged into understanding the importance of domestic violence—how the impact of domestic violence is felt from one generation to the next. The good police officer understands that the child who sees his father beat his mother is going to come to accept violence as a way of life. That

officer becomes involved and does something about it.

We do not have to wait until a child is in the emergency room with a fracture. The good police officer can see the signs if he or she knows the neighborhood and knows how to intervene in an effective and caring manner. We can do so much if we develop programs after school and in the evening. It is heart-warming to see police officers give their free time in sports and other programs to get kids off on the right foot.

Last month, Congress passed and President Clinton signed into law a bill that provides for \$150 million in community policing grants. I am dedicated to making sure you get those dollars in ways that can truly help you. There will be \$75 million for jurisdictions with populations at or above 150,000, and \$75 million for those below. Grant funds are available only for the salaries and fringe benefits of hired or rehired law enforcement officers over a three-year period and cannot be used to supplant state or local funds.

This is to try to get you some new help. We hope we will be able to fund approximately 2,000 officers to improve the long-term ability of law enforcement agencies to engage in community policing and innovative crime prevention. But police have been asking me, "All right, now if you get this money for community policing, what are you going to do with these people when we arrest them if you don't have enough jails, prosecutors, or courts?"

Identifying the mean/bads and getting them put away can help pull back the little wanna-bes and reduce crime. We can make it work by giving police officers the resources to do the job.

Grant application requirements include a demonstrated public safety need, including the need for more law enforcement officers. Assessment of need

will be based on both public safety and economic factors. The community policing strategy will require preparation of a three-year plan for community policing that emphasizes community involvement and interagency cooperation. The plan should include provision for continuing the initiative and retaining the positions with program funds at the end of the grant. Other provisions apply.

Applications will be considered in three rounds. The first deadline is October 14, 1993. Awards are expected to be announced in November and December 1993.

This is just a very small first step. The President has announced plans for a crime bill that will provide for funds to put up to 50,000 police officers on our streets. How are we going to afford this? I do not like the federal government to come in and say, "We've authorized 50,000 officers for you." And you ask, "Where are the 50,000 officers?" And the answer is, "Oh, we didn't appropriate the money." I am dedicated to making authorizations and appropriations match.

Some police chiefs have expressed reservations about the police corps. I would like to sit down and talk with you. I do not know whether we can work anything out, but I want to address the problems so we know exactly where we stand.

There will be other provisions. Empowerment zones and enterprise communities will provide an opportunity to

show what communities can do. I have a dream that someday a community can come to one desk in Washington and gain access to the whole range of relevant government programs. The community can say, "Look, here are our needs and resources. What can you do for us?"

Finally, police officers and police chiefs have also been on the cutting edge of one great controversy. They represent the feelings of most American people—that we must pass the Brady Bill and develop a ban on assault weapons that have no use for sporting purposes. People will listen if police speak out and say, "Look, do you know what this assault weapon is like? Do you know it has no purpose whatsoever except to kill another human being? Why in the world do we want it on our streets?"

I want to create a true partnership. Back in Miami, my home phone number was listed, and I returned all my phone calls. I tried to see every officer, including the officers who wanted to fuss at me because I had not filed the charge they thought should be filed. In Washington, my number is (202) 514-2001. Obviously, if you have a problem that can be resolved otherwise, try to do so. But if it is a problem that goes to the heart of the partnership we are trying to develop, if you have ideas and suggestions, please call me. I am bound and determined to do everything I can to make the Department of Justice a true partner with you every step of the way.

## Street Level Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *George A. Rodriguez, President, Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association, Los Angeles, California*

**Panelists:** *Joseph Ryan, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

*Michael Buerger, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

*Stephen D. Mastrofski, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

**George Rodriguez** said he first heard the term *community relations* 29 years ago, as a local officer in California. Back then, officers had the attitude that their job was to get people into jail, not to try to keep them out. The move to use community relations in policing has fluctuated since then, and it reemerged in recent years in the form of community policing. But the attitudes of officers, in general, have not changed. They offer the same criticism of community policing and the role of officers as they did 29 years ago. But once people understand the concept of community policing and experience how it can benefit people, all levels of community and government will encourage and support it.

Community policing is the key to addressing many crime-related problems that exist in American communities. **Mr. Rodriguez** noted that law enforcement is a dynamic arena. He cited, in particular, community disunity and its role in crime. As an example, Los Angeles, where 45 percent of the population is Hispanic, experiences third generation Hispanic gangs at war with first generation ones. While there are myriad problems that are

mentioned at community meetings, none are as important and basic as those dealing with people's safety. Any steps toward addressing this must involve the community.

**Dr. Joseph Ryan** conducts research on defining community policing. The definition of community policing varies among police departments, communities, and individuals. **Dr. Ryan** stated, "Community policing cannot be precisely defined, but you know what it is when you see it." Community policing involves strategies tailored by police and management to meet different community needs. **Dr. Ryan** conducted surveys in various cities of police officers' attitudes about community policing. The NIJ-funded study included Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New Haven, Connecticut; Portland, Oregon; and San Diego, California—all cities that are engaged in community policing. After compiling profiles of these cities and their reasons for implementing community policing, **Dr. Ryan** concluded that Portland presented the best prospect for success in its community policing efforts. He highlighted several factors contributing to this conclusion.

Portland is the only city that was not considered ethnically mixed (85 percent white) and the only city that did not have a particularly sensational crime incident that precipitated initiation of community policing. Precipitating incidents in the other cities were the MOVE incident in Philadelphia, the shooting of a Yale student in New Haven, and a police shooting in San Diego. Portland also received a grant from the Eisenhower Foundation for police and city officials to travel to Japan and other U.S. cities to study policing concepts and practices. Community policing was also recognized by the city council as the official government response to crime problems.

The Portland police department established practices and policies that ensured greater success in community policing. All officers are engaged in community policing, and duties are assigned in such a way that there is continuity of key personnel involved in community policing. A community policing support division was also established to help officers solve problems as they arise. A most important factor is that there is documentation of each incident handled, the actions taken, and the results of those actions.

The overall study involved 60 interviews of officers from the four mentioned sites and two additional sites that were not to be identified. The surveys involved open-ended questions and were not quantified because the responses were never identical. The interviews made five basic inquiries:

1. What are the perceived goals of law enforcement?
2. What are the desirable goals of law enforcement?
3. What are attitudes about working with the community?
4. What are attitudes about working with government agencies?
5. What are the goals of law enforcement in reality?

Fifty-nine of the 60 officers interviewed did not have ideas about the goals of law enforcement. When asked about their success as officers, the majority had no set idea of whether or not they were successful. Only the 16 officers involved in community policing had concrete responses for gauging their success. Most of the officers agreed that the desirable goals of law enforcement are to prevent crime, protect life and property, and apprehend offenders. The officers recognized that these goals cannot be met without the cooperation of the community. They voiced frustration about their perception that the criminal justice system, after the point of

arrest, too quickly releases criminals back to the community.

The officers could broadly define what *working with the community* meant but were unsure of its limits. In some departments, there are strict guidelines for what officers may and may not do with civilians. Officers were concerned about knowing what degree of involvement would no longer be appropriate and about the possibility of corruption. With regard to working with other government agencies, officers generally agreed that this was needed, but they were skeptical that turf issues among agencies could easily be overcome.

The fact that the officers interviewed had difficulty identifying goals was considered by **Dr. Ryan** to be an impediment to the development and implementation of community policing. If the police cannot clearly identify their goals, the community also will have difficulty doing so. Neither would be able to develop better strategies for policing and community life. Furthermore, if goals are not identified, performance measures cannot be developed. **Dr. Ryan** emphasized the need for more training on the role of the community and government agencies and for better training of community policing officers.

**Dr. Stephen Mastrofski** has conducted research on a wide range of police-related topics, the most recent of which is an NIJ-funded observational study of patrol officers engaged in community policing. His study was conducted in Richmond, Virginia, where community policing is in its third year of a five-year implementation plan. **Dr. Mastrofski** emphasized that, rather than a program, community policing in Richmond was based on a philosophy that focused on police-community partnerships and "creative failure." Features of Richmond's community policing include decentralized command, coordinated government services,

permanent patrol beats, special proactive units, and numerous community outreach programs.

Narrative and coded data were collected through 1,200 hours of observation covering 125 ride-alongs with 120 officers, 1,100 police-citizen encounters involving 1,600 citizens, and 5,600 other police activities. This study was considered very successful.

Officers defined community policing as improving police-community relations, developing partnerships for problem solving, and "doing what good cops have always done." Many officers did not consider community policing as something new, but rather what police do when they are doing well what they ought to do. A little more than half had positive or very positive responses when asked their opinion about community policing, and 26 percent had negative or very negative responses. Those with negative responses felt skeptical rather than opposed to it. They felt that community policing would not solve real problems, that those who should support it would not, and that the police department in particular was not doing enough to support it. Those with favorable responses felt that police need all the help they can get. One officer's response was, "If those we're working to help won't help us, who will?"

In the course of three years of community policing, the officers had identified three particular areas of challenge: relationships with the community, redefining the officers' roles, and management issues. Factors that challenged developing community relationships included community apathy, community resentment of the police, police resentment of the community, and citizens' fear of reprisal for cooperation with police. When discussing their roles as officers, some felt that community policing was akin to "babysitting," and, what is more, they felt it was not working. These officers just wanted

to do what they were trained to do. Officers who are overzealous with their authority, what **Dr. Mastrofski** refers to as the Wyatt Earp Syndrome, also find it difficult to work within the framework of community policing. Officers also expressed a discomfort or concern with broadened boundaries for interaction with citizens, fearing that favoritism and corruption would be more likely. Management issues included controlling the demand of 911 calls, training of officers, and supervisory support. The enhanced needs for equipment, facilities, and other adequate support for community policing were also emphasized.

**Dr. Mastrofski** developed profiles of officers based on their attitudes toward community policing. Proponents of community policing generally enjoyed their work, were friendly and talkative, were committed to serving and protecting their beat, and took pride in small accomplishments. Those opposed to community policing were generally unhappy with their jobs, avoided contact with the public, had negative attitudes about their beats, were doubtful of their effectiveness, and were concerned about favoritism and corruption.

**Dr. Michael Buerger**, a former police officer and currently a professor at the University of Wisconsin, has edited a casebook on problem-oriented policing and is the author of several articles on community policing. **Dr. Buerger** began his presentation by stating that "the rhetoric overpromises what we can deliver at the moment." He pointed out that he was not concerned with community policing, but with policing in general. "As long as it needs the adjective *community*," he said, "it will be considered different from policing." The basic problem with community policing, he contended, is that it "romanticizes something that we can't deliver." Although some cities claim to have developed philosophies, community

policing remains overwhelmingly a lot of programs that merely focus on and involve the community. An underlying philosophy upon which attitudes, behavior, programs, and policy are based must exist for community policing to be a reality.

While there is much work being done to advance community policing, elements are being ignored that are precisely what must be addressed. There are many skeptics among police as well as the community. Many cynics among police have seen reform movements come and go, and they are merely waiting for the "fad" of community policing to pass. Those that oppose community policing can be powerful enough to derail the best of efforts. The importance of excellent supervision to challenge resistance cannot be overemphasized. Those who are unsupportive cannot be ignored but must be converted into supporters. This connects to another point that is often left unaddressed: quantifying successes and translating this into information that skeptics can accept and adopt.

Successes that are attributed to community policing are primarily the result of efforts of a few specialized officers. These are not department-wide or representative. While this may be good for public perception of the police department, it has deleterious consequences for internal relations. These select officers often receive special recognition that generates resentment among other officers. Highlighting successes that are not representative of the department overall may be risky. If the entire department is not invested in community policing at a philosophical level, a single incident, like the riots following the Rodney King verdict, could damage or dissolve the image presented to the public.

**Dr. Buerger** maintained that the image of police must be changed before the relationship between police and the community can really be improved.

Community policing is not a fundamental change from the police professionalization movement, as some scholars have claimed. If community policing is to become a reality, it will require completion of the reform agenda of the professionalization movement. While it is difficult to do, all officers should be exposed to the same milieu as that offered to the "best and brightest." Usually, the best and brightest officers are taken off regular patrol duty and assigned to community policing. The less-than-best must then handle day-to-day, more common tasks and assignments. This, he contended, can be counterproductive, because these are precisely the officers who comprise the majority of a police department and most need to be exposed to better training. They are also the officers left responsible for training, and they have the greatest opportunity for setting examples and influencing attitudes that are counter to those fostered by community policing.

A primary element in community policing is establishing a relationship between police and the community. It is essential, in helping to change unproductive attitudes, that police be more in touch with the community so both can see one another as human beings. But an understanding of what the partners in the relationship want from one another is often ignored at the outset. While *partnership* implies that both partners do something, police have not often determined what they want the community to do or whether the community has the capacity to do it. However, there are some common themes that emerge with regard to police expectations. Community members can

- Act as eyes and ears for the police
- Intervene on behalf of the police
- Provide monetary assistance to the police, and
- Make a statement against crime.

**Dr. Buerger** contended that a list of community responsibilities like this is not

progressive but rather a statement of what the community already does. It may, indeed, be more than the community is willing to do or ought to do. The 911 calls reflect the community acting as eyes and ears for the police. Police encourage symbolic statements against crime, such as reporting strangers, although in neighborhoods where crime is rampant, it is well known that most victims and offenders are from the same community and are not strangers to one another. In these

neighborhoods, residents are not inclined to make any direct statements against crime when it could well mean endangering their lives.

**Dr. Buerger** acknowledged that he had presented a skeptical viewpoint of the community policing movement, but said he supported it as a worthwhile outcome. He cautioned that police departments must not overlook key factors that allow community policing to work.

## Community Policing Evaluations

---

**Moderator:** *Joseph M. Wright, Executive Director, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, Washington, D.C.*

**Panelists:** *Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Director, Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago*

*Roger Przybylski, Coordinator of Research, Chicago, Illinois, Police Department*

*Antony Pate, Director of Research, Police Foundation, Washington, D.C.*

*Susan Sadd, Project Director, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, New York*

*Randolph M. Grinc, Senior Research Associate, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, New York*

During this session, panelists discussed current efforts to evaluate community policing and innovative neighborhood-oriented policing in various cities across the country. The evaluations, which include both process and impact evaluations, are in varying states of completion.

**Roger Przybylski** and **Dr. Dennis Rosenbaum** focused on the evaluation of Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS). **Mr. Przybylski** opened the panel with background information on CAPS and its features. Beginning in April 1993, Chicago implemented a problem-solving approach known as CAPS in five of its 25 districts, with plans to implement the strategy citywide over the next year. According to **Mr. Przybylski**, the foundation of CAPS is crime control, law enforcement, rapid response, and proactive

problem-solving. The police department has also adopted CAPS as a philosophy.

As part of the initial implementation in the five districts, the department organized a community advisory board to develop action plans and set priorities for implementing CAPS. It also conducted a beat profile to identify problems and available resources in the specific beats. Using data from the profile, the department worked with the community advisory board to design responses to the problem. **Mr. Przybylski** described how the department used computerized crime analyses to produce a map of crime hot-spots so that a beat officer has timely information about events, crimes, etc., that occur in his or her beat. In conjunction with police services, CAPS also involves prioritized delivery of other city services to the five districts and cross-training of the various city agencies.

CAPS involves both an internal and external evaluation. The department is conducting a process evaluation of the implementation of CAPS, while an outside consortium of universities, including DePaul, Northwestern, Chicago, and Loyola, is evaluating the impact of CAPS. **Dr. Rosenbaum** explained that the outside evaluation includes both process and impact evaluation components but should also be considered a formative evaluation because there is a feedback component.

According to **Dr. Rosenbaum**, the process evaluation involves observations of meetings in the police department, community advisory board meetings, mayor's meetings, strategic planning meetings, and implementation meetings. Researchers meet with a variety of persons involved in CAPS, such as field operations sergeants, community leaders, and union leaders. In terms of quantitative data, the evaluators surveyed 1,800 police officers in the five experimental districts and five

control districts on measures of satisfaction. They are also evaluating training and the training curricula. Furthermore, teams of researchers will conduct block observations, noting the physical conditions (land uses, graffiti, trash, schools, churches, recreation centers, etc.) of more than 2,000 city blocks. The evaluators are also surveying more than 2,500 residents in the experimental and control districts. **Dr. Rosenbaum** noted that, in order for the information and results of the evaluation to be useful, it has to be usable for people working in the program. Therefore, everyone must be involved in the process. He stated that results of the evaluation effort are preliminary, and data will be forthcoming.

**Dr. Susan Sadd and Dr. Randolph Grinc** discussed the NIJ evaluation of the Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) program. Under the INOP program, eight jurisdictions were funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance to deal with the problems of drugs and crime using innovative, community-oriented policing techniques. **Dr. Sadd** reported on some of the perceived effects of the INOP program on drug demand reduction, drugs, crime, fear, and community involvement.

**Dr. Sadd** stated that the effects of the INOP program were limited. In part, this was due to problems with implementation and timing. The evaluation provided only a snapshot of the impact and did not include a long-term evaluation of the effects. In terms of the effects on drug crime, she indicated that the INOP program had achieved geographic displacement at best. In fact, the adjustments may have been temporal, because the drug dealers seemed to adjust their schedules so they were there when police weren't. However, **Dr. Sadd** said some of the results from Portland, Oregon; Tempe, Arizona; and Prince George's County, Maryland, have been favorable.

According to **Dr. Sadd**, in those areas where people thought the INOP program had effects on crime, the fear of crime was down. She reported that most sites felt their relations with the community had improved. In particular, many felt the level of community involvement and participation had improved.

**Dr. Grinc** described the difference between the police implementation of INOP and community policing implementation. He said the greatest difficulty for police in implementing INOP was that it created a new role for the patrol officer. The evaluation showed little police "buy-in" to the INOP strategy. Many officers said they felt it wasn't real policing. Some officers and residents used terms for INOP that included:

- Social work policing
- Smile and wave policy
- N.O.P.—not our problem or nobody on patrol
- Management du jour

Part of the problem, according to **Dr. Grinc**, was that there was a lack of training for the program. As a result, a common attitude formed that community policing meant better community relations rather than better policing. Further, the INOP program called for the development of a special unit to carry out the strategy. This special unit status was a problem because it was viewed by others in the department as "non-police" work. The unit was not responsible for taking calls and therefore lost its legitimacy. Police officers indicated the unit was soft on crime, and many took offense at the fact that management made such an effort to involve residents in the program, but not other police officers. Officers also indicated they felt the INOP program started too quickly and strained department resources.

There were similar complaints from the community about INOP, with the most frequent being that residents would not or did not want to get involved. They indicated

that the police made little effort to include or inform the community. Resident knowledge about the INOP program was low except among those in regular contact with the community policing officers. **Dr. Grinc** explained that some of the lack of community involvement could have been caused by fear of retaliation for involvement, fear of crime in general, a feeling that the increased law enforcement efforts were a passing strategy, and poor relationships between the police and residents.

Other problems were public and police apathy, rotating beat officers, lack of outreach to the community, and intragroup conflicts (e.g., community organizations had conflicting interests with some residents). **Dr. Grinc** concluded that to have more effective results, we must bring both residents and police officers into a problem-solving mode.

**Antony Pate** spoke on a process evaluation of the model precinct effort in New York City. The program was organizationally structured to facilitate a transition to community policing. The New

York City Police Department began the process in 1984 in Brooklyn's 72d precinct. With 162 personnel assigned to the 72nd precinct, the department planned a reorganization to full staffing that would require a 26 percent increase in personnel. The program was designed to develop an operational system to encourage community policing, including development of an information system to support community policing efforts, development of a system to share 911 workload, work with other department units to develop a comprehensive community policing model, and development and implementation of a training program to support the new model.

Among the new processes implemented were staff meetings, precinct team meetings involving commanders and two citizens, crime mapping, and alternative responses to low priority calls. **Mr. Pate** explained that one of the primary goals of the model precinct was to decrease specialization. In terms of the general effects, **Mr. Pate** reported there was a large drop in the number of citizen complaints.

## Street Level Drug Enforcement

---

**Moderator:** *Steven R. Harris, Chief of Police, Redmond Police Department, Redmond, Washington*

**Panelists:** *David Hayeslip, Program Manager, Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

*George E. Capowich, Criminal Justice Consultant, Alexandria, Virginia*

*Deborah Lamm Weisel, Senior Research Associate, Police Executive Research Forum, Raleigh, North Carolina*

**Dr. David Hayeslip** reported on the Baltimore County, Maryland, Community Oriented Drug Enforcement (CODE) project. Baltimore County has a suburban environment with an area of 600 square miles, 700,000 population, and no incorporated cities. The police department includes 1,500 to 1,600 sworn officers, who respond to 400,000 calls for service each year. There are 80,000 Part I and Part II crimes reported annually, and 1,500 tips are received annually on the drug hot line. Baltimore County has very little street dealing of drugs. Most drug dealing occurs in apartments, especially those under the federal Section 8 program for low-income residents.

Baltimore County has a long history of community policing. In each precinct, there is a special Drug Enforcement Unit headed by a corporal. In 1990, low-level drug trafficking became a priority. Because of staffing shortages, narcotics and vice could not handle this level of dealing. They were concerned with dealers at the middle and higher levels. The narcotics captain believed that a partnership approach could be directed at low-level dealing, and asset

forfeiture funds could be used to pay for officer overtime. The partnership approach would be based upon information from rental managers, business leaders, and community groups.

A mix of traditional surveillance and buys supported large-scale drug raids, combined with community policing, to maintain law enforcement presence. These techniques were used in geographically distinct residential areas in the county. Each local precinct devised its own strategy for community police maintenance. For example, a precinct might use block watch, foot patrol, or police athletic league (PAL) programs.

**Goals.** The goals of the project included good arrests in target areas (drug crime related), displacement of drug markets, and improvement of quality of life in the area (less fear of crime). Ninety percent of arrests resulted in conviction; 50 percent of arrestees served time. Repeat offenders received sentences as long as 25 years, and reported crime was down. Although drug markets moved, and new dealers came in, there was increased satisfaction with police, and residents felt safer.

**Traditional Enforcement.** Over time, the program moved from an emphasis on community policing to a more traditional vice-narcotics approach to law enforcement. This occurred in both the administration and tactics. In Phase I, there was central command support for community policing. The central narcotics captain favored decentralization to the precinct level, and the precinct command was supportive of community policing. The decentralization resulted in planning by lower-level officers, including the units assigned to the program. Brainstorming sessions with community representatives were held before operational

planning occurred. The emphasis was on problem solving.

Phase II began when the narcotics captain left. The new captain was not as supportive of community policing. At the same time, the precinct commands were faced by two crises: an internal affairs investigation and an increase in crime. As a result, control of the program shifted back to central command and the central strike team.

*Tactical Changes.* Traditional tactics in Phase I, such as raids on dealers, were followed by post-raid surveys of the community to explain the raids and ask for future help in organizing the community as part of the maintenance policing. During Phase II, only one precinct carried out a post-raid survey. Only sporadic efforts were made to implement community policing thereafter.

The success of community policing varies by the type of community. If the community is stable, traditional policing is difficult (because police surveillance is easily identified) and community policing is relatively easy to implement. In a more transient community, however, traditional policing is easier to implement than community policing. Police are not known by transients, and transients are not interested in helping police or improving the community.

The shift back to central command diminished the precinct's "ownership" of the program. This, in turn, reduced interest in community policing and working with the community.

Both central and precinct law enforcement support is needed to ensure success. The program should be operated in decentralized fashion, and beat officers should be encouraged to involve the community. Overtime funds should be available for brainstorming before planning. Community characteristics must be taken into account.

**George Capowich** described sites funded in 1988 to implement problem-solving policing in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and San Diego, California. Both departments were committed to department-wide implementation rather than using special units.

At each site, officers received training in problem solving on topics such as gathering information about a neighborhood.

The evaluation used problems as the units of study. Both prospective and historical case study approaches were used because both sites implemented the program before the evaluators began data collection. The evaluation followed 20 cases to determine what officers do to solve problems. It focused on both the process of problem solving and outcomes (or effects).

In San Diego, police focused on narcotics use and sales. In Tulsa, the police focused on public housing crime at five sites. The evaluation found that the longer the police used problem solving, the more likely they were to apply it to different types of cases.

The Tulsa project was not successful due to political involvement. For example, the city council opposed "highbrow" police methods. A concern in the approaching mayoral election was that the project might result in lower arrest statistics. The Fraternal Order of Police also opposed the project, since it was established by police managers. The Tulsa project focused on both crime and factors associated with crime, such as unkept property. The average time given to police to work on a problem was 73 days.

In San Diego, the police focused on crime only. Of 41 cases, only two were not drug crime cases. Community action of some sort was initiated in 36 cases. In addition to traditional criminal law enforcement methods, the police also sought assistance in 14 cases from regulatory agencies. For example, they referred one

case to the animal welfare authorities to deal with a dog that protected a crack house. They also used child welfare laws and building code enforcement. Tulsa police did not make similar use of alternative enforcement methods.

Training for officers focused on three elements: identify the problem, define its boundaries, and create a response. In San Diego, problems were narrowly defined, but a wide set of responses resulted. In Tulsa, traditional law enforcement led to a broader definition of the problem.

San Diego showed mixed results. The ten successful problem-solving cases were narrowly defined, with specific targets, such as cleaning up property. Less success was seen when the problem was broadly defined (for example, all street robberies in an area), or when the area was too broadly specified. Calls for service in surrounding areas (within two-tenths of a mile) were unaffected, suggesting no crime displacement to nearby neighborhoods. Calls for service in the target areas did go down.

**Deborah Lamm Weisel** reported on the NIJ-funded evaluation of emerging drug enforcement techniques. As a result of broad definitions of enforcement, many of the tactics seen were the result of uniformed officer creativity. The term *tactic* referred to a discrete approach to a problem by an officer.

The study began with a review of the literature. This identified 150 different enforcement tactics in categories that included observation/arrest, undercover/surveillance, technology observation (e.g., night vision goggles),

investigation/follow-up (e.g., electronic surveillance, pen registers), physical approaches (e.g., installation of speed bumps, changing traffic patterns), and enforcement of local ordinances (e.g., loitering, bar licensing).

The literature review was followed by a national survey of police agencies. The patrol divisions were surveyed separately from the investigative force. The most common activity responses were plain-view arrests, searches, and dog searches. Less-used investigative techniques included wholesale drug investigations, deciphering coded information, clone beepers (matched with beepers used by dealers), cargo inspection, monitoring of chemical precursors, and currency report monitoring.

The most common uniformed officer techniques included crime analysis, developing informants, and ancillary techniques (e.g., boarding up abandoned houses, high intensity lighting, changing pay phone numbers, and enforcing loitering/disorderly conduct laws). Community policing methods also included citizen ride-alongs, referrals to other agencies, abandoned auto cleanup, school prevention programs, and drug-free zones. Some areas used innovative approaches, such as drug-sniffing pigs, notices on off-ramps of "drug checkpoint ahead," charging drug stamp tax violations, and sending postcards to drivers of cars seen in high drug sale areas.

The panelists commented, in conclusion, that community policing seeks to establish police-citizen partnerships, increases citizen access to police services, and promotes alternative methods.

## International Panel on Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *Richard H. Ward, Associate Chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago*

**Panelists:** *Ron Hadfield, Chief Constable, West Midlands Police, England*

*Abdelkarim A. Darwish, Major, Egypt National Police Academy, Egypt*

*Julian Fantino, Chief, London, Ontario, Police Force, Canada*

The West Midlands Police Force is one of the largest forces outside of London and is situated in the industrial heartland of England. It comprises the major cities of Birmingham and Coventry and five other large urban districts. The county is diverse, dynamic, and densely populated, with each district having its own unique characteristics and each generating different demands upon the police. The unemployment rate over the past decade has remained near the national average. However, areas within the inner cities have an unemployment rate of almost 25 percent. Especially hard hit is the younger age group. Poor housing, a high proportion of single parent families, a concentration of minority ethnic groups, and a social service system that is frequently overwhelmed all serve to create a feeling of futility and generate social tensions that affect the police.

**Chief Constable Ron Hadfield** explained that crime continues to rise steadily in all parts of the West Midlands, but serious crime involving grave injury, death, or the use of firearms has remained low and relatively stable. A majority of assaults involve juveniles or young adults, known to each other; these occur late in the evening and probably involve consumption

of alcohol. While crime figures indicate that the county streets are inherently safe for ordinary people, the citizens feel a real fear of crime.

**Chief Constable Hadfield** said that policing in Britain depends upon the public allowing itself to be policed. The public must be informed of policing issues and reassured of the police's ability to influence what happens around them. The strategy and the tactics employed by the police are formulated not only within the rule of law, but within the bounds of public acceptability. Policing is essentially about people's expectations and perceptions. The people's needs can be expressed quite simply as

- More uniformed police officers patrolling the streets,
- Reduction of crime, and
- Reduction of the fear of crime in order to improve the quality of life.

Policing occurs at several levels.

While we may see each level as independent and substantially different, there is coordination and interaction within and between these levels:

- *National and international.* Many more crimes are being attacked from a national and international level.
- *Regional and interdepartmental.* In almost all metropolitan areas, some form of interagency task force has been arranged.
- *Local.* Local police are probably the most responsive to the public. Local police have to respond to diverse environments, from inner city to rural. They are closer to the public and therefore can provide the impetus for community policing. Yet, local police cannot ignore the other two levels of policing.

The public wants to see uniformed officers in order to be reassured that they are

controlling crime, reducing the incidence of crime, and thereby reducing the public's fear of crime. The continuing rise in crime, increasing demands for police response, and a growing administrative burden, combined with shrinking or stagnating resources, make this goal nearly overwhelming. The public wants the police to preserve the peace by keeping stability in the community, preventing and detecting crime, and enforcing regulations. However, demand is overburdening the police. They are becoming the social service agency of last resort. To better focus their efforts, they should address the population that commits most of the crime.

Many, if not all, traditional social structures have changed: the family, religion, education, neighborhoods and communities, media and communication linkages, and technology. People have different aspirations and expectations. Communities don't necessarily want the same type or amount of police service. Therefore, one policing model doesn't necessarily fit all communities.

Police must remember they cannot go it alone; they must involve other agencies. The police must be responsive and service-oriented. The police must not deviate or promise what cannot be delivered. The police must have status; they must be supported by the administration and government. The police must have continuity, focus, and target; they must take small measures, not try to solve all the problems. Officers should not become social workers. Administrators and supervisors must ensure that officers don't spend more time consulting than doing. Enforcement still applies.

The police should concentrate on prevention and getting the public to become more involved in self-help initiatives. They must focus on juveniles and form special juvenile bureaus. This emphasis should include schools, families, and communities.

The police must not forget deterrence and detection as well.

Using the community policing label helps people notice. There are many community policing models around; some have been in existence for several years. New programs should choose pieces from several successful models, to be tested in one area and possibly spread around the city.

Any community policing effort should involve these principles:

- *Consult.* Identify others who know the topic, problem, area, etc.
- *Prioritize.* Don't take on more than you can deliver. Focus and target.
- *Involve.* Involve as many of the stakeholders as possible.
- *Change.* Be prepared to change the way you are doing things.
- *Economize resources.* Use available resources from a variety of sources.
- *Set goals.* Keep focused and avoid deviation.

**Major Abdelkarim Darwish** began his presentation by stating that Egypt covers some 380,000 square miles with a population of 55 million. Egypt has existed for over 7,000 years and has had a central government for 5,000 years. There has been some form of police for over 3,000 years. As a result of the 1952 revolution, the police administration was placed under the Ministry of Interior. There are 86 local governments with police agencies.

Local police departments have a history of working with citizens and businesses in their assigned areas. Local departments have a large number of police stations and substations. The community relations officers assigned to the police station coordinate and remain in contact with various elements of the community. Support groups help with selected policing activities, such as traffic control, public health, juvenile delinquency, and community conflicts. This relieves the officer to work on more serious crimes. The

police also work with private security forces in public housing.

There are many crime prevention associations formed by police stations across the country. Also, the police help members of the prisoners' associations to work with families of those in prison. The police help the association keep the family together, find work, establish day-care centers, etc.

There are four police colleges/academies in the country. The subjects taught at these colleges include engineering and social services. All police managers and junior and senior ranks attend these colleges. Those who are in post-graduate studies receive education on police technical subjects. The police academy teaches such community policing subjects as how to work well within the community, identify and solve community problems, and organize a community.

There is a police research center that supports all policing in Egypt. Its mission is to upgrade and apply criminal justice techniques to policing. These activities include international, national, and local policing efforts. In summary, **Major Darwish** pointed out the need to increase the problem solving capabilities and accountability of police officers.

**Chief Julian Fantino** gave an overview of community policing in Canada. London, Ontario, is home to 310,000 people of diverse national backgrounds. The police department has 594 personnel. The police department has made strides to capture and use people power. Because the department realizes the crucial role the community plays, the police have brought the community into policy making, policy review, and the rehabilitation process. The department has been working to foster partnerships with the community to improve the quality of life.

**Chief Fantino** subscribes to the

philosophy of community involvement. Newly arrived from Toronto, he spent most of his early months championing the need to eradicate the drug and crack cocaine problem. **Chief Fantino** considers the drug problem to be epidemic. Although the media called the chief's efforts scaremongering, his connection of the problem to health issues caused the public to support the chief's enforcement effort.

Through such programs as "Safety, Security and Quality of Life" (SSQL), citizens help the police frame the issue and identify solutions. Now, the citizens are championing the police budget, which they see as their own budget. They make their views known, thereby helping the department to increase its resources. The people are very supportive of the police and the SSQL program, although the city fathers are concerned about the cost of this support.

The London Urban Alliance is a race relations organization. It is a privately funded, nonpartisan effort that allows two-way communications between various community factions, the community, and the police. The Urban Alliance can provide a neutral ground. It has formed and assisted in youth programs, reduction in the use of police force, conflict resolution, etc.

The police use a community survey to identify issues and concerns. It includes questions on youth and community involvement. The police must listen to the youth, who are much concerned about violence and drugs.

Because most police departments try to be nonpolitical, rank-and-file police officers have seldom been involved in critical public issues. However, community policing is changing that. Officers now champion those members of the population who have been left behind and provide meaningful leadership.

## Use of Civil Remedies as Alternative Sanctions

---

**Moderator:** *David W. Brown, Chief of Police, Tempe, Arizona*

**Panelists:** *Peter Finn, Research Analyst, Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts*

*Albert J. Toczydlowski, Assistant District Attorney, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, District Attorney's Office*

*William Johnston, Deputy Superintendent, Bureau of Investigative Service, Boston, Massachusetts, Police Department*

**Chief David Brown** pointed out that the use of civil remedies is not automatically considered a part of community policing, yet community policing and civil remedies are linked for several reasons. First, police agencies often turn to both approaches because of frustration. They realize criminal sanctions are not solving all crime problems. Second, both approaches bring in other agencies. Third, both involve problem solving and considering the causes of problems, not just outcomes. Finally, both community policing and the use of civil remedies involve empowering police employees and citizens.

**Peter Finn** discussed research he conducted for NIJ on the use of civil remedies in eight jurisdictions. The study included site visits and telephone interviews with police, prosecutors, and others in Duluth, Boston, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Manhattan, New York State, Kansas City, and San Diego. Although approaches differed among the sites, all of the jurisdictions were searching for long-term solutions to crime problems.

Community involvement in planning civil remedies is critical, according to **Mr. Finn**. In Los Angeles, for example, citizens

were outraged because of a shooting by a mentally ill person. Before proceeding with civil remedies, however, the police met with representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union, National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, and others to discuss acceptable solutions. Similarly, in Kansas City, where crack houses were to be targeted, police first met with an association of property owners. Continued involvement with citizens and community-based organizations is also important. For example, a representative of the Manhattan District Attorney's narcotics eviction program regularly attends community meetings. In Duluth, a community-based domestic violence intervention program identifies violators of civil protection orders and regularly reviews police arrest reports.

**Mr. Finn** further illustrated the importance of community involvement in civil remedies by discussing the Kansas City approach. In 1985, the Missouri legislature expanded the civil code to include as nuisances private houses where drugs are sold. In February 1989, a high school student was killed by another student who was reportedly high on crack. The Ad Hoc Group Against Crime (Ad Hoc) launched a campaign against crack houses with a caravan that involved cars, coffins, and a police escort. Ad Hoc used bullhorns to publicize its crime hot-line number and to express intolerance for drugs. Subsequently, Ad Hoc sponsored rallies in front of specific crack houses and obtained media coverage.

At the same time, Ad Hoc formed a partnership with police and prosecutors to pursue civil remedies against crack dealing. Both Ad Hoc and the police identify houses where drugs are sold, focusing on locations that have repeatedly been the site of drug activity. Ad Hoc uses trained volunteers to observe activities, take down license plate numbers, and identify the property owner.

The owner is invited to a meeting with representatives of the police, prosecutor, and Ad Hoc. At the meeting, the owner is asked to sign an Ad Hoc agreement to evict the drug-involved tenant and to improve the property. If the owner does not comply, the prosecutor initiates civil nuisance abatement proceedings. Although the Ad Hoc agreement has no legal force, it can be used as evidence of an owner's knowledge of the problem. **Mr. Finn** also noted that citizens may be more inclined to call Ad Hoc than the police with tips about drug activity.

At the time of the conference, NIJ was reviewing the report on which **Mr. Finn's** presentation was based (*Using Civil Remedies for Criminal Behavior: Rationale, Case Studies, and Constitutional Issues*).

**Albert Toczydlowski** discussed the Philadelphia District Attorney's LINE (Local Intensive Narcotics Enforcement) program. This program, he said, was born of frustration with drug dealers and with the inability of criminal sanctions alone to effect long-term solutions. Essentially a vertical prosecution program, LINE focuses on the 18th police district. In this district, crack is often sold from the porches of row houses. The DA's office analyzes all complaints, arrests, and drug cases in the 18th district—"large and small, adult and juvenile"—and interviews residents to determine whether civil remedies may be appropriate. A MAPINFO software program is also used as part of the analysis.

**Mr. Toczydlowski** said there are many concerned residents in the 18th district, and their participation is critical. For example, at one neighborhood bar, many arrests had been made but the bar was still a trouble spot. When the liquor control board met to consider renewal of the bar's license, 10 police officers and a busload of residents came to testify at what is typically a routine hearing. The license was not renewed, and the bar closed.

Civil forfeiture laws are used when either a property owner or a tenant is selling crack. In all search warrant cases, the DA sends a letter explaining that the owner can lose his or her property and offering to help evict tenants if necessary. An in-house assessment showed that drug activity ceased at 27 of 30 houses where the owner received such a letter. **Mr. Toczydlowski** also stressed the importance of publicizing the law and the civil forfeitures that occur. The potential loss of a home or property investment gets owners' attention, he said.

As a result of the LINE project, drug sales are now much less visible in the 18th district. Further, the project has "created a perception among the populace that the criminal justice system works." In **Mr. Toczydlowski's** view, complaints to the police increased because "people saw that when they complained, something happened."

In response to a question about follow-up after houses have been forfeited, **Mr. Toczydlowski** said the Philadelphia DA's office may sell the property or may give it to a church or a community organization. The DA's office tries not to seal the house, as the cost is \$1,000, but at times this is necessary. Owners who get their sealed houses back must reimburse the cost of the seal.

Before his recent appointment as a deputy superintendent of the Boston Police Department, **Bill Johnston** was commander of the department's community disorders unit. This unit was formed in 1978 because of disturbances related to busing. At that time, Massachusetts did not have a civil rights law.

**Superintendent Johnston** discussed several cases to illustrate how the state civil rights law has been used since then to combat threats, coercion, intimidation, and violence. In one example, an African American family "bought a dream house" only to have 18 windows broken out in one

night. Of 14 persons believed to be involved in the crime, three were arrested on civil rights violations. In another case in the Dorchester section, both criminal and civil statutes were applied, and the perpetrators were enjoined from going within 100 feet of the residence. There are several advantages to applying the Massachusetts civil rights law in these and other cases. The proof required is "preponderance of the evidence"; the burden is on the perpetrator to prove that

he or she no longer represents a threat; and any bodily injury constitutes a felony punishable by 10 years in prison.

**Superintendent Johnston** also noted that currently the gay community in Boston is "being terrorized." The department is now looking into ways the state civil rights law and other civil remedies can be applied in these cases, as well as in domestic violence and gang cases.

## Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Education

---

**Panelists:** *William Modzeleski, Director, Drug Planning, U.S. Department of Education*

*Ronald Stephens, Executive Director, National School Safety Center, Westlake Village, California*

*Peter Blauvelt, Chairperson of the Board, National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers, and Director of Security, Prince George's County, Maryland, Schools*

**William Modzeleski** introduced data from the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Centers for Disease Control that suggest school crime and violence are up. The number of thefts and assaults and the number of weapons confiscated have risen to the point where some 3 million thefts and violent crimes occur on or near school grounds annually. During the 1992-1993 school year, about 30 students and teachers were killed at school or on their way there. Twenty, ten, and even five years ago such a rate was unheard of.

Because students cannot learn well when they are surrounded by violence, the Department of Education is attempting to help reduce the crime rate so that by the year 2000 all students will attend schools that are safe and drug-free. The proposed Safe Schools Act would provide local schools with about \$175 million to fight crime through security measures and such techniques as conflict resolution and peer mediation. Under the act, schools would be obligated to participate with communities in crime reduction, set clear policies on weapons and violence, and develop programs that do not rely solely on security measures.

**Ronald Stephens** commented that if children are going to be required to attend

school, schools must be made safe to attend. In a recent study in *USA Weekend*, close to 50 percent of students polled said they avoid school restrooms out of fear, and about 60 percent said they do not feel safe at school.

Truancy has a high correlation with daytime burglary, and suspending or expelling students gives them more opportunities to commit burglaries. Truancy can run high: of the 1.6 million students in the Los Angeles public schools, some 300,000 are truant daily.

One method of reducing truancy involves intervention by the police. In Honolulu, the chief of police sends letters to parents whose children are absent four unexcused hours. The parents and children are requested to attend a four-hour lecture by police on a Saturday.

Reducing school violence often requires reducing gang activity in schools. Gang members are 10 times more likely to carry a weapon to school than nonmembers are.

The San Antonio school district and police department have developed a 10-point program to reduce gang activity. The points are as follows:

1. **Be honest.** Admit there is a gang problem.
2. **Get smart.** Teach police officers and school employees about gangs.
3. **Identify gang leaders.** Gang leaders move from city to city, spreading gang influence.
4. **Don't close at 3:15.** Give kids something to do after school instead of joining gangs.
5. **Work with the police.** Cooperation between schools and police is essential.
6. **Involve transfer students.** They may not already belong to gangs.

7. **Get parents on your side.** Obviously, the participation of parents in gang reduction is crucial.
8. **Find role models.** Gang leaders fill the role-model vacuum to the detriment of all.
9. **Work together.** The gang problem is more easily combated when antigang efforts are coordinated.
10. **Believe you can make a difference.** The right motivation can work wonders.

Some cooperation requires new forms of information-sharing. To give teachers some warning as to which students might be more likely to attack them, both Virginia and California now require the courts to inform school principals when a student has a criminal history.

**Peter Blauvelt** remarked that schools tend not to be forthcoming regarding what goes on inside their walls. How can the gap between schools and police be bridged?

First, schools must differentiate between violations of school rules and actual crimes. Rule violations can be dealt with by school officials, but when crimes occur, schools should call the police.

One challenge in reducing school violence is the lack of data. Schools do not keep proper records, so it is difficult to devise a crime-reduction plan or chart the success of school safety measures.

Another challenge is what to do with dangerous students. In Prince George's County, for example, a student who brings a gun to school is automatically expelled for the current semester plus one more semester. That leaves the offender out on the street for up to a year with little to do but cause trouble for the public and the police. If the juvenile is arrested, the judge may well require that he return to school, but the schools do not want him back.

A level of distrust exists between school administrators and police. Some of that distrust is caused by laws that prohibit information-sharing. For example, even though the cause of crime reduction would be served by passing the information along, in most states the police are prohibited from giving school officials the names of juveniles they arrest in a school, even students caught burglarizing a school on a weekend.

The Prince George's County school security department uses sworn, trained officers with full powers of arrest, but the officers are unarmed and wear plain clothes. The investigators and security officers in the department make a point of getting to know students. That technique pays off in terms of information. In particular, almost all guns confiscated in the schools are first discovered through student tips.

The key to any solution to school violence is to intervene with students at a younger age and to encourage the involvement of parents.

## The Homeless in the Community

---

**Moderator:** *Patrick V. Murphy, Director, Police Policy Board, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, D.C.*

**Panelists:** *Paul F. Evans, Superintendent-in-Chief, Boston, Massachusetts, Police Department*

*Julie Rusk, Manager, Community and Neighborhood Services Division, City of Santa Monica, California*

*Marsha Martin, Executive Director, Interagency Council on the Homeless, Washington, D.C.*

**Superintendent Paul Evans** portrayed the extent of the problem by reviewing points that have affected the possibility of shelter for the homeless. Alcoholism has been decriminalized, and most vagrancy statutes are now recognized as unconstitutional. A night in the jail can no longer represent an option. Detoxification facilities are only a short-term "crisis" solution and have always been inadequate to handle the number of alcoholics. Skyrocketing real estate values caused a tremendous increase in the cost of housing in the last two decades. Retirees, the elderly, and many others living on fixed income no longer were able to afford housing costs. Even many working class people could not support themselves or their families. State mental health systems added to the problem by putting a large number of people with marginal ability to care for themselves out on the street. Additionally, nearly an entire generation of Vietnam-era veterans with physical and mental disorders have been left without societal support. The economy, in decline since the late 1980s, caused a sudden increase in unemployment.

**Superintendent Evans** related that, according to a census of the homeless conducted by the Mayor of Boston's Emergency Shelter Commission, last year the homeless population of Boston increased by 12 percent to 4,411, either on the street or housed in a variety of public and private shelters. From a law enforcement perspective, most of the homeless are people with problems rather than people who are a problem. However, a sizable minority of the homeless represent a considerable drain on police resources. As the public service agency that is available on a 24-hour-a-day basis, **Superintendent Evans** explained, police have often been forced to take traditional roles in dealing with the homeless. There are limited options for dealing with the common problems that arise. Those with alcohol abuse problems would be transported to a detoxification facility or to a district police station to sober up. Individuals under the influence of a narcotic drug could only be taken to a hospital for appropriate medical care, unless they had been arrested for a criminal charge. Once released, they, too, would soon become a law enforcement problem again.

Because of the continuing policy of de-institutionalization for the mentally ill, there is no place to take those individuals for long-term care. Even if they display violent behavior, individuals taken to a psychiatric center for treatment are generally released after being placed on medication to control aggressive tendencies. Victims of domestic violence, too, frequently resort to a shelter for temporary housing. Police intervention consists of the response to the initial call for police service from the victim and of follow-up investigation for prosecution of the abuser.

The advent of the neighborhood policing model has significantly altered the

way police deal with the homeless. **Superintendent Evans** noted that partnerships have been formed with corporations, public agencies, and private nonprofit agencies to provide care, shelter, and services for the homeless. This has relieved the police of the burden of caring for homeless people who are not guilty of breaking any laws. Public and private shelters have taken a much more active role in caring for the chronically homeless—the mentally ill, the alcohol abusers, and the substance abusers.

Increased use of shelter facilities required training on the part of both the police and shelter staff. The Boston Police Academy developed courses on nonviolent conflict resolution techniques, which are currently taught to all police recruits. Additional training concerns protecting oneself from an assaultive person without injuring him or her. Training seminars are shared with shelter staff. Referral procedures have been developed to educate the police about who could be properly referred to a particular shelter, who should be transported to a hospital, and who would be better served by a short stay in a police facility. Police personnel learn about the various capabilities of the shelters available. Different shelters take certain segments of the homeless population but not others, i.e., adult men only, veterans, women only, etc. Most private nonprofit shelters will not accept a person who is inebriated, under the influence of a controlled substance, or behaving aggressively. These individuals either remain in police custody or must be referred to a public shelter.

In the area of problem solving, noted **Superintendent Evans**, officers who are familiar with their sectors or beats, in the sense encouraged by community policing, have obvious advantages over traditional patrol officers. Familiarity with someone who appears regularly on the street in an officer's beat might, for example, enable the

officer to respond properly if that person were suffering from a heart attack, stroke, or other major illness. Similarly, knowing that a mentally ill person is nonviolent can make a big difference when responding to calls for police service.

Other joint efforts include the following:

- A police detail on the premises of a shelter (paid off-duty police officer)
- Church-sponsored meal programs and clothing distribution for the homeless
- Business community funding for a vehicle that transports the homeless to shelters

**Superintendent Evans** noted that there are many continuing problems in dealing with the homeless. Since a sizable minority of the homeless are either mentally ill or inebriated, no neighborhood wants to face the prospect of a large number of homeless persons living in or hanging around their area. This has resulted in shelters for the homeless being located in unfavorably remote nonresidential areas. In many cases, the homeless really need counseling, training, job referral, housing assistance, and perhaps residential care. These services are beyond the scope of any law enforcement agency and must come from a network of other sources. Increased funding from both the state and federal governments is necessary to truly alleviate the plight of many of the homeless.

In the short term, the police must still balance the needs of the homeless with those of the rest of the community. Citizen complaints of aggressiveness on the part of some panhandlers have necessitated a review of the constitutionality of city ordinances requiring a permit in order to beg. Community members need to better understand that removing the homeless is not necessarily an appropriate use of law enforcement resources. In conclusion, **Superintendent Evans** pointed out that

homelessness is a societal problem with many causes and can only be solved by a multifaceted approach. It will take the continuing efforts of the police, the business sector, public and private agencies, and the community to eliminate homelessness entirely. The homeless situation can be solved, but it cannot be solved by law enforcement alone.

**Julie Rusk** reported on the efforts of the Santa Monica City Council to activate and coordinate various city agencies to address the problem of the homeless in their city. The estimated population of homeless in Santa Monica is 1,000 on any given night and between 3,000 and 5,000 including persons in shelters and on the street over the course of the year. An increasing number of low-income persons and families at risk for homelessness add to the city's burden.

In March 1991, the City Council appointed a Task Force on Homelessness composed of business representatives, religious representatives, community members, and social services representatives to formulate recommendations for short-term actions and long-term strategies. The task force's recommendations, contained in a report entitled *The Santa Monica Task Force on Homelessness: A Call to Action*, were unanimously adopted by the City Council in December 1991. The recommendations address issues of public health and safety, social services, shelter and housing, resources and funding, and advocacy and partnership. These recommendations attempt to balance a social service and housing focus with public safety.

Since adoption of the recommendations by the City Council in December 1991, the following measures have been implemented:

- Institution of an ordinance prohibiting encampments in parks and other public spaces
- Moving of the large outdoor (City Hall lawn) FAITH Meals Program

to smaller indoor sites linked to services

- Institution of zoning changes to facilitate the development of a range of affordable housing and shelter
- Assistance to specific prioritized shelter/housing projects
- Identification of new city funds to implement social service and housing projects
- Continuation of work with the County of Los Angeles to develop stronger county roles in dealing with homelessness, specifically mental health, in Santa Monica
- Increased coordination of existing social services, mental health, and law enforcement outreach teams
- Enhancement of law enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal activities in parks and other public places
- Adoption of regulations controlling the distribution of food in public parks
- Maintenance of funding to nonprofit homeless service providers, despite citywide budget cuts

The police department has played a large role in this effort. Twenty additional officers were added in fiscal year 1991-1992 to provide full enforcement of high-profile crimes. The police department's Office of Special Enforcement targets parks and neighborhoods for more effective patrolling. Police resources are being supplemented by reassigning city park rangers and a special HELP (Homeless Enforcement Liaison Program) team to help implement recommendations of the Task Force on Homelessness.

Additionally, Santa Monica's city attorney is developing an alternative sentencing program, which will use community service and possibly mandatory treatment. The Community and Cultural Services Department is currently working to upgrade the maintenance and security of all

26 public restrooms in the city and is considering the use of portable toilets to increase available bathrooms. That agency is increasing visible recreation activities to encourage positive community use of the parks. Sample activities include after-school sports, play groups, art shows, and park concerts.

**Marsha Martin** spoke about the Interagency Council on the Homeless, which was established in 1987 by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. The council provides leadership for activities to assist homeless individuals and families. Some of their major activities include the following:

- Planning and coordinating federal programs for the homeless and making or recommending policy changes to improve such assistance
- Monitoring and evaluating assistance to the homeless provided

by all levels of government as well as the private sector

- Ensuring that communities and other organizations receive necessary technical assistance to effectively help the homeless
- Disseminating information on federal resources for assisting the homeless

Members of the council include many heads of federal departments, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The council coordinates various policy-level working groups and task forces, and it meets monthly to provide a forum for programs and special initiatives. In addition to the council's staff in Washington, D.C., there are full-time regional council offices (provided by HUD) in each of the 10 federal regions.

## Hot Spots of Crime

---

**Moderator:** *Johnnie Johnson, Jr.,  
Chief of Police, Birmingham, Alabama,  
Police Department*

**Panelists:** *John "Jack" O'Connell,  
Director, Delaware Statistical Analysis  
Center, Dover, Delaware*

*Adele V. Harrell, Senior Research  
Analyst, Urban Institute, Washington,  
D.C.*

*Michael Buerger, Visiting Fellow,  
National Institute of Justice, U.S.  
Department of Justice*

**Jack O'Connell** reported that Wilmington implemented community policing in 1989. The "hot spot" attacked in Wilmington was in the city's east side, where 9,000 residents live and where cocaine dealing was a problem. Analysis of geo-coded 911 calls for service showed a decrease in calls between 1989 and 1992. Moreover, the area from which most calls came in had also decreased in scope. Fewer intersections or neighborhood streets were included.

Community policing involved more than officers on beat patrol. Community leaders had asked for increased police enforcement. A community organization committee met with police at least monthly. This group helped police determine how to address problems in the neighborhood. For example, mothers who work at night may be unable to prevent youth from being out at night. This could encourage the use of youngsters as "lookouts" for drug dealers. The solution was night child care.

The evaluation methodology involved interviews with police, community leaders, and social service agency personnel. Interview results showed that police

anonymity disappeared. This took three to four months. As police showed that information from residents would produce action, more information became available. This resulted in a reduction in 911 calls. Now, the 911 number is reserved for true emergencies, rather than citizen complaints.

Public accountability of police increased. When the police chief wanted to move a community police officer outside of the area, the community reacted. The officer was eventually returned to a community assignment after citizens went to the mayor. **Mr. O'Connell** noted that this was a white officer in a black area.

After the police had locked up the local dealers, a New York City gang tried to move in. Members were easily identified by the beat officers. When they were arrested, the gang members claimed police brutality. Community witnesses proved the charges false by testifying to resistance to arrest. Community meetings were able to force absentee landlords to attend to their property.

On a subjective level, **Mr. O'Connell** said that community residents reported less fear of crime. In the target area, citizen complaints went up, as police responsiveness encouraged reporting. One problem that interfered with the program was the resignation of a community program director, who was not replaced for six months. This showed that community policing without social programs is not effective.

Overall, after one year, arrests and complaints declined in the target area. However, areas without community policing deteriorated. The Weed and Seed program in Wilmington then focused on these areas. This program includes federal law enforcement to supplement city police. The Seed side addresses the needs of teenagers.

By 1992, most of the city was in better order, except for one area without community policing.

**Dr. Adele Harrell** gave an alternative description of her study as "Anticipating and Combating Community Decay." The project goals were to determine whether decay or crime developed first in a community and to use community databases for prediction.

The study began with a search for model programs involving police partnership. Of 1,000 nominations, 50 were identified as being relevant model programs. Of these, 34 sites were selected for interviews. Some examples of nominees are the following:

- *Good Neighbor Program in Gasden, Alabama.* This has no paid staff and focuses on helping specific groups in the community (e.g., elderly, minorities) to develop leadership.
- *Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association, New York City (Bronx).* This group was concerned with crack and arson. It now owns 900 rental units and seeks to increase citizen home ownership. The police are one of 16 groups in the association. Among its activities are police enforcement of code compliance and building maintenance.
- *Avenue West Community-Oriented Policing, Milwaukee.* This group works in an area with significant commercial activity near downtown. It emphasizes target hardening, lighting, etc.

The key lesson from the study is the importance of joint process, rather than program specifics. Activities such as painting housing or installing lights are

important, as they bring people together. Agency networking is critical. Agencies must learn to work together.

The research shows two distinct approaches to analysis: (1) situation management (e.g., target hardening) and (2) increased active surveillance. Strategies are linked to specific neighborhoods or crime problems. It is necessary to determine whether the police or the community should be in charge of specific programs.

**Dr. Michael Buerger** described the Minneapolis "Hot Spots" study, which was designed to revisit the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment. That study found no effect from preventive patrols. However, the study had several flaws:

- Inadequate sample size (15 beats),
- No measures of program intensity, and
- Dispersal of patrol over low-crime areas.

The Minneapolis study focused on 110 hot spots, used neutral observers to measure patrol presence, and focused on areas of documented high-crime levels. Observers reported on both presence of patrol cars and officers driving through on patrol. In the patrol areas, police would drive in, leave the car, and either walk a beat or otherwise appear on the street. There was no schedule for these actions.

The study compared increased police presence in 55 test hot spots versus regular presence in 55 control hot spots. These hot spots varied in composition:

- 46 hot spots were primarily commercial.
- 42 hot spots were primarily residential.
- 22 were mixed commercial and residential.

## Personnel Issues in Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** Elaine S. Hedtke, Chief of Police, Tucson, Arizona, Police Department

**Panelists:** Ted Balistreri, Captain, Madison, Wisconsin, Police Department

Robert Trojanowicz, Director, National Center for Community Policing, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Mary Ann Wycoff, Project Director, Police Foundation, Tarpon Springs, Florida

**Captain Ted Balistreri** of the Madison Police Department said his department began experimenting with community policing about seven years ago. Department managers read about the subject and visited different cities to see what other departments were doing. They concluded that early attempts at community policing failed because they lacked a managerial foundation.

The Madison Police Department envisioned a different kind of community policing program, one that would be closer to the people and would emphasize "quality inside, quality outside." The department implemented a new managerial approach called quality policing, in which managers acted as facilitators and employees were involved in decision-making. Moreover, department employees were treated as internal customers who must be given the opportunity to do their jobs right.

The department articulated the following 12 principles as the bedrock of its quality policing program:

1. Believe in, foster, and support teamwork.

2. Be committed to the problem-solving process. Use data to make decisions.
3. Seek employee input before you make decisions.
4. Believe that the best way to do the work will result.
5. Develop mutual respect among employees.
6. Have a customer orientation toward employees and citizens.
7. Base your management style on the behavior of the 95 percent of employees who work well. Deal with the other 5 percent promptly.
8. Improve systems before placing individual blame.
9. Avoid top-down decisions.
10. Encourage creativity and tolerate honest mistakes.
11. Be a facilitator and coach.
12. With teamwork, develop goals with employees.

Quality policing requires physical decentralization. The police must work among the people. To test the theory of quality policing, the Madison Police Department allowed a group of its employees to set up and design an experimental police district that covered one-sixth of Madison. The officers were even allowed to choose their own commander. Among other positive results, the officers there were more satisfied and called in sick less often.

The department's efforts were difficult, however, due largely to the lack of models to follow. Among the obstacles that had to be overcome were the fear of the unknown, the fear of change, the attitude that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it," and, among managers, the fear of the loss of power.

**Robert Trojanowicz** stated that much confusion exists over what constitutes community policing. Common elements in many definitions include decentralization, posts lasting 18 months or more, and community prioritizing of problems to be solved.

The National Center for Community Policing (NCCP) conducted research to see how many police departments are performing community policing. The research instrument asked respondents for their departments' definitions of community policing. Those definitions are currently being analyzed for common elements. In the meantime, the director of NCCP offers his own definition of community policing: a philosophy of full-service, personalized policing where patrol officers operate for 18 months or more from a decentralized police station.

One approach to community policing requires the establishment of a neighborhood network center. The neighborhood network center is a single location from which a police officer, social services worker, public health nurse, and other key persons work. The police officer serves as the informal leader of the group because he or she knows the community best and has the widest range of options to use in response to various situations.

Obstacles to community policing can be stated in the form of the following questions:

- Where can officers find free patrol time? Citizens might have to receive slower responses to incidents that are not life-threatening.
- Will police departments restructure themselves to select officers with the right qualities for community policing?
- Will departments conduct critical, long-term analysis of community policing?

- Will citizens volunteer their efforts to make the community better, thereby giving police more time to attend to community policing needs?
- Will community groups pitch in to make community policing work?
- Will police chiefs be given job security so they can experiment with community policing?
- Will the trend toward private policing eventually put police out of business? That is, will the public pay for free policing for the poor when the time comes that most people pay for their own policing?

Some departments should not undertake community policing. That policing style simply cannot succeed if a department lacks the support of its officers, the community and its subgroups, churches and social agencies, political leaders, and the media.

**Mary Ann Wycoff** reported on the Houston Performance Measures Study. If community policing is to be effective, police departments must change their performance criteria for officers. To study the effects of such a change, a research project was undertaken in Houston, Texas, which, like Madison, had set aside one-sixth of the city for community policing experimentation.

Houston changed its performance measures to emphasize to patrol officers the department's new expectations of them. Research for the Houston Police Department attempted to determine whether those new performance measures affected officers and whether the public noticed any difference.

In the community policing area of the city, one group of officers was exposed to the new performance measures, while a control group of officers was not exposed to the measures. The same was done in an area of the city that was not set aside for community policing.

After a trial period, the research found that officers subjected to the new, community policing-oriented performance measures had a stronger belief in the value of foot patrols, said they did more problem-solving, and had more faith in the goodness of citizens. Citizens surveyed were more

likely to remember the names of responding officers who were part of the experimental group. However, the research turned up no other changes. Because of a change in police department administration, Houston is no longer practicing community policing in the same manner.

## Bureau of Justice Assistance's Community-Oriented Policing Demonstration Program and Prototype

---

**Moderator:** *Richard H. Ward, Acting Director, Discretionary Grants Program, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), U.S. Department of Justice*

**Panelists:** *Stephen J. Gaffigan, Project Director, Community Policing Consortium, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Alexandria, Virginia*

*Richard Lewis, Research Associate, Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), Washington, D.C.*

*John Doyle, Project Director, National Sheriffs' Association (NSA), Alexandria, Virginia*

*Mary Ann Wycoff, Project Director, Police Foundation, Tarpon Springs, Florida*

**Federal Role.** **Richard Ward** explained how BJA has been actively involved in the evolution of community policing. Drug initiative programs in 1986 and 1987 involved a systems approach to drug interdiction and a problem solving approach to drug trafficking. Since 1992, as part of the "Weed and Seed" program, community policing has been developed with BJA assistance. The latest community-oriented policing program (COPP) is a 1993 BJA discretionary program.

BJA is looking for flexible community-oriented policing models. This is difficult since there is confusion about what community policing is, and many different programs have been labeled community policing. BJA contends that there needs to be a consistent format and framework which will be the underpinning of community-oriented policing, and there

are certain steps a department should go through. However, there are many ways to implement community-oriented policing.

The purpose of COPP is to design, demonstrate, and assess a comprehensive, department-wide community policing prototype. BJA has established a consortium consisting of IACP, PERF, the Police Foundation, and NSA to assist in the development of the prototype. The COPP program will select four sites per year during the three-year span of the consortium, which is supported by an appropriation of \$125 million.

Agencies interested in applying for the development of a community policing prototype must be willing to accept major program planning and implementation responsibilities. Selected sites must work with the consortium to carry out the following:

1. *Needs Assessment.* Identify those areas requiring change.
2. *Strategic Plan of Action.* Design and fully execute a strategic plan in support of the prototype implementation.
3. *Organizational Commitments.* Create a project executive team, and a local consortium involving various stakeholders; maintain a partnership with the consortium.
4. *Quality Control and Accountability.* Accept rigid quality control and accountability measures during the course of the multiyear project.
5. *Expenditure of Grant Funds.* Expend grant funds only for substantive purposes that directly support the project objectives.

## 6. *Key Program Elements.*

Implement those elements (approximately 10) necessary to carry out the prototype.

*Historical Perspective.* **Mary Ann Wycoff** pointed out that there is a core group of police agencies that are doing community policing. This is a groundswell that has its roots in the seventh principle of Sir Robert Peel, which stated, "The public are the police, and the police are the public."

Police administrators at the turn of the century began to structure their departments under a strong centralized and controlling system to combat corruption. With technology changes (automobile, telephone, radio), the officers became more and more efficient but more and more removed from the community. At the same time, communities were changing and becoming more diverse.

In the 1960s, there was anger and frustration throughout the nation. The police became the target. The riots and civil disobedience became a wake-up call for the nation. During the 1970s, three presidential crime commissions were formed; new police professional associations were created (Police Executive Research Forum, Police Foundation); federal legislation and funding were passed (with oversight given to a new agency, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration); and extensive research began. Some of the principal research that had an impact on community policing were the Kansas City patrol studies, San Diego's beat profile study, and the problem solving research.

In the late 1980s, there grew a willingness on the part of local government and police executives to change the status quo. Wilson and Kelling's "Broken Windows" article and Herman Goldstein's *Police Community Problem Solving* provided the direction. The private sector's emphasis on participative management and total quality management began to be

understood and practiced in some law enforcement agencies.

*Consortium Prototype.* **Stephen Gaffigan** explained the Community Policing Consortium's effort at developing a community-oriented policing prototype that will have a strategic emphasis. Like traditional policing, COPP will have a strong focus on the control and prevention of crime. The program will try to reduce the schism that exists between traditional and community-oriented policing.

The two keys in COPP are problem solving and community engagement. Both must be approached from various levels: grassroots (beat/neighborhood), department-wide, and jurisdiction-wide.

The requirements for the prototype include a detailed needs assessment and strategic action plan. The following are some of the key points to be stressed:

- The department's policing culture has to change.
- Management style and structure have to change.
- The department must decentralize.
- Patrol officers' responsibility and authority have to expand.
- The department's systems, policies, and practices have to support community policing (focus on internal operations before external).
- Politicians and the business community must be involved.
- The media must be involved to help influence the community.
- Plans must be made for tactical application of programs.

The consortium will have a definite operational focus. It will see that the prototype is practitioner-driven. The consortium will develop a mechanism to assess the prototype. It will expand as a resource center to provide referrals for jurisdictions having specific needs.

*Evaluation.* **Richard Lewis** explained that evaluating the community-

oriented policing prototype is necessary in order to measure progress; to identify what elements have to be changed or dropped; to support continuation of COPP, if it is working; and to make sure communities are ready for change.

Traditional measures of police activity (e.g., reported crime and arrests) cause difficulties when trying to measure COPP activities and impact. The consortium has identified three COPP measures: efficiency, effectiveness, and equity. Measurements of community input also impact the evaluation. It is essential to have community input, since concerned stakeholders should have significant influence on police policy, procedures, and practices. COPP requires the establishment of collaborative partnerships with the community and many private and public agencies.

*Effectiveness* measures would include number of problems identified, status, and results. The number of persons involved and their affiliation would also be considered.

Measures of *efficiency* would include what the department did to realign its structure and operation to support community policing, decentralize the decision making process, and empower the

officers.

Measures of *equity* would include elements like the number of ways citizens have access to police service.

*Prototype Flexibility and Adaptability.* **John Doyle** said many chiefs may be reluctant to get involved because the prototype seems to require strict adherence to a set of standards that may restrict the executive in carrying out the department's mission. The consortium is stressing flexibility. It understands that each jurisdiction is different and will approach implementation differently. For example, appointed chiefs of police and elected sheriffs look at the community differently. The size and diversity of the community (population, density, composition), as well as locality of the community (inner city, suburban, rural), affect implementation.

Each demonstration site will have sufficient flexibility to create partnerships between the police, community, and service providers. The consortium will not dictate who should be on the project team or the local jurisdiction's consortium.

Four cities have already been chosen. Two of the most difficult conditions to be worked on are overcoming citizen apathy and getting a jurisdiction's long-term commitment.

## How Abuse of Force Can Undermine Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *William A. Geller, Associate Director, Police Executive Research Forum, Wilmette, Illinois*

**Panelists:** *Gayle Fisher-Stewart, President, DA'VO, Ltd., Takoma Park, Maryland*

*Ellen Scrivner, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

*Norm Stamper, Executive Assistant Chief, San Diego, California, Police Department*

**William Geller** began the session by briefly discussing how incidents involving abuse of force by police present police departments with important opportunities with regard to community policing. Incidents of abuse of force draw attention from all sectors of a city to the police department for a given period of time. While this attention is generally undesirable, he noted that it must be looked upon as an opportunity to send good messages and address troublesome issues. He cautioned that police departments involved in community policing must be especially conscious not to confuse the public on how they handle these situations. In situations of crisis, police departments must keep their community policing agendas in the forefront and ensure that responses are consistent with this agenda. He points out that what is said in a state of calm is often forgotten in the midst of crisis. For police, **Mr. Geller** advocated developing strategic and deliberate responses to crisis situations that are consistent with and not contradictory or dismissive of community policing agendas and goals.

**Mr. Geller** emphasized two central issues in dealing with police abuse of force

in the development of community policing. The greatest responsibility of the police department is helping officers reach their highest level of performance, which, he notes, will involve every aspect of police work. **Mr. Geller** also advocated engaging in creative order maintenance tactics and developing support mechanisms for officers who may make mistakes in exercising the enhanced authority given to community policing officers.

**Dr. Gayle Fisher-Stewart** is a private consultant and trainer who retired from the District of Columbia Police Department after 20 years of service. She contends that community policing will not prevent abuse of force. Effective community policing is based on trust between police and the community. Police have no power unless it is granted to them by the community. Abuse of force happens when police use force to assert authority that has not been bestowed by the community. She added that abuse of force results from corruption of values and trust and from personal and organizational problems—as, for example, when a department's espoused values clash with operational values. Lastly, **Dr. Fisher-Stewart** offered a dictum that police are treated as well by the community as the community thinks it is being treated by the police. The frustration of officers with the community is all too often taken out on the community, resulting in abuses of force.

Attempting to address abuse of force must involve addressing internal conflicts within police departments. **Dr. Fisher-Stewart** noted the importance of de-emphasizing rank and personality issues and focusing on assigning officers to jobs for which they are best suited and qualified. The community and officers need to perceive that there is a sharing of power and that patrol officers are respected and valued.

Community policing needs to be implemented at the patrol level, but patrol officers are still perceived as lowly. It is not uncommon that officers are assigned to patrol duty for punitive reasons. High-ranking officers, conversely, are perceived to have special privilege, and less responsibility and accountability. When higher-ranking police have special privilege and patrol officers do not, the patrol officers often exercise their privilege in the street where they can impose it. Patrol officers then exert force and privilege on those over whom they have control: citizens.

To change the trend and tradition of abuse of police authority, **Dr. Fisher-Stewart** said that police must talk openly about the flaws and abuses in system policies, procedures, and operations. Changes need to be made in the most basic levels of policing and need to begin with training. Those who train new officers will train as they have been trained. In particular, she said training manuals and departmental policies and procedures need to be reviewed and rewritten so they reflect positive language. As long as there is a system that rewards abuse of force, there can be no essential change.

**Dr. Ellen Scrivner** is considered a national expert on police psychology and has worked in a variety of capacities in this field. She is currently conducting research on police use of excessive force. She began her study by interviewing 65 psychologists from 50 police departments nationwide to glean how they view abuse of force issues. She found that police psychologists were used more for crisis intervention and pre-recruitment screening, and they were not integrated into regular department policy and program development. To be most effective for reducing abuse of force, **Dr. Scrivner** contended, psychologists must become involved within the department to monitor early warning signs for risk of abusing force. Warning signs are found in

all situations, not just those related to patrol duties.

**Dr. Scrivner** also gathered data and information through situational counseling with officers. Findings dispelled common misconceptions that abuses of force result from manpower shortages, officer burnout, or working in areas with especially serious problems. **Dr. Scrivner** found that abuse of force occurs among all segments of the police department and in all areas of the city.

She identified five categories of abuse of force:

1. Early career stage
2. Patrol style
3. Job-related
4. Personal problems
5. Chronic risk

The early career stage cases, which account for 19 percent, involve young officers who lack discipline and good supervision. When undisciplined and poorly supervised officers are left unattended, abuse of force may become a part of their policing style, thereby evolving into the patrol style category, which represents 22 percent of cases. **Dr. Scrivner** notes that this type of officer can usually benefit from mentoring and structure. Abuse of force that results from officers' burnout or particular work-related conditions is included in the job-related category and accounts for 17 percent. Twenty-seven percent of abuse of force cases were attributed to personal problems that involve a significant personal loss. Traumatic losses, **Dr. Scrivner** explained, undermine the confidence and self-esteem of these officers. They then assert themselves in other ways and find their outlet through excessive force. The fewest cases (16 percent) were in the chronic risk category, which included people with personality disorders.

Reducing abuse of force must be approached through systematic training and as part of the police department's human resources development process. Different

kinds of abuse of force should be addressed with specified kinds of approaches. Patrol style and early career types of abuse of force will respond to organizational help. Personal problem and job-related cases need counseling. Chronic risk abuse of force cases, **Dr. Scrivner** stated, must be expelled from the police department.

The effectiveness of community policing is challenged by polarization that frequently arises over law enforcement issues. **Norm Stamper** noted that there is no better example of this problem than with situations involving abuse of force. The Rodney King case, he noted, was a blatant example of excessive force, yet it sparked a nationwide debate that did not consider the sizable gap existing between police and the community.

**Mr. Stamper** emphasized that it is critical to direct energy to meaningful goals. Community policing must overcome cultural and racial divisions and resolve issues that divide the police and community. He listed three "truths" that must be addressed. "We are in danger of losing our cities," he stated. Many cities have been rendered uninhabitable. Except for the fact that they do not have the means to leave certain urban communities, millions of people would eagerly live elsewhere. He also noted that cultural, racial, and other diversity are unavoidable. **Mr. Stamper** pointed out that police are not separate from the

communities they serve. They belong to the community, and the community should be a senior partner in that relationship.

"Only a revolution will save us," said **Mr. Stamper**. This revolution, he explained, means "debureaucratizing" the police, eliminating the paramilitary structure, and promoting officers for their qualifications. Furthermore, a unified front of community-based organizations and corporations representing the full range of diversity in communities should be created. Differences among people should be brought up for discussion rather than "left at the door," so that people can be disarmed of their concerns, suspicions, and fears. In that way, people can build on diversity.

**Mr. Stamper** put forth several "rules of revolution" for police and the community. People must be systems thinkers. Since crime and violence in this country are a part of a system, the solutions must also come from a systems approach. People must have courage at all levels, from confronting crack dealers on the street to asserting political views. People must not be frightened of laws but must use them to reclaim the streets. They must also act with dignity and respect for one another and include everyone. There must be no tolerance of bigotry for any reason. Lastly, **Mr. Stamper** stated that police must be treated in a manner reflective of the community's wishes, for, he noted, "we reap as we sow."

## Training Workshop: First Line Supervision for Community Policing

---

**Instructors:** *Edwin J. Donovan, Assistant Professor, Administration of Justice, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania*

*William F. Walsh, Director, Southern Police Institute, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky*

### **William Walsh and Edwin**

**Donovan** both noted that their perspectives on the training topic stemmed from both their academic work and their field experience as police officers. **Dr. Walsh** is a former police lieutenant, having served 22 years with the New York City Police Department. He now directs the Southern Police Institute and is an associate professor in the School of Justice Administration at the University of Louisville. **Mr. Donovan** was formerly a patrol supervisor and a unit commander for the New York City Police Department and helped develop Penn State's continuing education course on community policing.

**Dr. Walsh** said a continuing complaint is, "sergeants never do their jobs." Sergeants are in high-profile, high-risk positions, and these positions are critical to the success of community policing. Jerry McElroy of Vera Institute wrote about the sergeant's role changing from control-oriented to participative. Herman Goldstein states that sergeants should be problem solvers, communications conduits, and motivators, and should participate with officers throughout the problem-solving process. But sergeants have not been adequately prepared for their changing role.

**Dr. Walsh** conducted a study of 60 line supervisors involved in some form of community policing in departments with 50 to 150 sworn personnel. Although the study did not involve a representative sample, the results are instructive:

- 83 percent said their most serious problem was a lack of support from peers and patrol officers.
- 77 percent said management support was minimal.
- 72 percent said there were no job descriptions for community policing officers or supervisors.
- 65 percent said there were no community policing directives.
- 62 percent said there was no evaluation plan.
- 62 percent said no training was provided.

There is a clear need to structure the supervisor's role with regard to community policing. Police departments need to do the following:

- Define the job function, duties, and responsibilities. This involves conducting a job/task analysis and developing a job description.
- Identify the knowledge, skills, and behaviors that are desirable in a community policing supervisor.
- Consider the above characteristics in the officer selection process.
- Provide training.
- Conduct evaluations.

The department must also empower supervisors by taking the following steps:

- Develop policies and procedures for community policing.
- Provide support systems (e.g., determine who will be the mentor or ombudsman for the supervisor).
- Include supervisors in operational planning.
- Encourage intra-organizational networking. Community policing supervisors need to communicate with each other and advocate for their needs within the department.

**Mr. Donovan** noted that supervisory training for community policing is typically

limited to reviewing forms, troubleshooting, and disciplinary procedures. Instead, the following training topics should be considered:

- How to run a meeting
- How to allocate resources in proportion to needs
- How to define a community
- How to enlist support from the community and get diverse groups to work together
- How to analyze crimes, crime patterns, and trends
- How to conduct local community relations programs
- How to gather data for evaluation purposes

**Mr. Donovan** then discussed four characteristics of successful teams. The first is a *sense of commitment*. Evidence of this includes participation by all members, shared leadership, and effective communication by all team members. *Conflict* is also necessary. A healthy exchange of ideas should be encouraged. Although conflict should be controlled and should focus on ideas, not personalities, it should be sought out. Successful teams also demonstrate *creativity*. This is evidenced by the use of all possible resources; and by taking unique approaches to problem solving, decision making, and process development. Finally, successful teams use a *consensus process* to reach agreement.

**Mr. Donovan** noted that creativity means violating policy. For example, should officers be permitted to play a baseball game with residents while on duty? What about assisting a religious organization while on the clock? Supervisors must get their departments to write policy giving them authority to act in a community policing setting.

**Dr. Walsh** emphasized that community policing is "a significant change

in how we police the society and in how we manage police organizations." The change began after World War II, when departments started creating community relations units. Given the magnitude of change proposed, it is helpful to consider the main attributes of failed innovation. The following list of causes for failure was adapted from a 1978 publication by Wycoff and Kelling:

1. Lack of planning and understanding of the change process throughout all levels of the organization
2. Ideas imposed from the top or from outside the organization
3. Lack of support from the lower ranks
4. Mid-level managers and supervisors not included in the planning, not prepared for new role changes, and thus nonsupportive
5. Failure to make organizational, process, or structural changes required to support the new program
6. The organizational culture not supportive; new program inconsistent with departmental behaviors and belief systems
7. New program limited to an add-on or a special unit, not integrated into the whole organization (thus becomes an "innovation ghetto")
8. Overall effort made too fast

**Mr. Donovan** emphasized the need to go slowly, build on successes, and plan carefully. Community policing probably stands the greatest chance of success in a department that places a high value on patrol service (e.g., the department offers a good patrol duty schedule, makes good personnel selections, and "the brass stands up for patrol").

## Drug Use Forecasting and Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *Virginia Baldau, Director of Research, Applications and Training Division, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

**Panelists:** *Carol Putnam, Social Science Analyst, National Institute of Justice*

*Susan Pennell, Director, Criminal Justice Research Division, San Diego Association of Governments, San Diego, California*

*Scott Decker, Professor and Chair, Criminology and Criminal Justice Department, University of Missouri at St. Louis*

*Charles C. Foti, Jr., Criminal Sheriff, Orleans Parish, Louisiana, Criminal Sheriff's Office*

**Carol Putnam** gave an introduction to the Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) Program of the National Institute of Justice, which collects data from 24 sites across the United States. The program's purpose is to monitor drug use among arrestees in urban areas in order to alert local officials to drug use trends in their cities.

In the program, booked arrestees give voluntary, anonymous physical samples. About 70 percent of males arrested for burglary test positive for a drug, and some 85 percent of females arrested for prostitution test positive for a drug. In fact, more than three-quarters of all arrestees—both men and women—test positive for at least one drug. The program is now in its fifth year.

**Susan Pennell** reported on using DUF for Weed and Seed. Weed and Seed is a federal initiative to revitalize communities

by weeding out chronic offenders and seeding the communities by increasing residents' access to social services.

San Diego, which has one of the highest rates of arrestees testing positive for drugs, is a DUF data collection site. Among other uses, DUF data are employed in the city's Weed and Seed program. The DUF data permit offender concentrations to be plotted on a map of the city. A knowledge of those concentrations is used to allocate treatment resources most effectively.

**Dr. Scott Decker** discussed using DUF for drug research. Like San Diego, St. Louis is a DUF data collection site. The DUF program provides information that is useful in many elements of community policing. In St. Louis, the data collection personnel share their data with the police. First, DUF data collectors provide the police with information assistance. DUF information helps the chief of police answer media inquiries and helps clarify demographic patterns in drug use (for example, eight of the 42 neighborhoods in St. Louis account for 40 percent of the homicides).

Second, operational assistance is provided in the form of trend-spotting and add-ons. Add-ons are questions that can be added to DUF interviews for the purpose of gathering particular information that the police want.

Third, planning assistance is provided in the form of information that helps the police compete for grants and interact with other city agencies. For example, DUF interviews spotted a syphilis epidemic in St. Louis. That knowledge was passed along to other city agencies so they could provide treatment to carriers of the disease.

Fourth, personnel assistance is provided in the form of information that the

police department can use to warn or train its officers or to anticipate liability. For example, a knowledge of the level of HIV infection among arrestees can help the police department know what precautions to take in handling arrestees.

**Sheriff Charles Foti** reported on correctional alternatives in an urban community. Orleans Parish had been unable to raise taxes to build new jails; but by using DUF data, the law enforcement community was able to convince the public to approve a bond issue to build and renew jails. DUF data documented a rapid increase in hard drug use within the parish.

The sheriff of the parish called on attendees to examine the details of their local juvenile justice systems. He advised

intervening earlier than is typical to prevent youth from becoming criminals—middle school, not high school, would be the time to step in. He praised the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program.

In Orleans Parish, the sheriff's office established a partnership with local schools, routinely sending officers to eat lunch at the schools. One goal is to reduce youth recidivism. About 50 percent of 12-year-old arrestees in Orleans Parish are recidivists, as are about 60 percent of 13-year-old arrestees.

One way law enforcement agencies can implement community policing is to find new ways to help the community. The sheriff advised putting jail inmates to work in neighborhood restoration.

## Union Perspectives on Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *A. Tony Fisher, Chief of Police, Takoma Park, Maryland, Police Department*

**Panelists:** *Robert B. Kliesmet, President, International Union of Police Associations—AFL-CIO, Alexandria, Virginia*

*Bobby Mathieson, President, Police Benevolent Association, Virginia Beach, Virginia*

*Dewey R. Stokes, National President, Fraternal Order of Police, Columbus, Ohio*

**Officer Bobby Mathieson**, president of Virginia Beach Police Department's Police Benevolent Association (PBA), stated that Virginia is a right-to-work state. Virginia Beach has an urban population of 410,000 and a summer population of 1 million, with a police department that has between 650 and 675 sworn police officers. There are two unions: the PBA represents the rank and file.

The department has gone through growing pains in developing a community policing program. From the department's perspective there are some lessons to be learned:

- Sergeants have to understand that they must relinquish the concept of command and control.
- Organizational constraints have to be lifted.
- Performance evaluations have to be changed to reward community policing actions.
- Unions should be a strong advocate for community policing.
- Unions see community support as helping the police to obtain their

budget and to increase police benefits.

- Unions support a higher level of job satisfaction.

**Officer Mathieson** recommends going to the officers and asking for their ideas. It is necessary to make a concerted effort to communicate with the rank and file. Managers must stress quality, not quantity, of work.

**Dewey Stokes**, the national president of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), stated that the FOP has not generally announced itself for or against community policing.

Community policing is a continuation of former police practices. Walking beats were used in the 1970s, but many of the laws that supported walking officers (e.g., vagrancy and public drunkenness) have been taken off the books. Police management placed officers into cars to make them more productive. Now, we are finding the need to place officers back into the community.

There must be commitment from the chief and middle management; if not, community policing will waste time and resources. Community policing should not be a PR program. It is an abuse of officers to ask them to make politicians look good. Why, after 10 years, do only 300 police departments have some form of community policing?

Management must be in the forefront of community policing. There is a need for positive communications between management and officers. Often, the chief's expectations for community policing are not communicated to the officers. Job placement must be community policing oriented. Promotions and assignments must reflect commitment to community policing.

Police officers cannot be drained from response patrol to perform community policing functions. If management is not ready to share its authority, then it should not take on community policing. Union objectives are actually the same as those of middle management and executives. The Fair Labor Standards Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act also contain factors impacting on community policing.

There must be commitment to follow through. Community policing includes the officer's involvement as a person in community activity. Labor relations and the union can be used to effect change and support the community.

**Robert Kliesmet** emphasized that community policing is not new. Police did it way back in the 1950s. Even in the 1920s, Chief August Volmer espoused a form of community policing in order to respond to the problems of the inner city due to immigrants and poverty. The police reform movement, following the Taylorism model (after Frederick Taylor, father of time-and-motion studies), brought about a change in policing. It moved from a decentralized structure to a strong central command and control structure.

The reform movement, which was touted as a move to the police professional model, involved an officer's private life more. For example, it required officers to take weapons home, required them to take action if they observed a crime, and limited

their outside employment.

Police unions sprang up when the rank and file officers lost faith in management when negotiating for benefits. Unions collected money, founded PACS, made political endorsements, and supported candidates. Unions, not police departments, were seen as the organization that appreciated what the officer faced on the street.

The International Union of Police Associations (IUPA) supports community policing because it is a way the community will support the union. In 1987, IUPA received a small grant to look at community policing. When community policing was adopted in Flint, Michigan, the police received community support for increases in pay and benefits.

Police management may not be supportive of community policing because they may see it as conflicting with management rights and requiring additional staffing; and they are reluctant to include the rank and file in the planning for community policing.

**Mr. Kliesmet** commented further that the officers must be convinced about the idea first. They must be included in the planning for community policing. Management must also support community policing by making the commitment to allow officers the freedom to take action. Community involvement must be solicited, encouraged, and used.

## Partnership Panel: Local Efforts to Rebuild Communities

---

**Moderator:** *Julius Debro, Associate Dean, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington*

**Panelists:** *Barbara Bostick-Hunt, Executive Director, Community Building in Partnership, Sandtown-Winchester Project, Baltimore, Maryland*

*David J. Powers, Lieutenant, Chief's Executive Officer, Los Angeles, California, Police Department*

*David L. Armstrong, Judge/Executive, Jefferson County, Kentucky*

**Barbara Bostick-Hunt** was appointed in 1991 by Mayor Kurt L. Schmoke to head the Sandtown-Winchester Project, a comprehensive and integrated project that has successfully enhanced the lives of residents in the Sandtown-Winchester neighborhood of Baltimore, Maryland. Three years ago, in this 72-square-block neighborhood of 10,000 residents, 44 percent of residents were unemployed, 72 percent were receiving public assistance, and it ranked highest in Baltimore for crimes, violent offenses, incidence of AIDS, and infant mortality. It is for these factors that the Sandtown-Winchester community was selected as the pilot site for the Community Building in Partnership Initiative.

The initiative was begun with a grant from the Nehemiah Foundation to build 227 new homes and renovate old housing units. New and renovated homes were desperately needed; however, the community recognized that new homes alone would not improve the quality of life without a plan to transform and sustain the community as a whole. To build a partnership between the community and government agencies,

experts were brought in through the Enterprise Foundation to help develop community work groups. The work groups were composed of a range of people, and, **Ms. Bostick-Hunt** emphasized, the residents were considered the experts for their community. The Sandtown-Winchester Project also emphasized leadership development and hired residents to staff its programs.

In the two years since the project began, many changes have been implemented in the neighborhood. Two schools have been transferred to private management, an academy was established where parents and teachers receive efficacy training together, Habitat for Humanity has begun building houses there, a youth summer employment program has been established whereby every youth seeking summer work is assured a job, a food and clothing bank has been started, 80 residents have been employed in the construction of houses, and many others have been trained in housing construction and rehabilitation. Since these changes within the community, infant mortality has been reduced to almost zero percent, and crime was reduced by 15 percent as of the first quarter of 1993.

The Community Building in Partnership in Sandtown-Winchester is considered a most successful program. Its success is due to what **Ms. Bostick-Hunt** calls "reinventing government" so that systems that operated poorly in a dysfunctional community are now part of a working, productive community. Mayor Schmoke has been supportive from the beginning and made this type of effort a priority for his administration and the city. The city now has a model that it plans to apply to other communities.

**Lieutenant David Powers**, a 21-year veteran of the Los Angeles Police

Department (LAPD), currently manages LAPD's NIJ Partnership for Community Policing grant program. Through this program, he held a three-month series of meetings with people from all sections of the Los Angeles community in order to start the rebuilding effort. He says he realized very quickly that there were a host of problems. Further, he realized that the grant would not go toward rebuilding the community, but rather toward rebuilding the police department for the community.

**Lieutenant Powers** conceded that the LAPD was very difficult to change and commended Chief Willie Williams, an outsider, for playing an important role in creating a climate of consensus within the department. The chief, he noted, brought in new light and changed the department's mood to one of openness. After months of meetings, a commitment was made to change the core values statement, develop a mission statement, and then develop a strategic management plan for the police department.

There were three basic elements underlying the approach to rebuilding the police department. The department adopted the philosophy of starting from the beginning and rethinking what is being done at all levels. The department also decided to use what it called community-police problem solving. Lastly, a commitment was made to rebuild community relationships where they had been damaged and create them where positive ones may not have existed.

**Judge David Armstrong** was elected judge/executive of Jefferson County, Kentucky, in 1989, and chose as his administration's theme *Building on Our Best*. As an example of his administration's work in building communities, **Judge Armstrong** highlighted a program aimed at helping families with young children. It leverages resources and cooperation from the bottom up. The program focuses on

families at risk—families for whom home ownership has declined to 16 percent, where one in four children live below the poverty level, and 40 percent of children younger than age five live in poverty.

The program is based on three principles that are keys to its success: inclusiveness, collaboration, and accountability. The principles are translated into action by implementing five goal areas:

1. Getting agencies and providers to work together
2. Organizing and coordinating resources at the neighborhood level
3. Making employers more family-sensitive
4. Involving young families at risk in controlling their own destinies
5. Deciding priorities with maximum buy-ins

The program attempts to involve as many agencies as possible and as early in the process as possible. It is also helpful, he said, to create some momentum for the organizations and give them a sense of immediate accomplishment. His program places a one-year time frame on any action that emerges from the group's planning. This, he said, creates a healthy sense of urgency and keeps everyone in touch with how work is developing. It also helps to ensure that goals and outcomes are measurable and well defined. **Judge Armstrong** conceded that the process can be slow and occasionally frustrating, and he added that it helps immeasurably "to have a champion for the process who can be a catalyst and who has the political will to keep things moving forward." This, he said, is his own role in the program.

Among the first steps in developing the program was the formation of an advisory committee, which has grown to include representatives from more than 30 organizations whose missions involve service to young families at risk. The

committee's work has included helping to design the program, providing general program oversight, and setting the program's rebuilding priorities. The committee also formed a task force that garnered the help of more than 90 groups and organizations to work toward one of the committee's top priorities: making the workplace more supportive of family needs. Another project is a pilot effort called "The Neighborhood Place," which brings together every major human services provider in a neighborhood-based, one-stop setting.

The program has, from the beginning, sought input and direction from residents. One example of this is a two-day "visioning" forum, the first public involvement session, attended by more than 300 participants. This meeting identified the need for a Neighborhood Resource Team that will convene police, social and public health workers, housing inspectors, counselors, and practitioners from other disciplines. This team is presently under development. Two target neighborhoods will be surveyed regarding residents' perception of safety conditions. Teams will be formed and initial needs identified; then a

strategy will be developed to meet the needs.

The need to make employers more sensitive to the needs of families was critical to community betterment, and Jefferson County set a precedent for other businesses to follow. The government created a childcare subsidy for employees who had problems getting access to basic care. The government is also working with the Chamber of Commerce and the United Way to form a network of local businesses to develop similar and other initiatives.

In deciding the priorities, a set of criteria was developed to evaluate suggestions from the community:

1. Is a strategy likely to have impact on young families in the near future?
2. What efforts, if any, are already underway with regard to the proposed strategy?
3. How timely and feasible is the strategy?

The process of determining priorities is aided immeasurably by these criteria and by the direct participation of the community in applying these criteria to their own recommendations to arrive at decisions.

## Community Policing in Small Cities and Rural Areas

---

**Moderator:** Donna L. Hansen, Chief of Police, Ft. Myers, Florida

**Panelists:** Gil Kerlikowske, Chief of Police, Ft. Pierce, Florida

Ralph A. Weisheit, Professor,  
Department of Criminal Justice, Illinois  
State University, Normal, Illinois

Carl R. Harbaugh, Sheriff, Frederick  
County, Maryland

**Chief Donna Hansen** noted that there are many possible ways to define *small police department* (e.g., by population served, budget, number of sworn personnel, or victimization problem). Of the country's more than 15,000 police agencies, 91 percent employ fewer than 50 persons. Many of the policies and theories of policing have been developed for big cities and do not work well in small jurisdictions.

**Chief Gil Kerlikowske** explained that Ft. Pierce, Florida, a city of 40,000 residents on the Atlantic coast, has a violent crime rate comparable to that of Washington, D.C. In the late 1980s, there were 20 homicides in one year, and three police officers were killed within the past six years. The Ft. Pierce Police Department has 150 employees, 108 of whom are sworn officers. The jurisdiction has both industrial and rural areas.

**Chief Kerlikowske** noted that several elements of team policing are common to community policing (e.g., giving patrol officers more investigative responsibilities and encouraging beat officers to attend Neighborhood Watch meetings). In 1985, **Chief Kerlikowske** was a Fellow at NIJ, where he was involved in the Newport News, Virginia, problem oriented policing experiment. In 1990, soon after he was appointed police chief in Ft.

Pierce, he launched community policing there. Initially, this involved a team of six officers, one sergeant, and one lieutenant. By April 1992, the department had created three geographic patrol divisions. Essentially, there are now three "chiefs," each of whom serves between 12,000 and 15,000 residents. Although crime rates began a downward trend before his appointment as chief, community policing has had a significant positive influence on this trend. Crime rates in Ft. Pierce are now at their lowest levels in more than 10 years.

**Sheriff Carl Harbaugh**, formerly with the Maryland State Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, explained that Frederick County, Maryland, located 45 miles northwest of Washington, D.C., has 165,000 residents and covers 664 square miles. Although largely rural, the county is seeing an influx of residents who work in Baltimore and in the District of Columbia. It is also the site of the Presidential retreat, Camp David. The largest city, Frederick, has a population of 45,000 and a police force of 95 employees. The towns of Brunswick and Thurmont each have six officers. The county's main crime problems are burglary, domestic violence, and juvenile crime. The average patrol beat covers 72 square miles, but each deputy is assigned more than one beat and may cover between 150 and 210 miles in a day.

**Sheriff Harbaugh** promised a change toward community policing when he successfully ran for office in 1990. Since that time, the Frederick County Sheriff's Office has made many changes that demonstrate how community policing can be implemented in a rural area.

One of the first steps was to form a 14-member advisory committee, which surveyed residents about the services they believed the sheriff's office should provide. The sheriff now sponsors a citizens' police

academy. In addition, the sheriff began sponsoring teen dances, which the recreation department now supervises. At first, attendance at each dance was about 30; now it is between 160 and 260. Deputies in uniform work these dances. The sheriff's office also supports "Safe and Sane Graduation" events, in which 98 percent of graduates participate.

Deputies are assigned to permanent beats. They also park and walk in shopping centers and small towns and attend civic association and town meetings. As a result, three towns have provided the sheriff's office with substations. The work of some deputies as emergency medical service and fire department volunteers has also helped gain resident support for the sheriff's office.

**Dr. Ralph Weisheit** explained that he is currently involved in a research project with the National Sheriffs' Association and NIJ. The project involves conducting interviews and compiling all available literature on rural crime and rural law enforcement.

According to **Dr. Weisheit**, there are several reasons why cities should look to rural areas for community policing ideas. Rural citizens are more likely than urban residents to know their neighbors and to know offenders. Residents also expect a wider range of services from the police. Often, when they call the police department, they ask for a specific officer.

Like rural residents, rural police know many of the offenders, and they generally handle them differently than do urban police. Often, rural officers grew up in the area where they make arrests. Even when this is not the case, they quickly lose

privacy and a sense of identity outside of the police role. There is no police subculture when a department has only five or six officers. Police in rural areas are generally more positive about their relationships with prosecutors, probation officers, and other criminal justice personnel. Differences between rural and urban police tend to fade when dealing with the most serious crimes, but most police work does not fall into this category.

**Sheriff Harbaugh** and **Chief Hansen** noted that concern about liability is growing in rural areas and that the legal climate has been influenced by attorneys who have moved there from urban centers. An audience participant noted that rural areas show evidence of serious crime, including methamphetamine production, air strips used for drug shipment, and organized poaching.

The panelists then discussed concerns specifically related to community policing in small departments. **Sheriff Harbaugh** said the only associated cost for his office has been for training. **Chief Kerlikowske** said community policing in his department has not proved more labor intensive than traditional approaches. In his view, experienced officers who have become disillusioned with traditional enforcement may be more amenable to community policing than officers with only a few years on the job. **Chief Hansen** noted that supervisors, particularly lieutenants, seem to have the most difficulty accepting a community policing approach. She also noted that small local grants may be available to pay overtime.

## Training Workshop: Alternative Dispute Resolution

---

**Instructors:** Jennifer Adams  
Mastrofski, Faculty Associate, Center for  
Research in Conflict and Negotiations,  
Pennsylvania State University,  
University Park, Pennsylvania

Deidre Levdansky, Executive Director,  
Pittsburgh Mediation Center, Pittsburgh,  
Pennsylvania

The goal of the workshop was to have an informal, interactive training session composed of four elements:

- "Getting Your Feet Wet"
- The Pittsburgh Experience
- "Wading in the Water"
- Where Do We Go From Here?  
("Sink or Swim")

A scenario was presented to the session. Workshop participants were asked what actions a police officer should take to settle a dispute between a black man and an Asian couple who own a convenience store. The store owners have refused to reimburse the customer, who has put money into an arcade machine that would not work. Instead, they have referred the customer to the company that installed the machine. This is unacceptable to the customer, who makes some anti-Asian statements.

The workshop participants suggested a variety of responses, including a personal refund from the officer to the customer. Other suggestions would have had the officer engage in efforts to mediate the conflict, possibly having the store owners refund the lost money, calling the machine owners, or simply separating the parties.

The workshop participants were asked to define conflict. The trainers noted that the Chinese character for conflict has two parts that include both opportunity and danger. Conflict is also affected by perception. A picture, capable of being

differently interpreted, was shown. In one view, a profile of an old crone appeared; in the other, a back-view of a young lady with long hair was seen.

The participants were asked *when* alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods are best used. Based on the case example, ADR is applicable when there may be repeat situations involving the same kind of conflict. This would also include future contacts between the two parties, irrespective of the instant conflict. Other factors to consider include time frame issues, i.e., what can be done now versus later.

In the Pittsburgh experience, the trainers contracted with the city of Pittsburgh to provide ADR services. Several examples were presented, including mediation between gangs and police, gangs and schools, and police and other agencies such as the fire department in same building. Future work will involve police and housing residents' conflicts.

A second scenario presented by the instructors involved a police officer dispatched to a domestic dispute, involving two cousins residing together. One cousin is moving her property to a nearby car with the help of her boyfriend. She appears to be injured (two-inch cut on hand). The boyfriend reports that the cousins have fought before; he expects they will be back together in a few days but will fight again after that.

The workshop participants were asked what the officer should do in response. Participant answers varied from "nothing" to "arrest the cousin who injured the other cousin." In the actual case from which this scenario was developed, the officer reported suspicion that drug use was involved in the problem. The officer simply kept things calm by helping the first cousin

to get her things. The workshop participants viewed factors such as likelihood of repeat violence and the need to gather more information to be relevant to the officer's actions. In this example, there was no active conflict. There may have been a need for victim-offender mediation.

## Training Workshop: Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act in Law Enforcement Agencies

---

**Instructor:** *Paula N. Rubin, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

**Paula Rubin** began the workshop by explaining the protected classifications: race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, and persons with disabilities. She explained that although there are protected classes, there are bona fide occupational qualifications under which some jobs may discriminate because of the nature of the work. For example, men would not be hired to model women's bathing suits.

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), changes to Title I hiring mean that medical exams and inquiries cannot be done until a conditional offer of employment has been made. **Ms. Rubin** pointed out that one of the easiest ways to protect against discrimination lawsuits is to have written job descriptions that are distributed to potential job applicants, demonstrating a standardized job application process.

In order to clarify what disabilities are protected under ADA, **Ms. Rubin** explained that any substantial life activity that is limited creates a protected disability. She defined substantial life activity as any "—ing" word—for example, walking, hearing, or sitting. If any substantial life activity is affected by a disability, then the person is protected under ADA.

**Ms. Rubin** outlined the conditions for protection under ADA:

1. A person has physical or mental impairment that substantially limits significant life activities.
2. The person has a record of an impairment, even if the record is wrong (e.g., medical record

indicates loss of sight although the person has 20/20 vision; this constitutes protection under ADA).

3. A person is regarded or perceived to be disabled (e.g., a person who has received serious burns, or people who have a drug/alcohol addiction but are in rehabilitation or have completed rehabilitation).
4. The person is otherwise qualified for the job, is able to perform the essential elements of the job, or meets eligibility criteria to participate in a program.

In terms of applications, **Ms. Rubin** described the types of questions that law enforcement can ask on medical history, agility testing, drug testing, and other issues in a pre-offer status. For medical inquiries, employers cannot ask applicants about illnesses or medical treatments. She advised attendees also to avoid "back-door" questions such as whether the person has a driver's license or the number and reason for days absent. In the first instance, employers should only ask about a driver's license if driving is an essential part of the job. In the second case, asking the number of days absent creates what **Ms. Rubin** termed the case of the confessing candidate. If the candidate confesses a disability or perceived disability such as drug treatment and then does not get the job, the employer has created a potential for a discrimination suit.

Drug testing is permissible during the pre-offer process. However, **Ms. Rubin** noted that employers should be careful about prescription drugs because knowledge of prescriptions could lead to perceived or actual discrimination. She advised law

enforcement to ask labs only to notify about illegal drugs.

Agility tests may be given pre-offer, as long as a description of the test is provided in advance and the candidate has doctor certification that he or she is able to take the test. For incumbents, the employer must give reasonable accommodation if the person is still otherwise qualified and can still perform job activities. **Ms. Rubin** also explained that it is important to be consistent with light duty assignments.

She suggested that law enforcement remember several questions when screening applicants and complying with ADA:

- Does the person have a disability?
- If so, is he or she otherwise qualified to do the job?
- If the person is not otherwise qualified for the job, is there a reasonable accommodation that the

employer can provide that will make the person otherwise qualified (e.g., phone amplifier for a deaf person)?

Is there any reason or defense for not accommodating the applicant? One acceptable reason would be significant financial or other hardship. Another is if the accommodation would require the employer to fundamentally alter its program.

In conclusion, **Ms. Rubin** offered an easy acronym for the attendees to remember: "**EQUAL**."

- "**E**" for essential functions of the job
- "**Q**" for qualified individual with a disability
- "**U**" for undue burden or direct threat
- "**A**" for accommodation
- "**L**" for living with disability

## Executive Forum: Law Enforcement Executives Face the Issues

---

**Moderator:** *Susan King, News Anchor, WJLA Television, Washington, D.C.*

**Participants:**

*William J. Bratton, Police Commissioner, Boston, Massachusetts*  
*David W. Brown, Chief of Police, Tempe, Arizona*  
*Sylvester Daughtry, Chief of Police, Greensboro, North Carolina*  
*Clarence Edwards, Chief of Police, Montgomery County, Maryland*  
*A. Tony Fisher, Chief of Police, Takoma Park, Maryland*  
*Charles C. Foti, Jr., Sheriff, Orleans Parish, Louisiana*  
*Donna L. Hansen, Chief of Police, Fort Myers, Florida*  
*Clarence Harmon, Chief of Police, St. Louis, Missouri*  
*Steven Harris, Chief of Police, Redmond, Washington*  
*Elaine S. Hedtke, Chief of Police, Tucson, Arizona*  
*Johnnie Johnson, Jr., Chief of Police, Birmingham, Alabama*  
*Gil Kerlikowske, Chief of Police, Fort Pierce, Florida*  
*Thomas G. Koby, Chief of Police, Boulder, Colorado*  
*Robert K. Olson, Police Commissioner, Yonkers, New York*  
*Marty Tapscott, Chief of Police, Richmond, Virginia*  
*Fred Thomas, Chief of Police, Washington, D.C.*  
*Elizabeth M. Watson, Chief of Police, Austin, Texas*

According to moderator **Susan King**, the goal of the session was to examine the idea of community policing from the

perspective of the media and front-line officials in law enforcement. **Ms. King** set the stage with a scenario involving a major city with a new mayor who has promised to put more police on the street, clean up the town, and make the city better. The mayor chose a police chief who shares those goals. Unfortunately, the crime rate continues to rise. The news media catches onto a series of murders in a diverse, gentrified neighborhood. Reporters give the perpetrator a name: the neighborhood stalker. A young woman is killed while walking her dog; her father, a diplomat, goes to the media and tries to mobilize the community, but the murders continue. **Ms. King** asked panel members what they, as police chiefs, would do first.

**Commissioner William Bratton** said he would contact his district commander for the area that was experiencing the problem and get a sense of what was happening in that neighborhood. He would use that commander to network with institutions there, get the media to understand that the police were working with the community, and attempt to bring additional resources into the neighborhood to lessen fear. He observed the impossibility of placing a police officer on every corner of the neighborhood without stripping the rest of the city and stressed instead reliance on community resources.

Given the impossibility of saturation policing, **Chief Johnnie Johnson** stated that, in such a situation, his first meeting would be with the press to establish how the police and the press could work together instead of as adversaries. He said he would also walk through the community, make sure his better investigators were on the

case, and meet with the various groups in the neighborhood.

**Ms. King** expanded on her scenario, saying neighborhood residents complained there was not enough police presence there and said they wanted a police substation to be placed in their neighborhood. **Chief Thomas Koby** noted that he would take a different approach. Describing the scenario as a tactical situation that required a tactical response, he said he would ask his operations staff to develop a plan to address the issue. He added that he would manage the situation as a critical incident, including managing the press, which he described as being sometimes misguided.

**Chief Gil Kerlikowske** noted that a police department must warn the public as soon as a crime pattern is detected and should circulate a description of the suspect even if doing so jeopardizes an investigation. It is right, he observed, to put protection ahead of arrests.

Although a crime wave like the one in the scenario calls for a significant police response, **Chief Johnson** pointed out a pitfall of dropping everything to solve such a crime. Someone will say, "How come you're putting all this effort into solving this crime? When my brother got killed, I didn't see all this effort put into solving his murder." Police must balance their efforts among different crimes.

**Commissioner Bratton** observed that, in the past, police would flood the area, push youths up against a fence, and pat them down—and might end up alienating the community. Now, under community policing, community members understand that they must be the police's eyes and ears, and the onus of fighting crime is not placed solely on the police.

**Ms. King** stated that her scenario was based on the Mount Pleasant shooter (Mount Pleasant is a neighborhood in Washington, D.C.). She recalled a night when police stayed in the area in great force,

then pulled out. About an hour later, the shooter struck again. She said reporters began to wonder whether they should have been broadcasting all the details of the police plans—evidently, the shooter was watching the news.

Regarding management aspects of community policing, **Chief Elizabeth Watson** stated that police training has always focused on technical and skills training and has skimmed on communications and management training. She called that focus a disservice to middle managers. Police chiefs often carry the message of community policing to line officers, bypassing middle managers, but those managers cannot support what they do not understand. **Chief Watson** observed a shift from guiding by directive to guiding by values. Conquering fear and crime requires managers who can behave differently from the autocratic, control-oriented managers of the past.

**Chief Clarence Edwards** stated that his department undertook community policing from the bottom up. Its community policing committee consisted of 300 members, including police officers from the lowest level to the highest, plus community members, activists, and representatives from various branches of government.

Police departments must change their training, **Chief Steven Harris** observed. They need a clear mission, a statement of values, quality improvement, and cross-functional teams. Training in team problem-solving methods enables solutions to be found quickly when a problem occurs. Private industry, he said, is doing the same thing.

**Chief Marty Tapscott** raised the issue of whether community policing is a program or a philosophy. In Richmond, he said, it is considered a philosophy that evolves into programs, neighborhood by neighborhood. It is an attitude that has to be developed in the police department and in

the community. **Chief Harmon** added that community policing makes the officer examine both the present call for service and its implications for having to come back the next day.

One problem with treating community policing as a program that does not include every officer on the force, **Chief Tapscott** stated, is that the actions of some officers may counteract the efforts of the community policing officers. For example, if a few officers are practicing community policing in a particular neighborhood, and the next day the department's strike force goes to the neighborhood and kicks down doors and drags people away, the work of the community policing officers will be set back tremendously.

**Chief Harmon** added that assigning just a few officers to be community policing specialists might encourage the rest of the force to say, "Let's call the community policing guys," rather than trying to solve problems themselves.

Community policing means empowerment, **Chief Robert Olson** said, and it means taking risks. What is required is changing an entire culture. People who have spent their whole lives in ranks do not drop those barriers easily. There are plenty of officers just waiting for the chief to fail with community policing so they can get rid of him, dispose of community policing, and go back to the good old way of doing things.

Audience member **Bruce Pierce**, associate professor of criminal justice at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York, asked how police chiefs intended to translate community policing to the level of street officers, day in and day out. **Chief Watson** answered that community policing must start at the top and go throughout an organization. Programs come and go because chiefs come and go. Upper and middle managers will decide the future of policing in America by developing attitudes about problem solving.

**Chief Koby** observed that police departments must restructure themselves just as GM, IBM, and other companies are doing to get the product they want. **Chief Tony Fisher** added, however, that community policing cannot be implemented overnight and that not every officer will be successful in every neighborhood. Police departments must identify which officers work best in Hispanic, African-American, and other communities.

A critical element is the education of the American public—teaching it that the police have limitations, **Chief Edwards** observed. The public will have to take more responsibility for its own protection and be willing to work with the police and social service agencies to handle crime. Moreover, the public must be made to understand that police cannot respond to everything. They now respond to burglar alarms, reports of barking dogs, and other problems that could be handled differently.

Audience member **David Belluomini**, crime prevention coordinator for the Fresno, California, Police Department, asked how to select police officers in a way that promotes the future of community policing. He observed that traditional policing is said to recruit those with a spirit of adventure, while community policing targets those with a spirit of service. **Chief David Brown** answered that a community policing department must look for people with self-confidence, people skills, and communication skills. Recruiting will look not for brawn, but for recruits who can talk to people and solve problems.

**Ms. King** asked how a department can prove that community policing works. **Chief Sylvester Daughtry** replied that a department cannot rely completely on statistics but must survey citizens. **Chief Elaine Hedtke** added that if a department builds a strong rapport with the community, the community may call the police more often. The number of reported incidents

would then rise, and that rise would actually be a sign of success.

Ongoing evaluation of community policing is crucial, **Chief Brown** stressed. Over the long term, if a department is not reducing crime and disorder, it should change its tactics. In the short term, to measure success, a department should look at citizen satisfaction, citizen participation in police activities, and employee progress in community policing.

An overreliance on statistics can be misleading. **Chief Olson** observed that any discussion of crime must look at the whole community situation. In U.S. penitentiaries, only 28 percent of inmates have high school diplomas, he said, and some schools in U.S. communities have over 40 percent dropout rates. However, no one points a finger at the school superintendent when the crime rate goes up. Community policing can only work when all government entities work together.

## Plenary Panel: Community Partnerships in American Cities

---

**Panelists:** *Beth Hughes, Executive Director, Columbus Housing Partnership, Columbus, Ohio*

*Beverly Watts Davis, Executive Director, San Antonio Fighting Back of United Way, San Antonio, Texas*

Columbus Housing Partnership (CHP) is a nonprofit developer of housing that works throughout Franklin County, Ohio. Part of a national organization called the Enterprise Foundation, CHP provides technical assistance and funding to neighborhood-based organizations for housing development activities.

According to **Beth Hughes**, CHP believes one cannot succeed in housing development without looking at the context of a neighborhood. Support for healthy families and healthy neighborhoods is a prerequisite for quality, affordable housing.

For a privately held project in Columbus, Ohio, CHP brought together about 60 organizations, both public and private, to assist a neighborhood that has seen massive disinvestment and suffers a very high crime rate. CHP's cooperative process, called "building communities," was used at an apartment complex called Mwanza Place, named by the residents after the Swahili word for "new beginnings." The president of the city council asked the chief of police to assign an officer to work with CHP in the "building communities" effort. The neighborhood was under the control of what the police officer called the "bad guys." Prostitution, drugs, and gunfire were rampant.

CHP's first step was to ask residents to make some decisions about physical changes that would take place in their units. Those physical changes would provide tangible proof that what the residents said

was in fact heard. There was no reason for the housing developer to decide carpet and paint colors and playground locations—the residents could decide. When people saw that their decisions were listened to, CHP was able to get them interested in talking about some of the more difficult issues. As social services professionals, CHP staff expected that residents would want to work on day care and similar issues. By contrast, the real problems were safety, drugs, and teenagers. And until the issue of safety could be dealt with, no other issues could come forward.

CHP met with many adult residents, but the teenagers felt left out. One of CHP's first activities was to replace all the complex's locks with secure locks. One of the teenagers' first activities was to superglue all those locks. That act got CHP's attention. It was not enough simply to work with the adults in this complex; the teenagers, too, wanted to be a vocal part of the planning. The teenagers had slightly different concerns. They were ashamed of where they lived. They did not feel safe, and they were sad to see their brothers and sisters growing up there.

One advantage of the Mwanza Place project is that residents had telephones. In other apartment projects or complexes, the lack of telephones leaves no way for residents to call the police department when a problem arises. Every night the "bad guys" tried to retain control. They did not want to give up their turf. Both residents, because they could see changes taking place, and the CHP staff were frantic to gain control of the project. Together they worked to improve safety with better street lights, high-wattage front and back porch lights, and alarms in vacant apartments. CHP assigned a guard temporarily to work nights at the project. The police assigned foot

patrols to the neighborhood, and the residents also provided some guards.

Throughout the development process, CHP orchestrated special events, such as cleanups, garden planting, and group trips. The events were initiated by the residents. In addition, all of the teenagers who said they needed jobs received them. Other people in the neighborhood got involved. When they saw the changes, they came over and talked about what the neighborhood used to be like. They expressed hope that the neighborhood would continue on its new course of improvement. They said they wanted to invest in their houses now that the neighborhood was getting better.

Families began to feel safe. Families that previously would not allow their children outside were now spending time in their yards. They perceived the neighborhood as safe. The amount of crime in the neighborhood dropped so the police, too, perceived it as safer. As the amount of vandalism dropped to nothing, the developers were delighted.

Once safety issues were taken care of, the residents could move on to other issues that affected them. They could deal with drug and alcohol abuse, child and adult day care problems, and spouse abuse.

The Columbus police played an important part by participating in all the planning meetings, by assisting the professional staff, and by spending time with the residents, both adults and youth. The police also visited the teenagers' school and talked to their counselors and teachers.

CHP has moved on to the next neighborhood. It certainly has not solved all the problems at Mwanza Place or created strong, healthy families, but it has made a significant difference. The new neighborhood has a high incidence of arson and substance abuse. CHP could have chosen an easier place to work with, as indeed the police suggested the organization

do. However, CHP deliberately works with very difficult places. If it solves problems there, other places may be able to take care of themselves. The process has not been smooth or easy, but CHP feels the various parties—police, developers, and residents—need each other very much. The relationship between the Mwanza Place neighborhood and the police has improved substantially, as has the safety of the residents.

**Beverly Watts Davis** introduced San Antonio Fighting Back (SAFB), a comprehensive community empowerment program whose whole strategy is partnership. SAFB believes it cannot do *to* and *for* people, but must do *with* them. If everyone is involved, then everyone is vested in making a plan work.

SAFB focuses on youth, the family, and the community they reside in. Programs that work only on community empowerment neglect the fact that people go back to families. Unless a program works on individual and family growth, any gains may be undone by negative forces in the community.

SAFB's constituency said its number one concern was crime. Neighborhood residents did not want a stadium or better schools; they wanted a reduction in crime. So SAFB worked with the police and the community to develop strategies, including a Weed and Seed program.

That program is divided into two parts. Weeding consists of law enforcement's interdiction and deterrence efforts. Seeding consists of foot patrols, cultural sensitivity training, and community partnering. Each foot patrol officer is buddied up with two neighborhood residents who actually walk the patrol with the officer. Those residents introduce officers to community residents and maintain a secondary intelligence network. The officers began to see that the people in the neighborhood were not the criminal

elements they consistently saw at night. The officers are now well loved. Almost every time they set out on foot patrol, someone brings them a cake or lemonade or plays basketball with them. This is partnership at its most basic level. Still, SAFB takes care not to make the officers feel they must become social workers—they are law enforcement officers.

SAFB is also instituting safe havens, which are secure places (such as school buildings) to which young people and families can go. Although it is a simple concept, it is difficult to implement because school systems like to close down in the afternoon. Area youth, whom SAFB treats as consultants, said youth crime could be curbed if there were places where young people could go immediately after school until about 9:00 p.m. and, on weekends, between 10:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m.

Children tend to know everything that is going on: crime, drugs, and who is doing what where. Therefore, SAFB hired 56 young people to become consultants to United Way. They came up with a full strategy for summer and fall activities. One of their activities was "Dive-In Movies," which the youth described as a gang and drug prevention program. They got the Police Athletic Leagues to donate inner tubes, which the youth blew up, put in the pool, and sat in while watching videos all night. How is that gang and drug prevention? Basically, it is hard to use drugs while swimming, and it is hard to fight in the water. The organizers charged 25 cents admission and ran the concessions themselves. With the profits, they attended youth leadership conferences.

An older group came up with Midnight Basketball. To keep young men aged 14 to 21 out of trouble, an activity was needed between 10:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m. The San Antonio Spurs supported the program. During the final basketball game, 15 gang groups were present at the gym at

the same time, and there was not one fight or act of vandalism.

SAFB has been in operation almost two years. During that period, it has reduced crime by 52 percent. People actually know who their neighbors are now.

The military is a tremendous resource to couple with law enforcement. Residents at the Springview Public Housing Authority wanted to turn a large vacant lot into a baseball field. The military brought in its equipment, and, working with the residents of that public housing development, built a baseball field.

The secondary intelligence network developed by residents has defeated a tremendous number of crack houses. Traditional informants sometimes give police unreliable information, but the residents actually go out now and write down license plate numbers and descriptions of suspicious cars and people. Community residents have even set up shifts and videotaped crack-house activities on a 24-hour basis. In one case, when residents turned over their evidence to the U.S. attorneys, an entire shopping center was confiscated. That shopping center is now being turned into a teen center.

The intelligence network has turned up about 30 crack houses. The military will demolish all 30, and the business community is going to do two things with the lots. The lots will first become community gardens. Soon after, through the efforts of an SAFB board member who is also a bank president, affordable housing will be built on those sites and financing will be set up so that people in the neighborhood can own their own homes.

The majority of those future homeowners come from public housing. The public housing authority is paying the construction costs, SAFB is paying the architectural fees, the bank is arranging the financing, and the military is doing the demolition.

The wonderful thing is that people have become inspired because they can see things changing. The school system reports that, because the military has provided 320 mentors to middle-school students in the area, school vandalism is down 40 percent, the absentee rate has dropped by 30 percent, and the test scores in those schools have improved 20 percent.

## Community Policing and Criminal Justice System Partnerships

---

**Moderator:** *Andrew L. Sonner, State's Attorney, Montgomery County, Maryland*

**Panelists:** *Joan E. Jacoby, Executive Director, and Heike Gramckow, Research Associate, Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies, Washington, D.C.*

*Jay M. Cohen, Deputy District Attorney, Kings County, New York, District Attorney's Office*

*Michele Sviridoff, Director of Research, Midtown Community Court Project, The Fund for the City of New York, New York*

**Michele Sviridoff** discussed the Midtown Court Project, which will begin in September 1993, in Manhattan, after two years of planning. The Midtown Court will handle misdemeanors and ordinance violations only, especially those that affect the quality of life of midtown residents. The target area includes the Times Square, Clinton, and Chelsea neighborhoods and runs from 29th to 59th Streets and from Lexington Avenue to the Hudson River. The court is located on 54th street.

The Midtown Court Project is a three-year demonstration project and has the following goals:

- Make the court more aware of problems that matter most to the community.
- Implement constructive and visible responses to these problems.
- Increase public confidence in the court system.
- Reduce jail crowding.
- Send a strong message to juveniles that the public will not tolerate criminal behavior.

- Develop more meaningful case dispositions and increase accountability.
- Increase the feedback provided to police about cases.

The target area has many working class residents and many community groups. Community leaders played a central role in project development, and the project is designed for local problem solving. According to **Ms. Sviridoff**, the Manhattan District Attorney's Office has not supported the Midtown Court and has developed another array of sanctions for misdemeanants. Special activities under the auspices of the Midtown Court will include a community newsletter; suggestion box; ride-along program for judges; community service projects that include graffiti painting, neighborhood cleanup, and soup kitchens; and community meetings.

A pretrial assessment will be conducted of all misdemeanants and will include assessments of substance abuse, mental health, and homelessness. Assessment results will be made available to a resource coordinator as well as to judges and attorneys. The resource coordinator will advise the judges about treatment options, the availability of treatment slots, and related matters. Misdemeanants may be assigned by the judge to high or low levels of supervision. Those under a high level of supervision will start community service immediately; others will begin later in the week. In addition, five counseling rooms and other flexible space are available for community-based service providers, with the aim of immediately linking arrestees to services. Daily counseling will be provided for several groups, including prostitutes, runaways, and persons with AIDS and HIV-positive test results.

The Midtown Court Project is considered a testing ground, and the National Center for State Courts has been working with the project. The Midtown Court is one of the first, but not the only, community courts. Other program elements being explored include mediation programs and an assessment of which offenders should be fingerprinted. By the end of the test period, researchers hope to answer several key questions:

- What happens when the spotlight is focused on the problem of misdemeanants?
- What role do community groups actually play?
- What happens to the courtroom roles, particularly the judge's role?
- What happens when services are co-located with the court? Does compliance increase? Are tensions between social service and criminal justice personnel increased or relieved?

**Jay Cohen** noted that cities still have enormous crime problems despite increases in criminal justice resources. The country has not won a war on drugs, or even fought it effectively. Compared to 1965, three times as many youth ages 10 to 17 are being arrested for violent crimes. Gunshots are the second leading cause of death among males ages 15 through 19, and the leading cause among African-American males in this age group. In New York City today, there are four times as many assistant district attorneys as in 1975 and 1,000 more police on the streets. The jail population in 1980 was 37,000; today it is 82,000. The annual cost of housing one prisoner in jail is \$58,000.

**Mr. Cohen** explained how community based prosecution, called zone prosecution, works in Kings County (Brooklyn). Kings County has 2.5 million residents. The prosecutor's office has designated five zones, with a team of

assistant district attorneys (ADAs) assigned to each zone to prosecute felonies. Each zone encompasses four or five police precincts, has six or seven judges, and has an ADA team of approximately 30. ADAs meet regularly with precinct commanders.

Targeted crimes are felony robbery and drug trafficking, and considerable emphasis has been placed on attacking crime through the use of civil remedies. In March 1993, ADAs in the zone that includes the 72nd precinct (New York City's model community policing precinct) expanded their scope of work to include misdemeanors and quality of life problems.

One special project is Project Legalize, which involves ADAs and other criminal justice personnel adopting Brooklyn fifth grade classes. ADAs spend 15 hours per month teaching students about criminal justice issues through role play, field trips, mock trials, and other activities that involve parents and residents. Project Legalize served 58 classes the first year, 126 the second, and 248 the third, with a goal of adopting every fifth grade class in Brooklyn.

Another special project is "Drug Treatment Alternatives to Prison," which is designed to serve nonviolent, second-felony offenders. Successful completion of a drug treatment program results in felony charges being dropped; failure to complete treatment results in full prosecution and mandatory state prison time. Two hundred persons have been assigned to the program. As of August 1993, 60 percent were either still in treatment or had successfully completed it. The annual cost of the program is \$1.7 million for every 100 defendants.

Finally, a community court is now in progress in Kings County and is located in the zone that also includes the 72nd precinct and the Red Hook housing complex. The court handles trials and dispositions as well as arraignments. Goals include the following:

- Provide a comprehensive, intensive, community prosecution program for public housing residents.
- Provide a video link between the community and various parts of the criminal justice system.
- Provide services (e.g., health care) on site.
- Implement community service sentences within the Red Hook area.
- Develop other programs for offenders and their families.

**Joan Jacoby** discussed some preliminary findings of an NIJ-sponsored research project designed to explore the following:

- The impact of community policing on the criminal justice system
- The impact of the criminal justice system on community policing
- New directions for research and evaluation

Four sites were selected for intensive investigation, and a telephone or mail survey will be conducted of other jurisdictions. A final report will be prepared in spring 1994.

**Dr. Heike Gramckow** reported on the four sites: Montgomery County, Maryland; Tucson, Arizona; Portland, Oregon; and Colorado Springs, Colorado.

The Montgomery County community policing effort is in the early implementation stage, and the focus is on problem solving. Special units were formed in each district, and all patrol officers are assigned to permanent beats. The effort is supported by the police planning unit, decentralized crime analysis, and the district commanders. The prosecutor is assuming a proactive leadership role. He began community based prosecution two years ago and makes personnel assignments that correspond to the police districts.

Community policing in Tucson is geared to improving community relations, problem identification, and referral. It is supported by officers assigned to patrol in

selected target areas, some of which have storefront police offices. The effort has a 12-year history but is considered to be still evolving. To date, lieutenants and sergeants have received only a minimum of training, and the police planning unit is not involved. The prosecutor is considered by the researchers to be supportive, but community policing is not a combined police/prosecutor effort.

The purpose of the Portland community policing approach is problem solving, according to the researchers. All patrol officers are expected to be involved in community policing, and the crime analysis unit is designed to support it. In addition, each of the city's 89 neighborhoods has a neighborhood liaison officer to conduct longer-term follow-up on problems. Seven "cluster officers" are in charge of several neighborhoods each, with the objective of gaining a broad view of community problems. Portland is in the third year of its five-year community policing plan. The prosecutor is proactive and operates a community prosecution program, with some assistant district attorneys involved in community problem-solving efforts.

Colorado Springs also has a focus on problem solving and views community policing as requiring a decentralized approach that involves all ranks, units, and programs in the department. Colorado Springs is in the second year of its five-year community policing plan. The prosecutor is characterized by the researchers as a responsive partner who operates a neighborhood justice center for the mediation of cases (including some felony cases).

**Ms. Jacoby** discussed some preliminary findings on the effects of community policing on the criminal justice system. In jurisdictions with community policing, the trend is for a greater emphasis on enforcement of ordinances and codes, the juvenile justice system, and the development

of new roles for prosecutors. There may also be changes in pretrial release programs, probation, and the role of public defenders. With regard to legislation, a greater focus is likely on juvenile laws, parental neglect and abuse, domestic violence, and ordinances (e.g., nuisance, trespass, and landlord-tenant). In terms of policy changes, prosecutors will be required to review their priorities. For example, the public may insist on prosecution not only of prostitutes but also of the persons who solicit them. Similarly, the courts (and many other agencies) will have to become more accessible and accountable, and interest in mediation and community outreach (e.g., neighborhood justice centers) is likely to increase. Decentralization of police operations and assignment of officers to permanent beats are among the major organizational changes police departments will need to consider in light of community policing goals. Finally, a high degree of coordination among agencies will be necessary. Not only police and prosecutors,

but also court administrative staff, the city attorney's office, the city budget office, and city regulatory agencies will need to increase their levels of cooperation.

In response to a question about the impact of community policing on the private sector, **Ms. Jacoby** noted that in Portland, police and prosecutors provided training for security guards, and the chamber of commerce donated funds to support a position in the prosecutor's office. In response to comments by **Ms. Sviridoff**, Barbara Jones of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office said the issue is not whether diversion for misdemeanants should be done, but how it should be done. Her office has a community affairs unit (the staff are not lawyers) that worked with the police to start a misdemeanor diversion program. She noted that the Midtown Court is not a trial court, and that the cases of persons who decline to plead are transferred downtown. Two audience members recommended that the Jefferson Institute report also discuss the downside of community policing and the likely sources of opposition to it.

## Drug Market Analysis

---

**Moderator:** *Chuck Wexler, Executive Director, Police Executive Research Forum, Washington, D.C.*

**Panelists:** *Lorraine Green, Assistant Professor, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts*

*John Eck, Associate Director for Research, Police Executive Research Forum, Washington, D.C.*

*J. Thomas McEwen, Principal, Institute for Law and Justice, Alexandria, Virginia*

**Dr. Chuck Wexler** described some of his previous experience in working with the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). He had been involved in investigating both the supply and demand sides of the drug problem, examining effects of prevention as well as treatment. ONDCP came to the conclusion that, although it does not necessarily know what works, it does know that every action causes a reaction. For example, stricter border control might cause higher prices for the drugs or greater purity. There is a need for more and better-coordinated information.

Many agencies are involved in this struggle. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Customs Service, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, for example, all have different perspectives and different information. But if one wants to know where, how, and when a particular neighborhood drug dealer is functioning, and what impact different police models will have on this problem, it is necessary to go to that specific neighborhood.

**Dr. Lorraine Green** described the Jersey City Drug Market Analysis Project (DMAP) as having three central goals: (1) to develop a systematic process for

identifying boundaries of targeted areas; (2) to put in place a computerized, location-based system for inquiries; and (3) to evaluate the effect of various innovative law enforcement strategies. The project tested a traditional-approach control group against innovative efforts and arranged for long-term follow-up.

Before the development of DMAP, drug arrests were made based on surveillance, search warrants, etc. The officers relied on their memories, experience, and manual background checks on the suspects to proceed. They did not work with the community in any of this.

The planning for DMAP included an existing minicomputer environment equipped for local mapping. Staffers arranged for it to be easy to custom design and change. Then they went to the detectives in the narcotics division and asked them what they wanted in such a system. Their responses included the following:

- The system should not be "locked away in an office."
- The system should be up-to-date within one or two days of current events.
- Detectives should be able to get information on suspects such as:
  - Suspect's name(s)
  - Prior arrests
  - Registration/Social Security Number
  - Vehicle
  - Alias
  - Firearm registration
  - Name of drug involved
  - Cohorts in previous arrests
  - Provider of bail in previous arrests.

- The system should be place-specific, showing
  - Places where a person was known to sell or buy
  - Descriptions of houses where drug sales occurred in the past
  - General information on "clienteles"
  - Hours of operation
  - Most common methods of sale (drive up, third person, hand-to-hand)
  - Types of drug sold
  - Physical layout of the area.

Lieutenant Belucci of the Jersey City Police Department's narcotics division was a computer buff and designed the menu to drive the detectives' inquiries. The staff also built in a "Data Reset" option to replace any accidentally corrupted database, after an inexperienced officer made inquiries and corrupted the existing one. None of the detectives asked for information relating to the community in general. The maps they developed for their crackdown used alternate (false) names for streets on the map to avoid discovery of their plan by scouts of the drug organizations. The detectives came up with other good ideas for the mapping as well, such as placement of one-way streets.

The implications of this effort for community policing lie in the important initial step of thinking *place* (neighborhood) rather than *person* (suspect). It was also a very good operational tool for the front line and for crime analysis.

San Diego was one of five sites for the DMAP demonstration. **John Eck** demonstrated the kinds of mapping products available in San Diego. There were spot maps showing placement of gangs, shooting locations, and addresses. There were colored maps with shading, showing patterns of different types of crime, such as car theft vs. drug sales. The maps brought the data into a more usable form of information for law enforcement. It

encouraged proactive work and specificity rather than reactive work (response to calls, etc.).

The examples he presented included the following:

- Coin-operated machine break-ins, mapped to show locations of affected merchants
- Thefts of Honda Accord automobiles, mapped in relation to the sports stadium
- Narcotics arrests, mapped in relation to the trolley lines
- Boundaries of the "Weed and Seed" regions and the radius around schools within them
- Car prowls, mapped to show seasonal relation to behavior of citizens/tourists

These tools also allow comparison of different arrest methods—where they occur and what their relative effectiveness is. One neighborhood might show a predominance of search warrant arrests, while another might show predominantly buy-busts or "knock and talk" arrests.

**Dr. Thomas McEwen** provided a progress report on computer mapping applications developed by the five DMAP projects. These projects were housed in the police departments at the sites, and a grant requirement was that each project include a research organization. The five sites and research organizations under DMAP are San Diego, California, with Police Executive Research Forum; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, with Carnegie Mellon University; Kansas City, Missouri, with Crime Control Institute; Jersey City, New Jersey, with Rutgers University; and Hartford, Connecticut, with Q.E.D. Corporation.

Each site has been operating for approximately four years. Each developed working definitions of drug markets and gathered extensive information about its markets. Four sites conducted enforcement experiments based on their increased

knowledge. Four sites also developed computer mapping capabilities to assist in their understanding of drug markets. The departments used commercially available software (MapInfo or ArcInfo) to support their mapping capabilities.

The Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) has received an NIJ grant to develop a series of reports that synthesize the experiences of the five DMAP sites along with mapping applications from other selected sites across the country. These will include a technical guide on implementing computer mapping systems, an applications guide on key mapping applications, a report on organizational change and computer mapping technology, and a report on how mapping techniques can be used in interagency working groups. Other reports will be identified as the project progresses.

The five sites have developed several interesting mapping applications. For example, three sites use computer mapping to identify "hot spots" of drug sales and other criminal activities. These maps usually employ different sized circles to reflect the amount of activity in a selected geographical area. The mapping software has considerable flexibility in selecting areas, which can range from a single block to the entire city. Maps of this type have also been used by the sites to determine displacement effects from drug enforcement efforts. The maps give a visual picture of how drug activity moves as a result of increased street-level drug enforcement.

With regard to community policing, computer mapping has been found to be

beneficial in all four steps of the SARA problem-solving model (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment). In particular, computer maps have identified geographic areas with problems that could be addressed by problem solving and community policing. Maps have also been useful in determining the effects of community policing activities.

A specific application under community policing concepts at two sites has been a comparison between drug dealing locations identified by patrol officers and those identified by citizens. Citizens call into the police department to report locations where they suspect that drug dealing has been occurring. Patrol officers also report locations where they have observed drug dealing. A map provides an improved picture of drug markets by showing these locations with different symbols for the two groups. The sites did not find a strong overlap between the two groups of locations.

Correlations between the DMAP sites are not precise. Mapping capabilities show different degrees of complexity. Access to the systems also varies; the more complex systems require greater training and more limited access.

The most time-consuming procedure in setting up a mapping system is the development of the geographic base file with coordinates. TIGER files may be used (from the U.S. Bureau of Census). These frequently have a high error rate (up to 30 percent error) and may require cleanup. Other agencies might also have geo-based files that could be used.

## Family Violence: Child Abuse and Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *Cathy Spatz Widom, Professor, Criminal Justice and Psychology, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany*

**Panelists:** *Debra Whitcomb, Senior Research Associate, Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, Massachusetts*

*Ronald C. Laney, Acting Director, Missing and Exploited Children Program, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice*

*Bill Walsh, Lieutenant, Dallas, Texas, Police Department*

People say that violence begets violence. How true is that claim? What other factors affect whether an abused or neglected child will become a criminal adult?

In 1988, **Dr. Cathy Spatz Widom** began a study that identified a large sample of cases of child abuse and neglect from 20 years before. Subjects were classified according to their age when the abuse or neglect occurred: birth to three years, four to five years, and five to 11 years of age. To overcome data problems, the study used a control group that was matched closely with the experimental group for age, sex, race, and social class. The findings should therefore reflect the effects of abuse and neglect regardless of age, race, sex, or social class.

The study found that being abused or neglected increases the likelihood of juvenile arrest by about 50 percent. Nevertheless, two-thirds to three-quarters or more of abused and neglected children are not arrested as juveniles.

The study found that black, male abused or neglected children have a much higher rate of subsequent juvenile arrest than any other group. The likelihood of getting arrested for a violent crime does not rise nearly so much for abused or neglected females and whites. Pure neglect (that is, failure to provide food and clothing) without physical abuse was also found to increase the likelihood of later arrests.

The implications of the study were threefold. First, early intervention in abuse and neglect cases is vital to stopping later juvenile and adult crimes. Second, neglect must be attacked at the same time as abuse. Neglect is three times as common as physical and sexual abuse. Third, violent behavior need not follow abuse and neglect. In fact, the majority of abused and neglected children studied did not later commit crimes, and not all criminals were abused or neglected as children.

In a child abuse case, **Debra Whitcomb** reported, if the number of early interviews of the child is minimized, the child can perform adequately in the courtroom. An investigation of child abuse, therefore, does best if the different parties—law enforcement, prosecutor, child protective services agency workers, witness assistance staff, and others—work together, not in parallel.

Some cities use multidisciplinary teams to deal with child abuse. Huntsville, Alabama, for example, has a children's advocacy center where all the parties mentioned can work together in interviewing and helping the child in a home-like atmosphere.

The community policing philosophy gives police an opportunity to prevent child abuse. Police can take the following steps:

- Work with neighborhood groups to monitor the whereabouts of known sex offenders.

- Work with runaway programs to see if people are abusing those children.
- Work with missing children programs.
- Work with ethnic groups that do not feel they are a part of the community.
- Enlist the community's aid in keeping an eye on children.
- Work with schools to find alternatives to corporal punishment.
- Develop a collaborative crisis intervention team.

If community policing consists of cooperation between the police and the community to improve the quality of life, then child abuse prevention is an ideal objective for community policing. **Ronald Laney** described police training programs in which the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has been teaching police about the signs of child abuse. The training encourages police, when they are in a household, to take a look at the children there and make any appropriate referrals to community agencies. The training also teaches police how to spot signs of abuse, although any investigations of child abuse must still be carried out by specialized investigators. OJJDP also teaches interviewing and interrogation.

OJJDP asked police officers in its training program how many calls for service are related to juveniles, either as perpetrators or as victims. The officers said as many as 50 to 70 percent of calls fell into that category.

**Lieutenant Bill Walsh** reported that child abuse and neglect are particularly difficult to detect and investigate. Among the difficulties are the following:

- Usually there are no witnesses to the crime.
- Disclosure by victims is often delayed and partial.

- Little children are physically unable to defend themselves or to run away.
- Victims may not want offenders to be jailed.
- Victims can be manipulated to feel that the offense is their own fault.

Child abuse is a community problem—that is, all agencies play a role in combating it. It is not solely a criminal, medical, or social problem.

Better approaches to combating child abuse and neglect include several techniques. Written protocols for cooperation between schools and the police help bridge the gap between those two groups. Police can help develop a wider community awareness of child abuse by speaking to doctors, parent-teacher organizations, and citizen groups about the signs of child abuse, and when and to whom they should report those signs.

Police can also educate the public through the media. One way is to give television news reporters the opportunity to interview the police for a story that ties in with a television program on abuse. That gives the police an opportunity to tell citizens what they can do about abuse and to encourage phone tips.

In addition, police departments can train fire fighters, paramedics, and police officers to look for signs of abuse and neglect. For example, if an investigator is in a burglary suspect's house and notices toys and pictures of a type that children like, the investigator may have stumbled onto a person who lures children to the house. Police also must be certain to attempt to identify additional victims and additional offenders in each case.

Numerous red flags may point to possible child abuse. When an adult is arrested with a child who is not his own, the police should talk to the child to try to ascertain the nature of the relationship. Also, if burglary charges are dropped

without reason, a molestation case may be present. Often a child escapes a molestation relationship when he grows older and takes revenge on the molester by burglarizing his house. When the molester finds out the suspect is one of his former victims, he drops the charges so their past relationship

will not be uncovered.

Another step police can take is to send a letter to all local film developing labs telling them their legal obligation to report any child pornography they might see. The letter should tell them what to look for and whom to call.

## Community Policing and High Risk Youth

---

**Moderator:** *Marty M. Tapscott, Chief of Police, Richmond, Virginia, Police Department*

**Panelists:** *G. David Curry, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia*

*Adele V. Harrell, Senior Research Analyst, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.*

*Alexander N. Luvall, Second Deputy Chief/Liaison, Detroit, Michigan, Police Department*

This panel focused on strategies for working with at-risk youth. The panelists reported on research efforts, intervention programs, and police outreach programs. **Dr. G. David Curry** first described data collected during a longitudinal study for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The focus of the study was to track youth involvement in gangs and to examine sources of self-esteem. The study was carried out in four schools in minority communities. Researchers tracked African-American and Latino males aged 12 to 16. The study began in 1981 and by 1992, 31 percent of the Latino males being tracked had been arrested. Of this 31 percent, 44 percent were arrested on gang-related charges. Fifty-two percent of the African-American males in the study were arrested, of whom 51 percent were arrested for gang-related crimes.

**Dr. Curry** noted that the hypothetical sources of self-esteem measured in his work were family, school, and peers. Of 105 Latinos, those who were not arrested had drawn self-esteem from all three sources. Those arrested for non-gang

related crimes had drawn self-esteem from the family and school but not from peers. Among males arrested for gang-related crimes, self-esteem was more closely related to peer relationships than to family or school. Of 249 African-Americans, those with no arrests had also drawn self-esteem from all three sources. Males arrested for non-gang related crimes were below average in school achievement and peer relationships but rated higher in family relationships. Those arrested for gang-related crimes scored very low in factors related to family and below average in measures related to school and peers.

**Dr. Curry** also talked about a national assessment of law enforcement that examined what police know about gang crime and identified law enforcement strategies. Based on official police records, he determined that there are 4,881 gangs being tracked and 249,234 gang members. The primary strategies included suppression, social intervention, organizational change, community organization, and provision of opportunity. According to **Dr. Curry**, providing youth with opportunities seemed to be the number one factor in preventing gang activity, while community organization was second. Strategies that did not work or had a negative effect were identifying gang members and working with the media.

**Deputy Chief Alexander Luvall** provided detailed information about Detroit Police Department programs that promote positive interaction between the police and youth. He noted that police are increasingly asked to foster such interactions. In response, the Detroit Police Department works citywide with 115,000 youth ranging in age from 4 to 18.

One of the programs that Detroit is operating is a school-community patrol squad, under which the police train students to patrol school areas. The students look for

suspicious or questionable people and report them to police. **Deputy Chief Luvall** noted that this program was developed in response to criminal sexual assaults against young children in the city. He said that to date, 4,000 students have received training on ethics, crime prevention, observation techniques, and other topics.

**Deputy Chief Luvall** also described the junior police cadet program. This program is designed for high school juniors and seniors who want to become police officers. The youth are chosen from both public and private schools to receive 40 hours of training at the police academy. These youth then work at the police department, patrol in and around their schools, walk elderly citizens to and from the bank or store, and perform other services. The youth are paid a daily rate of \$10 with \$5 for lunch.

Other efforts include an explorers program for youth aged 14 to 20; training on self-esteem and self-defense; and crime prevention programs that include the Blue Pigs, a band formed by three crime prevention officers who perform for youth ages 3 to 18. The Blue Pigs put on 114 programs for 46,000 students in 1992. Detroit also has a summer jobs program for which it received 30,000 applications last year.

**Dr. Adele Harrell** discussed the longitudinal evaluation of the Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (SIHRY) program. The SIHRY program targets at-risk youth, ages 11 to 13, for intensive intervention. The program is designed to address several risk factors:

- Environment: physical location and social and economic conditions

- Family
- Individual: poor school performance, peer association, etc.

The services the youths receive include family services, educational services, after-school and summer activities, mentoring, and incentives. Community policing in the target area, enhanced drug enforcement efforts, criminal and juvenile justice system intervention, and coordinated case management systems contribute to the program.

**Dr. Harrell** reported that the evaluation of the program includes quasi-experimental and experimental impact analyses that will occur over several years. She provided information on preliminary observations of the community policing component. One of the problems that has been plaguing the program is that the police departments and the case managers have not been sharing information because of confidentiality issues. **Dr. Harrell** explained that police departments must be involved in joint planning in order to facilitate this information exchange. For example, in Bridgeport, Connecticut, the community police officers are co-located with the case managers so that the youth are able to work with both the managers and the officers.

The SIHRY program also depends on a leadership commitment to the community policing effort that begins at the highest levels. She indicated that regular contact and interaction between police and others involved in the program is essential. Further, police departments and case managers may need written policies on the types of contact that can be made and the types of information that can be exchanged.

## Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

---

**Moderators:** *Peter Edelman, Counselor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*

*Ruth Sanchez-Way, Director, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention*

**Panelists:** *Howard Hughes, Executive Director, Boston Against Drugs, Boston, Massachusetts*

*Marilyn Wagner Culp, Executive Director, Miami Coalition for a Drug-Free Miami, University of Miami, Florida*

*Phyllis Gervais-Voss, Project Director, La Plata County Hospital District Prevention Partners, Durango, Colorado*

**Peter Edelman** remarked that partnership success requires a public role. We need to empower the community through partnerships. The drug abuse fight begins with prevention. Prevention is not an isolated issue. For example, it goes with efforts to reduce violence. It means rebuilding communities rather than individual "clients." The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) views violence as a public health problem. In this context, a prevention approach is required, rather than the more traditional medical model with a "cure." Violence is a public health problem because of the costs to the health system to treat results of violence. One recent study found that 20 percent of Medicaid costs are substance abuse related.

At HHS, community partnerships are only partly funded.

**Dr. Ruth Sanchez-Way** indicated that the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) believes prevention works when it is community-based, collaborative, and tied to the full range of

services. The prevention of crime is intertwined with drug abuse prevention.

CSAP is engaged in a number of criminal justice related initiatives. There is a New England coalition for coordination of effort and information sharing. CSAP recently met with 350 police chiefs at a May conference. CSAP, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and 25 California police chiefs are another group. There is the Southwest border prevention initiative. CSAP is also funding Head Start training workshops as part of Weed and Seed. This involves teachers and parent coordinators. Training manuals will be published.

**Marilyn Wagner Culp** introduced the Miami Coalition, which has 2,300 volunteers. It began in 1988 with a group of local business leaders and university presidents. Stimulated by articles in the *Miami Herald*, the president of the University of Miami spearheaded the effort to have business leaders sponsor a drug prevention effort. Once a commitment was made, the group spent eight months on strategic planning, using a task force structure. The consulting firm of Arthur Andersen detailed two consultants for each task force. The coalition began with a focus on illegal drugs and has since expanded to other substances: alcohol, cigarettes, and steroids.

One example of a coalition project is the POP (Push Out Pushers) program that is led by the Urban League in a defined area of the city. The coalition brought together religious leaders, small businesses, and citizens. A foot patrol was established. The coalition got the telephone company to change the telephone booths to use rotary phones (to foil pagers). A drugmobile is used at schools. Results included demolition of 52 buildings and securing of three vacant lots. A tracking system was

developed for apartment rentals by dealers. A total of 360 abandoned autos were removed from the area. The coalition has since expanded the area served by the program.

The coalition works with the police. The police made a priority of enforcing the Drug Free School Zone law. Schools asked parents to make signs for drug-free zones. To aid the law enforcement action, the media helped to set up hot lines to get tips on pushers. The PTA informed residents and their children of the enforcement success.

**Howard Hughes** described Boston Against Drugs (BAD), a program funded by private businesses. BAD was started in 1986 after the mayor asked the city chamber of commerce for help in fighting crack. BAD was set up to work in 16 target neighborhoods. In each neighborhood, a team worked with local businesses. Federal funds also supported this neighborhood effort. Calls to local BAD offices were turned over to the police. BAD and the police developed films on drug problems, including one on "ice."

**Phyllis Gervais-Voss** reported on CSAP's project in Durango, Colorado. CSAP funds became available in 1991 to supplement state funds. The project

structure brings together law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, business, and youth in a task force format. The Durango area is a major tourist site. Ranching is the second most important industry. Its population is 32,000, of which 20,000 are in Durango itself. Tourists nearly double this population in summer. The population is 84 percent Anglo, 11 percent Hispanic, and 5 percent Native American. Alcohol is the drug of choice in the area. Underage drinking laws were not enforced thoroughly, since drinking was widely accepted behavior. The project worked with the prosecutor to develop alternative sentences. Media presentations about the project have made youth more aware. The project has also worked with the Ute reservation to limit alcohol at the tribe-run gambling casinos.

During the closing discussion, **Ms. Gervais-Voss** noted that the Miami coalition is working on a plan for housing development. Law enforcement works with code enforcement (nuisance abatement) against crack houses. In the past three years, the police have knocked down 400 houses. The coalition is working with the Urban League to develop the empty lots after demolishing houses. Under state law, 15 percent of seized funds must go to community groups such as the coalition.

## Training Workshop: Policing Immigrant Communities

---

**Instructors:** *David Yang, Community Service Officer, St. Paul, Minnesota, Police Department*

*Billy Sifuentes, Neighborhood Center Police Officer, Austin, Texas, Police Department*

*Southeast Asian. Officer David Yang* explained that some jurisdictions have had a major influx of immigrants from Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and other countries of Southeast Asia. These people are having a difficult time being assimilated into our society. This population has had many traumatic experiences. For example, the Pol Pot regime killed over 6 million people; some parents killed their children to keep them quiet so as not to expose their hiding places; and some survived re-education camps where people were tortured and killed. Unfortunately, we tend to stereotype these immigrants because they look different and speak a number of languages that very few police officers can understand.

Landing in the United States is a culture shock for most Southeast Asian immigrants. Many come from rural communities without running water, electricity, toilets, etc. The police role in these countries is that of an enforcer, one who does not patrol the streets and has little contact with the people. Citizens are afforded very few civil rights. Laws are manipulated through power and corruption. Their criminal justice system doesn't revolve around due process or a presumption of innocence. Their communities are very closed societies based on tradition. The people are much affected by rumors. The family is supposed to handle its own problems. Calling the police or any government agency labels a person or family

as trouble. The adult head of the household is seen as not being able to control his family.

The Southeast Asian immigrants are now faced with living in a society that has substantially different values, standards, and culture. These immigrants are having a difficult time dealing with this change. The community police officer must understand the culture of the Southeast Asian immigrants when making contact with them. Most adults are very respectful and law-abiding. It appears that Southeast Asian youth are responding to the change differently. They are becoming westernized. This assimilation creates conflict within the family structure. It is important for the officer to take time to talk with the adults; otherwise it will be seen as being impolite. Officers should make every contact an educational one, trying to explain the different roles and expectations. Remember, these immigrants are concerned about physical retaliation against themselves and their families, so they will be very hesitant about singling out a perpetrator or even a witness.

*Police Response.* The police department should begin culture awareness during in-service and recruit training. Have some of the immigrants discuss their culture and their way of seeing the community, and describe the government service delivery systems to them. The department should assign two or three employees within the department to make community contacts and connect with other police departments who have a significant Southeast Asian immigrant population (e.g., California, Texas, Georgia, North Carolina, Wisconsin).

The individual community policing officer assigned to the area with a Southeast Asian population should get acquainted with the people by attending some of their

ceremonies and eating some of their food. Officers should go out of their way to learn some of the rudimentary common words and phrases of the language(s). It is extremely helpful if the chief of police and the officer attend a community meeting so the residents can see the connection. It shows the officer has a direct link with the chief.

The use of a translator is important. One should not rely on a member of the family since information may get screened. It is best to use an inside department translator or consultant services. Remember that the sex and age of the translator may adversely affect the quality of responses. The department should try to prepare a booklet that explains, in the appropriate language, some of the police and criminal justice procedures.

*St. Paul's ACOP Program.* The St. Paul Police Department's program is called the Asian Community Outreach Program (ACOP). The department established a mini-station in the Asian community (which includes public housing) and staffed it with five Asian employees and five non-Asian employees. These officers handle about 80 percent of the calls and conduct problem-solving efforts. Some of the techniques associated with the program include the following:

- Identify new immigrant arrivals and orient them regarding the police and criminal justice system.
- Conduct tours of the police headquarters and offer ride-alongs.
- Have regularly scheduled retraining sessions (twice a month).
- Make sure officers get to know the important foreign language words.
- Develop a mentor role. Help the immigrants adjust.
- Work with the different groups (elders and youth).

*Hispanic American.* Too often, all Spanish speaking persons are stereotyped into one category. In truth, there are a

number of cultures and languages, and not all Hispanics are Catholics. People coming from countries in Central and South America do not understand our police and criminal justice system. In many of these countries there are no police, only a military form of national guard. The concept of due process or guarantees of one's civil rights are unknown. Community police officers should know the cultures of people in their areas of contact. Knowing the culture will help the officer identify clues and cues about what is happening or may happen. It will definitely help the officer to better handle the situation and may well save the officer's life.

*Austin's Neighborhood Center.*

**Officer Billy Sifuentes** described how the Austin Police Department established neighborhood centers in several of the minority communities. Here, the community police officers can provide services needed and requested by the residents. This also offers the officers a neutral setting where officers can get to know the residents better. Insensitivity that may occur on the street is thereby reduced. One would be surprised at the amount of social services the community police officer is asked to perform. Anything, from providing translation services to loaning a resident a decent set of clothes for an interview, might be requested.

**Officer Sifuentes** discussed necessary elements for establishing similar centers. Internally, the department should make sure all forms, brochures, and other documents are translated and readily available in Spanish. The community police officer should provide training and tutoring to new officers so they better understand the various Hispanic cultures. This should provide an excellent opportunity to explain to the new officer how to treat people with dignity and respect, not to become uncaring or brutal.

The department should conduct citizen police academies. It is advisable for each neighborhood center to have an advisory council made up of residents, business people, other service providers, and even the assigned patrol officer. In Austin, the department has found that a mobile community center can help a neighborhood or strip shopping center create some stability and regain pride.

The community police officer must

realize he or she is never off duty. The officer must constantly look for ways to interact with the community, e.g., go to different churches, attend services and functions, attend local business association meetings, track down persons who have information or who are witnesses or victims, and work with other community workers in the area. There is no reason that police and city employees cannot mentor some of the residents and youth while on duty.

## Issues in Citizen-Police Partnerships

---

**Moderator:** *John A. Calhoun, Executive Director, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, D.C.*

**Panelists:** *Robert D. Miller, Director, NRP/CARE Program, Minneapolis, Minnesota*

*Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Director, Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago*

*Felice Kirby, Director, Neighborhood Anti-Crime Center, Citizens Committee for New York City*

**Robert Miller** directs the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) and the Community and Resource Exchange program (CARE), which endeavor to aid neighborhoods in long-range planning to address the most pervasive community problems. He likens his program's approach to that of a military operation which starts with a central point and disperses from there. The most troubled areas are typically located in the center of a city and then spread to other parts. The NRP/CARE program developed an opposing strategy that identified the area that had the strongest community features and began strengthening it further to enable it to help strengthen surrounding areas.

To participate in the NRP, neighborhoods are selected for the planning process through a public lottery. Once selected, they receive start-up funds to cover the cost of the planning process. Residents conduct organizing activities and work with NRP staff and city agencies to develop a multi-year action plan unique to their neighborhood. Like the NRP, the CARE program brings together residents, government agencies, and public interests. Neighborhood CARE committees are

established only at the request of existing neighborhood organizations and serve to carry out the tasks set forth in the action plan.

When the pilot program was initiated, the neighborhood selected as the pilot site was at first not supportive. **Mr. Miller** acknowledged the community's general mistrust, but "asked for a chance to let it work." An initial team of four representatives from the housing and health departments, a community crack prevention program, and a police officer went to the neighborhood and began surveying the residents, identifying community problems, and mobilizing community action. The team composition was reflective of the different government components whose collaborative work was required to effectively solve many of the neighborhood's problems. The program quickly managed to close several crack houses without the use of police, condemned several buildings, and filed charges against the building owners. Eventually, a housing court was established to handle cases such as these. Through the program, 225 homeless persons were placed in apartments where property owners had agreed to reduce rents.

Among the factors that contributed to its success is the fact that NRP/CARE only starts efforts in communities to which it is invited. It is now in 11 neighborhoods in the city and works with more than 20 different agencies and organizations throughout the country. **Mr. Miller** said that in order for programs like these to work, they must start with crime and safety problems first. Without addressing these, nothing else will attract the focus of the community. Once these problems start to stabilize, then residents can begin redirecting their energy to the next priority level.

**Dr. Dennis Rosenbaum** is presently evaluating community policing initiatives in several cities. He found that one of the problems in community problem-solving is that there are "no cookie cutter solutions." Each community and police-community relationship requires specialized approaches and solutions. Police often endeavor to solve community problems without the involvement of the community, and in neighborhoods where conditions are worst, the community often commands the police to "oppress and crack down" to restore law and order. On the other hand, noted **Dr. Rosenbaum**, the community may define problems and play a role in solving them, but it does not always know what is good for it. Yet, it will still be resistant and resentful of outsiders who claim to know. Given that police have the legitimacy and resources to initiate and organize community betterment efforts, **Dr. Rosenbaum** asserted that it is the police who have primary responsibility for educating and mobilizing the public.

There is a host of research documenting approaches to overcoming community apathy and sustaining community involvement and zeal. Efforts that survive the "honeymoon period" have multiple focuses and change according to the needs of the community. **Dr. Rosenbaum** stated that focusing on three main objectives for building strong community groups—leadership development, advocacy, and empowerment—will ensure effectiveness and longevity.

While partnerships between community groups and government entities were acknowledged as important, **Dr. Rosenbaum** noted several disadvantages that challenge their development. There is often conflict among partners over goals and how to achieve them. Prior adversarial relationships can interfere with resolutions. Partners also sometimes compete for limited resources and political recognition. And, while wide representation and participation

is sought, community groups can also become too large to be effective. When they are dominated by professionals from agencies, community groups are sometimes forced to adopt broader agendas and lose sight of the local issues for which they were formed.

Despite any problems encountered in their development, **Dr. Rosenbaum** insisted the advantages of forming community partnerships far outweigh the problems. These partnerships provide an opportunity to have collaborative and less adversarial relationships among community and government entities, and they allow for diminishing feelings of distrust and suspicion. Access to government agencies and resources is also made easier for the community through partnerships. The legitimacy of community organizations is enhanced when they affiliate with police and other agencies.

**Felice Kirby** is the founder and associate director of the Neighborhood Anti-Crime Center, which achieved national recognition for helping neighborhood leaders build successful anti-drug campaigns based on a three-fold strategy of community mobilization, law enforcement, and substance abuse prevention and treatment. She has experienced first-hand how effective community groups can change the life of a community. She saw the demise of a community group with which she worked for 18 years, and she experienced how life in the community changed in the absence of the group. Having effective community groups, she attests, makes a major difference and, as in her own home town, can become the strength of the community and aid survival through many trying times.

According to **Ms. Kirby**, a strategy for garnering community action should consider two basic approaches. Addressing a serious problem in the community usually serves as a great point of entry for starting community cohesion and action upon which

to build. Sometimes, however, a community may have a great deal of enthusiasm and energy focused on a certain objective that may not address a serious problem. In this case, community organizers should get involved in those efforts and then redirect energy toward solving community problems.

As a trainer, **Ms. Kirby** listed several requirements for establishing effective community partnerships. Training, she said, is required for both sides—the community and the police or other involved agencies—and each side must have clear roles. An interactive structure within which people can work best must be identified for the group, since some work better than others. **Ms. Kirby** recommended establishing beat level councils whose composition and location rotate to eventually reach and involve more people, especially those who do not always come to meetings. To assure accountability, although this is very seldom done, **Ms. Kirby** urged developing a formal statement of problems and then a documentation of responses and outcomes.

Community partnerships must also have implementation plans that should include several elements. Police officers must be given the responsibility, perhaps as a formal assignment, to engage in outreach through regularly talking with community residents. To be most effective, assignments should be geographically based so that officers can learn the issues, concerns, and characteristics of a particular neighborhood. **Ms. Kirby** suggested that officers conduct what she called, "neighborhood or beat

profiling," whereby officers have questionnaires or forms and systematically gather information about the area, residents, and businesses. This must be bolstered by training that is not limited to internal resources, but uses external expertise as well. Also required is excellent supervision and support of officers, which **Ms. Kirby** noted cannot be overstated. The use of unseasoned personnel with inadequate supervision too often undermines community policing efforts. Lastly, collaborative problem solving must involve all agencies. Police cannot presume to solve the problems of others without the involvement of others. If the community does not sanction the strategies of the department, the police will likely encounter resistance, or apathy at least.

Once an organized and effective community partnership has been established, **Ms. Kirby** suggested three key maintenance tasks. The groups must recognize barriers—either people, agencies, or situations that are obstacles to progress—and eliminate or diminish them. These must be identified by the community. Performance measures must also be in place to periodically assess how the community partnership is working and to keep abreast of community perceptions. **Ms. Kirby** noted that among the most important tasks is determining appropriate measures and criteria. She also highly recommended having structured communication and dissemination of formal information that assesses progress and priorities.

## Community Policing and Accreditation

---

**Moderator:** *Robert K. Olson, Commissioner of Police, City of Yonkers, New York*

**Panelists:** *Gerald Williams, Director, Law Enforcement, Education, and Research Project, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina*

*Thomas G. Koby, Chief of Police, Boulder, Colorado*

*Wayne Huggins, Executive Director, Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), Fairfax, Virginia*

**Commissioner Robert Olson** opened the session by noting some frequently heard comments about accreditation: that the national accreditation standards are too rigid for community policing; that accreditation has increased agencies' credibility with city management; that, as a result of accreditation, managers now know what to do; that an agency has reached professional status once it is accredited; and that the state or some other accreditation process is better than the national accreditation process.

**Wayne Huggins** said that when he was appointed CALEA director, he read many reports, letters, and other documents expressing concerns about accreditation and questioning whether the costs were offset by the benefits. Meetings were held in Rochester, New York, and Edmonton to address these concerns and to create a more responsive process.

One criticism was that accreditation seemed to favor cosmopolitan, suburban agencies. It was difficult for very large and very small agencies to complete the process. In response to this concern, CALEA will now have "component certification" for

training, internal affairs, court security, and communications. Regional crime labs, academies, and communications centers can also be accredited through component certification.

There was also confusion regarding the eight categories for fee applicability and costs; there are now four categories, resulting in a 25 to 35 percent savings in four of the previous eight categories.

Another concern was that reaccreditation was more difficult than gaining accreditation in the first place. To encourage agencies to focus on maintaining the standards, the reaccreditation period was reduced from five years to three years (the fee has been annualized). Many agencies also thought the on-site costs of the assessors was too high. CALEA now has a computer program to randomly select one-third of the standards for recertification. Assessors will review only those standards (although they can raise other issues). Agencies will be informed of the standards to be reviewed when the assessors arrive on site. CALEA also has a program to train and certify assessors. There are 34 assessments scheduled in September 1993, involving 110 assessors.

Most important, CALEA is sponsoring a thorough review of all 920 standards, and 32 people have volunteered to be reviewers. The process involves deleting irrelevant standards, combining standards that deal with the same issue, moving some standards to more appropriate chapters, and making the entire volume more user friendly. By January 1994, a new version will be circulated in the field, and at its March 1994 meeting the commission hopes to adopt a second edition of standards. Other measures are being taken to reduce the amount of paperwork required of agencies and to solicit and consider recommendations from users.

**Chief Thomas Koby** said that in his view a police department's consideration of community policing is a signal that it is prepared to explore better ways of serving the public. The department needs to look at everything it does in relation to its mission. Accreditation is good because it causes agencies to examine their operations carefully. But the accreditation process needs to be reexamined, and CALEA needs to ask: How can accreditation be of more help to agencies? Currently, the standards help agencies develop directives systems, but CALEA should also consider using technical assistance providers and trainers to assist with this. Another area of concern to many agencies is the need for training for first-line supervisors. CALEA should consider ways to help agencies develop their personnel. Finally, the current format for the standards gives the impression that there can be a "cookbook" approach to policing. This is not compatible with a community's desire for creativity in policing.

**Dr. Jerry Williams** discussed an NIJ-sponsored research project he is conducting with Dr. Gary Corder on whether accreditation and community policing are compatible. **Dr. Williams** explained that he has been involved with accreditation since 1981, when he conducted a pilot site assessment in Hayward, California, using 400 standards. The hope is that accreditation will promote police professionalism. The accreditation process is excellent for improving a department in crisis, and a department's directives can increase professionalism if they are comprehensive. However, since policing has changed in the past decade, particularly as a result of community policing, accreditation also needs to change.

**Dr. Williams** explained that as

police chief in Aurora, Colorado, he introduced community policing in an agency with 600 employees. His recommendation is first to reorganize the department's infrastructure to support community policing, then implement the approach throughout the organization.

**Dr. Williams'** current research is exploring whether accredited departments can also implement community policing, or whether the two processes are contradictory. Most likely, it is a question of sequence: the department should articulate its philosophy and values first, then develop directives that reflect those values. The research project involves two main activities. First, a detailed content analysis is being conducted of every CALEA standard. A special computer program has been developed for this purpose. Each standard was coded with regard to whether it widens or narrows police officer discretion, among other factors. Second, 12 accredited sites will be examined, and a special focus area will be considered in each department. The research includes telephone interviews with the chiefs of police regarding the status of their community policing efforts. In addition, surveys will be conducted within each department.

In response to a question from the audience, **Mr. Huggins** noted that accreditation can reduce civil litigation. In Fairfax County, Virginia, with 120 deputies, there were 20 lawsuits a year in the early 1980s. Ten years later, and after accreditation, there were 560 deputies and 0.9 lawsuits per year. **Mr. Huggins** said CALEA can provide both assistance and assessment and is working toward becoming more service-oriented. CALEA is also trying to interest more large cities in accreditation.

## National Service: How It Can Help Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** *Rana Sampson, White House Fellow, White House Domestic Policy Council*

**Panelists:** *Dean Esserman, Assistant Chief of Police, New Haven, Connecticut, Police Department*

*William J. Bratton, Police Commissioner, Boston, Massachusetts, Police Department*

*Clarence Harmon, Chief of Police, St. Louis, Missouri, Police Department*

**Rana Sampson** opened the panel session by providing background information on the President's national service initiative. She explained that the national service program combines educational opportunities with service, teaching people responsibilities and accountability while fostering good citizenship. There are four areas in which national service will be available: (1) education, (2) environment, (3) human needs (immunization, etc.), and (4) public safety.

**Ms. Sampson** explained that national service is about meeting needs and providing resources where they are lacking. She also said that national service can help police departments focus on the problems of crime and decay while national service providers handle administrative functions.

According to **Ms. Sampson**, national service workers will receive a modest stipend. Basically, it is an exchange of service for educational opportunity. The workers will receive approximately 85 percent of minimum wage plus \$5,000 per year toward college tuition. In addition, the federal government will pay 85 percent of health-care costs and 100 percent of child-care costs for national service workers. She

also pointed out that national service can help pay for police officer training.

By 1996, **Ms. Sampson** estimated, there will be 100,000 people in national service, of which approximately 25,000 will be involved in public safety activities, working with the criminal justice system. The funding for national service will be \$300 million in 1994, \$500 million in 1995, and \$700 million in 1996.

In terms of how national service will help the criminal justice system, **Ms. Sampson** provided an example of police chiefs needing additional resources in sworn and non-sworn positions to free up officers for community policing. National service workers can staff telephone reporting units, attend community meetings, analyze crime data, investigate minor traffic accidents, administer surveys, develop programs and initiatives, and more.

**Chief Clarence Harmon** described his vision of national service in St. Louis. The police department is currently implementing community-oriented policing department-wide. There are three components to help the department move to community policing: (1) neighborhood service aids, (2) retired senior officers, and (3) the police corps.

First, St. Louis is trying to coordinate city programs with the city's 75 neighborhoods through a Neighborhood Citizen Service Board, and the department has neighborhood liaison officers (NLOs) who serve on the board. The NLOs work in several neighborhoods that are receiving intensive services. National service workers could assist this effort by helping to process service requests, conducting surveys, mentoring, and channeling paperwork.

Second, the retired senior police officers' effort brings retired officers back to teach citizens at the police academy.

Citizens learn about mentoring youth, making complaints to the police, and much more.

Third, the police corps will benefit the most from the national service workers. The goals of the corps will be to expose people interested in police work to the reality of the work, to provide people with experience in community service, and to attract more college graduates. These people will have an opportunity to develop some of the essential skills and experience necessary for a community policing officer. As national service workers in the police corps, they will be paid a modest stipend, receive educational assistance, and be given priority in the hiring process.

**Assistant Chief Dean Esserman** spoke about the New Haven Police Department's model for community policing and national service. The department's efforts would involve both youth and senior citizens in public safety activities. He explained that these people could come into the police department to do work; they would not be a threat to sworn officers and would help support the community policing mission.

**Assistant Chief Esserman** described how youth could serve as caseworkers for officers to provide a support network. The youth could work in the neighborhood substation in the community where they live. As caseworkers, they could do research, attend community meetings, etc.

**Commissioner William Bratton** explained how the Boston Police Department would make use of national service. First, he asked whether national service was a blessing or a curse. Although many embrace community policing and

national service to support it, there is a risk in how officers will react. **Bratton** provided the following admonition: "Be sure [this program] supports the basic tenets/control mission and that it still has the ability to address crime and the causes of crime." Having said that, he described several ways in which national service could contribute to community policing efforts.

First, there are outreach needs. He indicated that there needs to be more outreach to pre-teens and teenagers (age 10-17) to work as community organizers to administer surveys, assess needs, and work with other agencies to provide services. Second, there is the anti-gang unit. Community youth might help officers steer youth away from gang membership and violent street life.

Third, with the diversity of communities, police departments often need people with various ethnic and racial backgrounds, particularly those who are multilingual. Such linguistics skills can help the police department communicate and work with minority communities better. Fourth, the domestic violence unit has a heavy workload. National service could train and prepare people to work in this field and support the unit.

Fifth, national service workers can aid neighborhood watch efforts and other crime prevention activities. Sixth, national service could provide technological and other kinds of training for police officers. With the help of national service, officers could receive up to 24 days per year of training. Further, national service workers with technical skills such as computer programming could be brought into the police department to work alongside officers and train them.

## Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

---

**Moderator:** *Elizabeth Cocke, Program Analyst, Drug-Free Neighborhoods Division, Office of Public and Indian Housing*

**Panelists:** *Alex Kinlaw, Sergeant, Police Neighborhood Resource Center Coordinator, Greensboro, North Carolina, Police Department*

*Beverly Watts Davis, Executive Director, San Antonio Fighting Back of United Way, San Antonio, Texas*

**HUD Programs.** Drug elimination grants have been one of the principal funding sources for implementing community policing in public housing. Over \$148 million has been earmarked for this program. Another program establishes youth programs in public housing communities to combat youth involvement with drugs. As part of the drug elimination grant program, public housing authorities can request technical assistance for on-site planning of their community policing programs. Consultant services may be given for a maximum of \$10,000 and 30 days. Interested jurisdictions can call (800) 955-2232 to receive a technical assistance grant kit. Elizabeth Cocke can be reached at (202) 708-1197.

In the future, HUD will expand its efforts against drug problems. Additional focuses will be on family disputes, alcohol-related problems, and organizing community partnerships against crime. There is legislation before Congress to expand the drug elimination grants to crime elimination grant programs, with an appropriation of \$150 million.

*Greensboro Police Neighborhood Resource Center (PNRC). Sergeant Alex*

**Kinlaw** described Greensboro, North Carolina, as having a total population of 225,000 with 15 public housing communities serving 15,000 residents. The target site was Little Greensboro Village, otherwise known as "the Hill." Initial police efforts were directed at enforcement through the use of the department's tactical squad. Many arrests were made, in fact too many arrests since the jails were overcrowded. The police decided this effort was efficient, but not effective. Residents of the public housing community were uneasy also.

The police joined forces with the public housing authority, residents, and other service providers to implement community policing in four of the largest public housing communities. The initial effort placed police officers exclusively in these chosen communities.

The PNRC has three major functions:

**(1) Deliver police services.**

The assigned officers are first responders to calls in their area. They have communications equipment (radio) and police cars so they can drive directly to the location. Their primary emphasis is on the quantity and quality of their foot patrol. They stress non-adversarial contacts with the public. They found that the vast majority of problems in the selected communities were caused by outsiders.

**(2) Serve as a liaison with referral capacity.**

Since the beginning, the police have included all human services providers in their program planning and implementation. They have written memoranda of understanding (MOUs) so there is support for requests for service. The MOUs allow for a quid-pro-quo with the police, giving

service providers the support they need and early referrals. This requires the police to be on the lookout for other quality of life issues. They may, for example, ask pregnant women if they are in prenatal care. If not, they can make the proper referral. The police have found that assigned officers must be totally committed to working with the residents and must not be disheartened if they perceive apathy in the residents. The officers must concentrate on having residents help themselves. One way to build the necessary trust is for officers never to promise more than they can deliver.

### (3) Solve problems.

The officers assigned to the PNRC are expected to solve problems by getting to the root causes of the problems. This effort has been most frustrating but most rewarding for the officers. Usually, police cannot make an independent decision and must run the solution up the chain of command. The program encourages the officers to follow through with their innovative solutions, such as basketball leagues and having children's pictures taken with Santa Claus. Many of their programs tap into the youth of the target area. On the downside, many police commanders are concerned about the potential for civil liability in innovative solutions.

*San Antonio Fighting Back.* The key elements of the "Fighting Back" program include the following:

- Develop community-wide prevention efforts.
- Recognize, develop, and provide leadership.
- Maintain momentum.
- Implement activities.
- Build resources.
- Assess the impact of the prevention efforts.
- Develop partnerships that involve cooperation, coordination, and collaboration.

- Put your own money where your mouth is.

In order to implement such a program, **Ms. Beverly Watts Davis** suggested several ground rules. It is necessary to recognize what brings people together. Include all groups in the initial discussions, steps, and planning. Begin to build a coalition that will make your program happen. Commit to assessing the key problems in the community (needs and resources). Be aware of changes in the community. Continue to plan, implement, and document what is happening with the program.

The community has leaders who can facilitate. Both formal and informal leaders are valuable. People will support what they help to create. Leaders focus on the "bigger picture" and do not let groups become side-tracked by apathy and negativism. True leaders share their roles and nurture others to become leaders. Remember, as leaders, to "keep your eyes on the prize." Any deviation will be detrimental to achieving the mission. Resources will have to be used where they are most needed, but any issue can help to keep the team focused.

**Ms. Davis** gave several other instructions for a successful program. Have regular meetings and provide training to community leaders to generate community support. Hold retreats to lay out the mission and goals. Conduct ongoing recruitment efforts to bring new members into the group. Persons recently recruited should be immediately put into the work groups. Mix assignments so people don't grow stale. Establish operating norms by defining roles and responsibilities. Recognize, reward, and celebrate successes. Immediately address and resolve conflicts.

Design activities to address the identified needs. Keep people busy. Involve as many people as possible in planning and implementing activities. Establish an evaluating process for activities

to determine their impact and success. Use the results to improve or correct failure. Make sure that activities are culturally sensitive, relevant, and appropriate. Have officers work with citizens, and have citizens go through a citizens' academy

(simulated police academy).

Funding, in-kind contributions, human capital, community capital, and partnership collaboration through co-location of resources can all help the program succeed.

## Partnership Panel: U.S. Department of Labor, Youth Fair Chance/Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) Program

---

**Moderator:** *Terry Orr, Director, Youth Fair Chance Demonstration Evaluation, Academy for Educational Development, New York, New York*

**Panelists:** *Ed Turley, Deputy Director, Community Youth Gang Services, Los Angeles, California*

*Jeff Seifert, Executive Director, Ecumenical Social Action Committee, Youth Fair Chance in Boston (Egleston Square), Boston, Massachusetts*

*Ana Palmer, Executive Assistant, Office of Employment Development, Baltimore, Maryland*

The Youth Fair Chance initiative was intended to target high poverty communities with approximately 25,000 residents. Because youth and family problems are very interrelated, multiple service agency partnerships were needed to achieve the goal of developing productive, self-sufficient young adults. This could typically involve city-wide agencies that could deliver youth and adult education, pre-employment, recreation, social service, neighborhood safety, and health care elements. Private industry councils were encouraged.

Models addressed poor school performance, unemployment, welfare dependency, and juvenile delinquency. Part of the outcome of the grants was the development of a process or approach to address those problems. Resource advisory boards were formed, and community centers and core programs were formed that were intended to be free-standing enterprises within a three-year period. Results of these grants have had an impact on juvenile

delinquency, crime, and drug trafficking in the selected neighborhoods.

Ed Turley's organization works with a private industry council to provide work experience for youthful offenders. The organization provides graffiti abatement as part of its strategy against violent gang activity. The organization is modeled after the Philadelphia plan that uses former gang members to mediate in gang disputes. Mr. Turley's organization has addressed gang problems across the city of Los Angeles and has dealt with gangs of all types, including Crips, Bloods, and others.

In 1987, it began a six-component strategy for the East Los Angeles jurisdictions. This included crisis intervention, in which individuals go to "hang out" where the gang members themselves go, in order to encourage and assist those who want out. Mr. Turley said there was a large "cry for jobs" among this population. The second component of the strategy is job development. The program helps the youth get ready for employment, providing them with interview skills, resumes, etc. The third component is known as community beautification. This is the program's graffiti removal initiative.

Graffiti is used as a means of communication between gangs and often marks turf boundaries. The youth in the program serve under journeyman painters to remove graffiti and beautify the community. The training gives them practice in basic job skills such as being on time and getting along with other employees. The fourth component of the strategy is known as "Career Paths, Alternatives to Gang Membership." This instruction has several levels and aims at helping youths avoid peer pressure that pushes them to be in gangs. It also fosters self-respect and tries to help them stay in school.

The fifth component involves the parents and teachers of the youth in the program. Participants in this component visit block clubs, PTOs, and churches in affected areas to sensitize them to gang activities in order to help them see signs of this subculture. Developing a sense of community is an important link for the success of this effort. The final component of the strategy is known as "100 Men Plus." This element emphasizes the need for men to hold visible activities, such as basketball games or other sports, in these neighborhoods. Masculine role models are often missing in affected communities, a situation that strengthens the gangs' position with the young men. The community has to "buy in" to the change, or the effort as a whole cannot succeed.

The Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) program uses a restitution model through which youth who have community service as part of their probation or parole clean alleys, clear trash, and remove graffiti. When this service is completed on time and without signs of gang affiliation, these youths are offered employment for up to 20 hours per week at a wage of \$4.50 to \$6.50.

The program also works with the city council and various church groups. Tutoring and other services are available to help youths in the program and young adults affected by the Los Angeles riots. These participants may be up to the age of 29. **Mr. Turley** has seen the need to be creative with the problems of youth and to get away from bureaucratic procedures. Otherwise, the criteria for getting into the program may end up excluding those most in need of help. One Old Gangsta (OG) "veteran" of over 19, who has returned to law-abiding behavior, may be able to affect many younger individuals. There is much better success with suggesting what *to do* rather than what *not to do*. The late-night and daytime basketball leagues have recruited 350 players. They have 16 teams that play from

8:00 p.m. until 3:00 a.m. These individuals may be between the ages of 17 and 35, can be from rival gangs or rival housing areas, and are often sponsored by law enforcement groups. Positive, organized, supervised recreation helps as a diversion method.

In the Egleston Square Project of Boston, **Mr. Jeff Seifert** reported the partnership of city-wide agencies included Community Development (housing authorities), the YMCA, the Boston Urban Gardeners, many church groups, and tenant organizations in the affected housing areas. There was a competition among neighborhoods in greater Boston for the model community in this program. Egleston Square won the competition. That area includes two ethnic groups: African American and Latin American. There is also a small, older, Anglo American population.

The core project is an alternative high school that opened in January 1992. It is competency based and currently has 60 students enrolled. The Boston School Department provides services and teachers, who must apply to teach in the special school. The students run the policies in the school on subjects such as attendance, and they try to put programs into the school that engage and interest the students.

This community of about 25,000 residents is isolated. It had, prior to the Department of Labor (DOL) grant, no bank, no pharmacy, no movie theater, and no public transportation. There has been a history of high crime as well. One mark of program success, according to **Mr. Seifert**, is that it was able to avoid having a youth characterized as a martyr when he recently initiated violence against the police and was killed in the process. Through the intervention of the YOU program, a bank was brought into the area (Fleet Bank), and it has substantially invested in the physical environment surrounding its offices.

All the participating young people are Boston residents; most of them are Latin American, but a significant proportion are African American. For one reason or another these students were unable to succeed in the regular school system. The local police have been supportive; they donated a truck, for example, to deliver desks to the school. Community policing in this neighborhood is primarily beat-walking, which has provided large amounts of information on the community.

**Ms. Ana Palmer** reported on the Sandtown neighborhood project. The proposal for this program involved a matching grant, meaning that the applying neighborhood had to find \$2.7 million in funding to add to the same amount from DOL. In the planning phase of the proposal, the representatives of the DOL visited to meet with all the partners who would work on the project. Two out of five possible projects and complementary activities had to be chosen for development through the grant funding.

The Baltimore area selected the neighborhood of Sandtown for their project. This community is 72 square blocks, with a population of approximately 12,000. Seventy percent of the households are headed by single women; 53 percent rely on welfare income; and 70 percent receive some kind of public assistance. The unemployment rate in the neighborhood is 23 percent, approximately double the rate of the city overall. According to the 1990 census, however, as many as 41 percent of the male community members and 53 percent of the female community members were not active in the labor force. Seventy percent of the housing has been rated as substandard, and there are about 600 vacant houses. One 531-unit apartment complex is nearly empty. Only 20 percent of the housing is owner-occupied.

The ethnic make-up of Sandtown is 98 percent African American. It has no

public transportation and little industry: only a barber shop, a beauty shop, a funeral home, and a "ma & pa" grocery. The dropout rate for high school students is the highest in the entire city (about 50 percent).

During the planning phase of the proposal for the DOL, Mayor Kurt L. Schmoke convened a subcommittee of his cabinet in the subject area of human services. The necessary partnerships for the project were thus readily available. Banks, the private sector, Urban League, police, and the communities were involved.

The planners determined that they needed a family orientation for this project, as the problems of the youth required that family difficulties be addressed. The project took the form of a one-stop community center, with teen activities, literacy training, day care, and Ventures in Community Improvement. This is a training project in which 18- to 24-year-old dropouts are taught construction industry skills by journeymen and community college personnel. There is also a dropout prevention program. Buy-in from the community is definitely necessary for positive results. One of the youths involved in the project was able to completely build two houses, one to be sold and the other for his own family's residence. The program has also developed a family case management information system with a central database. This allows easy reporting to the 20 different funding partners.

Recreational and cultural activities are the big key to involving the young people. The program has developed a "Midnight Basketball" league, and the community center holds dances, teaches reading and gives GED preparation, and has a teen parents' program. Local law enforcement has gotten involved and helps sponsor activities such as the basketball. The police have also developed an effective gun buy-back program.

## Training Workshop: Law Enforcement Response to Child Abuse

---

**Instructor:** *Bill Walsh, Lieutenant,  
Dallas, Texas, Police Department*

Crimes against children are among the most difficult crimes investigated by law enforcement officers. **Lieutenant Bill Walsh** reported that the crime usually has no witnesses, as the offense is committed one-on-one. Children are perfect victims, for they cannot fight back or run away and they are trusting. Moreover, children are viewed as being inherently less credible and competent than the offender. Also, the defendants in child abuse cases usually do not brag about their crimes, making detection that much more difficult. Usually there is no physical evidence of the crime, and when there is, it does not prove who committed the crime.

Child abuse cases often involve concurrent civil, criminal, and administrative investigations, and the cases often cross jurisdictional lines. Child abuse usually does not consist of a single, isolated incident; instead, it takes place over time, so that the victims often cannot even say how many times the abuse occurred (although techniques such as tying the abuse to dates a child might remember, such as Christmas, Easter, or the child's birthday, sometimes helps a child pin down a date). Victims often do not want offenders punished or imprisoned; they just want the abuse to stop. Also, victims may not disclose the abuse, or the disclosure may be delayed or progressive.

Child abuse is often investigated by inexperienced or poorly trained personnel because of turnover in the field. Also, child abuse investigation is not usually the upward route for ambitious investigators. The whole criminal justice system is designed more for the needs of adults than children. In addition, communities' denial of child abuse often prevents them from taking

needed steps to prevent and detect the problem.

Despite the difficulties, police are in many ways ideal agents for combating child abuse. Collecting evidence and conducting investigations are police specialties. Police can arrest offenders and get them into the criminal justice system. They can interrogate offenders, obtain and execute search warrants, respond immediately, and use the "long arm of the law" (calling police in other jurisdictions to learn what a suspect may have done there, etc.). Also, police are armed, and the presence of an officer's weapon can prevent violence.

Houses in which molesters operate may contain many clues to the offenders' activities. Police should look for video games that are used to lure children into the house, then for X-rated videotapes that the molester shows to children to lower their inhibitions about sex. Computers, disks, and bulletin board servers may contain clues about sex rings or may hold digitized child pornography.

Offenders usually pick on children whose parents are not heavily involved in their lives. As for other physical but nonsexual abuse, the speaker said he expects to see more physical abuse and deaths from child care providers in the future.

Interrogation of suspects has two goals: manipulating the suspect to tell the truth, and doing so in a way that meets legal scrutiny. Several techniques are useful in conducting interrogations of suspected child abusers. It is vital to know the case well, that is, to know what is alleged to have happened. It is also important to know as much as possible about the suspect, including such facts as whether he has been arrested before for the same crime.

The timing of the arrest is important, as the suspect is more vulnerable when isolated from his support systems. During

an interrogation, the police should display no badge, gun, beeper, or other reminder of the consequences of a confession. Police should take care to use a private place for the interrogation; the offender, if he does confess, does not want to tell everyone in the station what he has done. Police should also wait to give the Miranda warning until reaching the police station.

## Triad Program: Community Connections with the Elderly

---

**Moderator:** *Betsy Cantrell, Director, Crime Prevention-Triad, National Sheriffs' Association, Alexandria, Virginia*

**Panelists:** *Robert J. Prinslow, Sheriff, Marion County, Oregon, Sheriff's Office*

*Steven D. Weaver, Chief of Police, Newport, Rhode Island, Police Department*

*Clara K. Brown, Chairperson, Columbus, Georgia, SALT Council*

**Betsy Cantrell** opened the session by describing the Triad program. The national Triad effort is coordinated through the American Association of Retired Persons, National Sheriffs' Association, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The purpose of Triad is to work together at the national and local level to reduce victimization of the elderly and to reduce fear of crime.

At the local level, police, sheriffs, and senior citizens work together to prevent crime and address the issues surrounding victimization of the senior community. Many of the jurisdictions participating in Triad agreements also have SALT councils (Seniors And Lawmen Together). The SALT council brings together leaders among the senior citizen community, police, and sheriffs to talk, listen, plan, and strategize in a collaborative manner.

**Sheriff Robert Prinslow** explained that many people in public safety turn to community policing concepts—getting the community members involved in day-to-day activities and decisionmaking. Marion County, Oregon, began adopting a community policing philosophy in 1990. **Sheriff Prinslow** said that it is essential that

law enforcement open and facilitate communication with the senior citizen community because it is the fastest-growing segment of our population.

He pointed out that success depends on the way in which services are delivered to the seniors in the community. He also said that a primary concern for the Marion County Triad is meeting the needs of senior citizens. A SALT council was established in nine communities throughout Marion County, and four other communities are working to set up a SALT council.

Among the concerns raised at the SALT council meetings are safety issues related to shut-ins, establishing neighborhood watch, and setting up a senior citizen patrol to curb thefts and vandalism. **Sheriff Prinslow** talked about one area in Marion County that established such a patrol. Prior to the establishment of the patrol, there were approximately 350 thefts and 40 to 75 burglaries per month. After the patrol was started, there were none. To help support the patrols, the sheriff's department provided the seniors with training and cellular phones to call the police department patrol cars directly if they spotted something suspicious. Senior citizens also raised concerns about scam artists who target the elderly; they wanted information on how to protect themselves. The sheriff's department provided them with training and information on scams that were being operated in the area, and the seniors set up a monthly newsletter about what to look for and what was going on. A final concern that **Sheriff Prinslow** discussed was that senior citizens felt intimidated by the youth who hang around stores. The sheriff's department provided the seniors with information on what to look for to avoid victimizations. It also made arrangements with the police department to do foot patrols.

**Sheriff Prinslow** noted that focusing efforts on the concerns of the elderly improves the quality of life for everyone. The SALT council gives senior citizens an opportunity to decide what law enforcement services are provided and how they are delivered. The senior citizens conduct the SALT meetings and law enforcement personnel act as resources for information and education. **Sheriff Prinslow** told attendees to remember that senior citizens are one of the best support groups for law enforcement, both as a strong political base and as a volunteer resource. The SALT council and volunteer efforts have enabled Marion County to enhance and expand its community policing efforts.

**Chief Steven Weaver** described how the Newport, Rhode Island, Police Department works with the elderly as part of its overall community policing efforts. For example, the police department and the senior citizen community are involved in programs for youth, in order to foster a better understanding between the generations and to help eliminate fear and uneasiness of the elderly around youth. Some of the senior citizens work on cosmetology, arts, and crafts programs for young girls and women.

Another program is the Adopt-a-Grandparent program. Special education students are paired up with patients in nursing homes. The effect on both the kids and the seniors is very good. It helps the elderly understand the youth and provides an opportunity for them to see mild-mannered and less aggressive youth. The Newport Police Department also has a citizen police academy that travels to senior citizens to help educate them on crime prevention, police activities, crimes, etc. There is also an awareness effort that notifies senior citizens about crime, how to identify problems, and how to get results in solving the problems. **Chief Weaver** concluded by

saying, "Barriers can be broken down and connections can be made between people."

**Clara Brown**, a representative of the Columbus, Georgia, SALT council, remarked that Triad is a giant step toward crime prevention for the elderly. She explained that the Columbus SALT council is a working organization dedicated to the protection and well-being of seniors in the community.

In 1991, the sheriff, police, and seniors signed a Triad agreement to work together on program development and enhancement of law enforcement service delivery to the senior citizen community. Fifteen senior citizens were asked to serve on the SALT council, whose function is to serve as a law enforcement advisory board to inventory programs, monitor and assess the impact of programs, tailor programs to the needs of the elderly, and inform the elderly that they have a voice.

**Ms. Brown** described the initial tasks and development of the council. Its first task was to survey the senior citizen community to identify its issues and concerns. Based on this information, the council established committees to work on specific issues. Some of the committees, results, and products of the survey are described below:

- Public relations committee to inform the public of the SALT Council and crimes against the elderly
- Education committee to develop programs to teach police officers to recognize the signs of Alzheimer's disease
- Policy committee to sponsor a seminar on missing items and theft in nursing homes—how patients can protect themselves, how to locate the missing items, and what policies and procedures should be in place
- Seminar on "Aging in the '90s," which brought together

professionals and senior citizens to talk about care and finances for the elderly

- Adopt-a-Senior program, in which police and sheriff's deputies adopted a senior in their beat to visit on a weekly basis to alleviate loneliness,

inspect the home for safety and cleanliness, etc.

- Recognition program for people who do special things in and for the senior citizen community
- Planning committee on seniors helping seniors

## Varieties of Community Policing Around the Country

---

**Moderator:** *Frank Hartmann, Executive Director, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts*

**Panelists:** *Dan W. Fleissner, Planning Manager, Seattle, Washington, Police Department*

*Craig B. Fraser, Director of Training, Richmond, Virginia, Police Department*

*Dave Williams, Assistant Chief, Portland, Oregon, Police Department*

*Dianne Salen, Corporal, Community Oriented Police Enforcement, Prince George's County, Maryland, Police Department*

**Dan Fleissner** has more than 18 years' experience in public safety planning and is currently involved in the Seattle Police Department's transition to community policing. Community policing in Seattle started in 1988 when community groups approached police at various precincts and requested help. The department's initial response was to avoid the community groups and discourage any changes in policing. Many meetings were held at which the department presented every possible obstacle to community policing: there was no provision for it in the budget, it was not in the department's policies and procedures, it had not been done before, etc. The community and those favoring community policing persisted, and the department finally conceded to try it.

The initial step toward community policing involved the creation of a pilot team of community policing officers. At the time, a management study of Seattle was completed, and it determined that community policing teams should be

expanded. The public voted overwhelmingly in favor of allocating money to do this. Within one month, four teams, one per precinct, were established. Each team geared its strategies and activities to the needs of its community. The team in the downtown area, for instance, focused on concerns regarding the homeless and panhandlers, while another team focused on school-related issues. The major benefit of the community policing teams, said **Mr. Fleissner**, is that they handle problems other than just 911 calls for service. They do make arrests, but they also work as needed with schools and other agencies to help residents. The teams are now well established and popular. Crime has leveled off in the areas with teams, while continuing to increase in other areas.

Community policing in Seattle is known as a team operation department-wide. A key factor in its success is involvement of the entire department. All officers receive one week of intensive training. Another important factor is that the promotion of community policing is specifically tailored for different audiences. **Mr. Fleissner** emphasized that efforts to get funding support may have to vary.

**Mr. Fleissner** noted that education and orientation are important components of a community policing model. The public, he said, must first be educated about what police really do because they do not really know. The public must also be educated about what community policing is and become familiar with the concept of joint problem solving. The police department must also become better educated about who and what comprises the communities it patrols. Each community might have hundreds of community groups and organizations that reflect its interests. **Mr. Fleissner** encouraged the use of resident

surveys to get the best insight into a community.

**Mr. Fleissner** recognized cost issues and organizational change as among the few problematic areas in community policing that still need to be addressed. Community policing can be labor intensive, and it costs more than traditional policing, at least in the short term. He also noted that the police department's organizational structure needs to be moderated so that more decision making can take place at lower ranks, as described in the community policing model. Despite any shortcomings, however, community policing in Seattle is considered a model for the nation. NIJ recently awarded a grant to the city to document how community policing was developed and implemented.

**Dr. Craig Fraser** is responsible for community policing training for the Richmond, Virginia, Police Department, which has been involved in community policing for five years. Richmond's strategy, he said, is a planned approach that has a philosophical foundation, and it is designed to permeate all divisions of the department.

He lists five guiding principles:

1. It is based on a set of values.
2. It makes a commitment to problem solving.
3. It moves away from dependence on 911 calls to gauge problems.
4. It focuses on service delivery to the neighborhood.
5. Officers at the line level are considered experts for their areas.

Richmond's community policing program was phased in over four to five years and involved five key tasks:

1. Developing a set of values, based on discussions with the community and government
2. Developing a plan for use and control of 911 work demands, based on a resource allocation

assessment that determines if resources are used to capacity

3. Redesigning patrol beats to reflect natural community boundaries
4. Training and education of police and community
5. Designing short-term, high-impact crime control strategies to show immediate results rather than waiting for long-term accomplishments

While community policing officers are engaged in nontraditional policing and are more involved in issues that are not directly crime-related, the primary mission of community policing is crime control. Community policing allows officers to recognize disorders and prevent criminal situations. Through the officers' knowledge of residents and their activities and homes, and through the community's heightened awareness of community life, criminals are deprived of their anonymity, making them less inclined to commit crimes and less likely to escape arrest if they do.

**Dr. Fraser** said he has learned that community policing can only succeed in the presence of fundamental changes in the police department. Changes in the department require consciously adjusting the organizational structure and translating this into behavioral changes. These changes must transform the department from one that is autocratic and authoritative to one that is decentralized and open and that works with and respects the community. This is no minor task. The department has operated under traditional rules and regulations for a long time, and there are many that will be resistant to change. **Dr. Fraser** offered two approaches to address this: Mid-level managers must be taught how to convert their old skills to work in the new environment, and they should be given the first opportunity to be trained in the new skills. Community policing must be focused

on small geographic areas so that assigned officers can better identify what problems exist and apply appropriate resources. Officers must also engage the community at various levels: daily contact, community education, ad hoc efforts focused on specific problems, community consulting, and partnerships.

The police department of Prince George's County, Maryland, has always had a commitment to the community policing philosophy, as reflected in the first sentence of its mission statement, which reads: "To work in partnership with the citizens of Prince George's County toward providing a safe environment and enhancing the quality of life consistent with the values of our community." In 1990, the police department received a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance to develop and implement a community policing plan. **Corporal Dianne Salen**, who was among the first officers to volunteer for community policing patrol, described the planning and implementation process.

Developing community policing for the county was done in three phases: planning, training, and implementation. The planning phase involved establishing a committee of representatives from the Citizen Advisory Council, Health Department, Department of Environmental Resources, Apartment and Office Building Association, Child Protective Services, and Department of Public Works. This committee outlined community needs and described how respective agencies could help meet them. In the training phase, the entire department received training, which included required reading and discussion of *Problem Oriented Policing* by Herman Goldstein; training in computer crime analysis retrieval and programmatic and beat condition reporting; and special training by the Police Executive Research Forum. Officers also met on a weekly basis for in-depth training from specific agencies

offering assistance to the community policing effort. The department is now developing enhanced training for all branches. This will be offered first to the highest ranks and eventually will be given to patrol officers.

**Corporal Salen** is presently the only community policing officer in her beat of 13,808 residents. Each community policing officer was assigned to a specific beat and began implementation of a set of tasks. **Corporal Salen** first established a satellite office, the space for which was donated by the community. She prepared a beat condition report and then developed a beat management strategy. She began by developing personal relationships with the people and businesses in her beat, using scooter and car patrols. She handled select calls for service in her beat, attended civic meetings, and made home visitations.

**Corporal Salen** noted several problems that can arise with community policing, and she suggested solutions. She said burnout among community policing officers is common but can be addressed by having a more stringent selection process for officers. Those who want to be community policing officers for the good of the program, as opposed to those having selfish reasons like interest in accruing overtime, are less inclined to become over-stressed. Bureaucratic procedures can also be overwhelming, but this problem was alleviated in Prince George's County by getting full and official support from the county executive. The common problem of community apathy was addressed by showing that the police department wanted the community to be involved. Officers met with mini-planning committees composed of citizens, held a citizens' police academy, and involved the community in all efforts. **Corporal Salen** emphasized that community buy-in can only be won by persistent communication.

**Dave Williams**, who has worked with the Portland, Oregon, Police Bureau for more than 20 years, was responsible for the development of the city's community policing transition plan. He assisted in the formation of the department's Community Policing Division. Planning for community policing began in 1989 and implementation began in 1990. The directive to implement community policing came jointly from the mayor, the city council, and the chief of police. The city's strategic planning model was developed with reference to other community policing models but was designed specifically for the needs of Portland. The first step in the process was to identify key stakeholders and conduct an organizational assessment to determine what they wanted from the police department. They compared services already provided with what was needed. A five-year draft plan was produced from reports of various

committees, and from it, a five-year transition plan was adopted.

According to **Assistant Chief Williams**, a plan for community policing must consider several factors. It is difficult to change the culture within an organization. People resistant to change must come to see what community policing would mean to them and what their new roles would be. The mission and goal statements of a plan must be articulated in terms of values, and officers must be exposed to actions that help align the practice of community policing with these values. The plan must be outcome-specific and output-focused, rather than process-focused. This serves as the foundation for training and service development. Lastly, **Assistant Chief Williams** emphasized the need to include a performance evaluation component that considers attitudes of the community as well as outcomes of actions.

## Mobilizing Municipal Services for Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** Gerard J. Hoetmer,  
Assistant Executive Director,  
International City/County Management  
Association, Washington, D.C.

**Panelists:** Joe Balles, Sergeant,  
Madison, Wisconsin, Police Department

Andrew J. George, Sergeant, Lansing,  
Michigan, Police Department

George C. Crawley, Assistant City  
Manager for Public Safety, Norfolk,  
Virginia

This panel examined and discussed how to organize government services at the neighborhood level. The panel consisted of two community police officers, who discussed their successes and failures in their implementation of community policing; and a member of city government, who spoke about difficulty in establishing community policing and about the cooperative projects that can be organized when the city and the police department work together.

Sergeant Joe Balles presented an overview on being the initial community police officer in a neighborhood. One difficulty is the many roles a neighborhood officer undertakes. These include the traditional officer, whose primary responsibility is law enforcement; the detective, who investigates crimes and community disputes; the social worker, whose main function is short-term problem solving; and the community organizer, who focuses on long-term problem solving. Another difficulty with community organization is that different properties have different owners. Each owner has his or her own idea of what the police officer's involvement should include.

Broadway-Simpson is a neighborhood in Sergeant Balles' district. It is a six-block area with about 3,000 residents, over 800 apartment rental units, and 30 different managers or owners. In the years 1989-1991, there was a heavy migration of families from Chicago to Madison. In those three years, there was a 100 percent increase in calls for service to the Madison Police Department. By the standards of Madison, formerly a relatively quiet city, this neighborhood was out of control. The fall of 1990 saw the arrival of many hard-core "gangbangers" from Chicago, and in the spring of 1991 the first crack arrests were made. It was the beginning of the open-air drug markets. In 1991, the city began problem-solving efforts to combat the changes in this neighborhood. A documentary entitled "Changing Face of Madison," on a local CBS affiliate, highlighted these problems to the general public. Numerous articles were written concerning major crimes, gangs, and "troubled neighborhoods." The community responded by forming a rental property managers/owners association, and the Rainbow Coalition formed a resident association. Government responded by assigning a full-time building inspector and providing funding for neighborhood center expansion.

The most positive outcomes realized from neighborhood policing were the personal relationships that developed between residents, property owners, and managers; collaborative relationships developed with other government agencies; empowerment of neighborhood residents; and seeds that were planted for future community development.

Sergeant Andrew George discussed Lansing's Neighborhood Network Center. The community policing program began in

Lansing four years ago with one community policing officer, and there are now fifteen. Two years ago, the department decided to adopt a community policing philosophy, which is not yet ingrained throughout the department.

The department decided to interact with Social Services workers, who would go into the schools, while the community police officers would start in the same neighborhood and attend the interagency group meetings. In February of 1991, the Lansing Police Department formed a group of organizations with a private donation of \$1,000 to pay the utilities. However, the police department got stuck with most of the other responsibilities. It was forced to deal with problems while other groups were pulling out of the organization.

Then the chief of police left, and the department had no chief or other agency assistance. The community police officers looked at three alternatives during the transition: (1) "drop-in" method, where people could just come in for what they needed (but where transients would probably come in and just hang out); (2) programs that could be sponsored by private grants; or (3) a problem-solving team that would meet once a week. Using the third alternative, they formed a partnership with the school district. As the problem-solving team began to take shape, other agencies got involved again, and more money began to flow. This led to the network of municipal services that is up and running in Lansing today.

**George Crawley** spoke about the Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE) program. Four years ago, community policing was implemented in Norfolk, Virginia, to combat crime and violence as the city became a fertile drug area for people coming south from New

York City. When the police department began community policing, it developed a philosophy but needed a framework—so it formed PACE. The intent of the organization was to convey that problems and solutions involve all citizens as well as social services and the police. The city council used revenue from a three-cent real estate tax increase to rent additional offices and to promote related activities.

One of the main objectives of PACE was to create a presence in public housing areas to reduce the fear of crime so social services workers would feel safer working in crime-affected neighborhoods. Since PACE was funded by taxes, it had to maintain high visibility and activity. The Norfolk Housing Authority realized it needed to be a major player in the partnership so it got \$800,000 of drug elimination grant monies from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This money currently helps to support PACE. The Norfolk Police Department also formed a partnership with the public school system.

PACE members realized they should have a goal of providing support and inspiration for the community. They began other pre-service training programs for unwed mothers and children. Some of these programs include job training, night basketball, an athletic league, and a support services committee. They formed a Family Assessments Services Team (FAST), which attempts to turn words into actions. PACE also formed a Neighborhood Environmental Assessment Team (NEAT), which keeps neighborhoods clean. The strongest commitment in Norfolk, with this joining of agencies, is to cut out the red tape in order for community-oriented government to work.

## Police/Public Health Partnerships

---

**Moderator:** *Kenneth E. Powell, Medical Epidemiologist, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia*

**Panelists:** *Dean M. Esserman, Assistant Chief, New Haven, Connecticut, Police Department*

*Steven Marans, Assistant Professor of Child Psychoanalysis, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut*

*Emily C. Martin, Director, Training and Technical Assistance Division, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice*

*Carole Miller, Assistant Director, Neighborhood-Based Alliance Program, New York State Department of Social Services, Albany, New York*

What is public health? Public health as a field has a community perspective, noted **Dr. Kenneth Powell**, encompasses many disciplines, and is geared to prevention. Public health workers are concerned about common and potentially common health problems.

Homicide is now the 10th most common cause of death in the United States, and among persons age 15 to 34, it is the second most common cause of death. Therefore, public health agencies have become concerned about violence as a danger to public health. The connection between public health and community policing is their focus on prevention.

**Dean Esserman** reported on the Yale Child Study Center/New Haven Police Department program on child development and community policing. This program got

its start after the New Haven chief of police was called to a homicide scene and saw, around the corner from the kitchen where the murder victim lay, five small children sitting neglected on a couch. The police were busy gathering evidence. The children's parent was the murder victim.

To address the problem of the effects of violence on children, the New Haven Police Department developed a course on the subject for its officers. Instructors were drawn from the pool of doctors at the Yale Child Study Center.

The police now make sure the Center is notified whenever there is a serious crime involving a child (even as a witness). A representative from the Center then comes out to help the child.

As part of the program, the police department also leases 500 pagers for its officers. The officers are encouraged to give their pager numbers to store owners or any other citizens who might need to contact them. Likewise, if an officer sees a child in need, he or she can call the information in to a doctor and a higher-level officer 24 hours a day. Officers have reported feeling more helpful when they can help victims in this way.

**Dr. Steven Marans** reported that on the Yale Child Study Center side, doctors note that children chronically exposed to violence may develop nightmares, trouble in school, and difficulty with sleeping and eating. Exposure to violence is not rare: one out of 10 children seen in the primary care unit at a Boston hospital were found to have witnessed a shooting or stabbing.

When doctors from the Yale Child Study Center arrive at the scene of serious crimes that children have witnessed, **Dr. Marans** said that the children typically express disbelief that the event has occurred. The two groups of children that are most

vulnerable to later problems after witnessing violence are those who have experienced prior difficulties (with sleeping or eating, for example, or in school) and those who show no symptoms at all, not even talking about the incident.

**Emily Martin** stated that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) feels community policing could help prevent delinquency by providing a mitigating, softening, and protective effect for children who witness violence. The frequency with which some children witness violence is astonishing. At a recent Washington conference on violence, one youth said 40 of his friends had been killed.

OJJDP urges police departments to include a child-oriented focus in their community policing efforts.

**Carole Miller** explained that teamwork among social service agencies and a community sense of ownership of the program are vital to success in community-based efforts. If crime reduction and teen

pregnancy reduction efforts are to succeed, community members must take responsibility for themselves and their community. However, they need help doing so. If they were capable of adopting and satisfying those responsibilities on their own initiative, serious neighborhood problems would not exist in the first place.

New York State's adolescent pregnancy program has had different focuses over time. Sometimes the program focuses on prevention; at other times, the emphasis is on help during pregnancy or assistance to parents who are trying to become self-sufficient. The geographical areas the program chose to serve were those that ranked statistically high in low birth weights, infant mortality rate, single-parent households, and high-school dropout rate.

The state's Neighborhood-Based Alliance Program attempts to assist everyone who lives in a selected community. Members of selected neighborhoods draft five-year action plans. Safety has been high on every group's list.

## Partnership Panel: Bureau of Justice Assistance

---

**Moderator:** *Donna Schultz, Crime Prevention Branch, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice*

**Panelists:** *Robert Coates, Senior Manager, Neighborhood Policing Services, National Crime Prevention Council, Washington, D.C.*

*Steve Morreale, Special Agent, Drug Demand Reduction Coordinator, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration*

*Randall Phillips, Community Leader, Muskegon Heights, Michigan*

**Donna Schultz** noted that on a recent *Meet the Press* television program, two police chiefs were asked whether they could stop crime if the number of police officers, prosecutors, and judges were doubled. They replied that they could not, but that they could make some significant changes in neighborhoods. The purpose of this panel, she said, is to talk about different ways police-community partnerships can be approached.

**Steve Morreale** noted that the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) has 19 drug demand reduction coordinators (DRCs) in the country, and that he is the DRC for the six New England states. The process of "selling" demand reduction within DEA is similar to selling community policing within a local police department. The New England demand reduction effort is a partnership that includes DEA and other federal agencies, local police chiefs, sheriffs, colleges, criminal justice planners, state police, crime prevention associations, training councils, municipal associations, citizens, and others. The main purposes are (1) to create a network for sharing

information and resources, and (2) to create change.

To promote community policing partnerships, agencies can begin with police officers who are already open-minded, provide orientation and training in a comfortable environment, and encourage everyone to share ideas. Effective peer trainers should be used. Officers should be encouraged to get out into the community. As simple an activity as lunch at the schools can help both students and faculty start seeing officers as human beings. Departments should also emphasize how community policing can improve the quality of life for officers as well as residents.

**Dr. Robert Coates** emphasized that "partnerships don't just happen"; people must be educated about the need to work together before they can be motivated, organized, and mobilized. Most people want to know, "What's in it for me?" Organizers must acknowledge the mutual benefits to be gained, work toward building trust, and foster a feeling of togetherness. A number of difficulties can be anticipated: turf battles, ego battles, and difficulties in making a paradigm shift from traditional roles toward community policing. **Dr. Coates** described the main steps in developing interagency collaborative partnerships as follows:

- Define the vision and the purpose.
- Identify the agencies, community organizations, residents, and others who should participate. Participation of juveniles is important.
- Recruit people who have a stake in the problem. These are not necessarily the agency directors.
- Select other agencies and residents to get involved.
- Provide orientation and training.

- Share data, especially data that can contribute to a needs assessment.
- Develop a work plan that states goals, objectives, and activities.
- Implement the plan.
- Assess effectiveness.
- Keep the group motivated.
- Celebrate victories.

**Randall Phillips** explained the history and work of the Muskegon Heights Neighborhood Association, which began as a block club and evolved into a partnership that succeeded in closing 53 drug houses. The association now comprises 13 block clubs in an area with 20,000 residents.

**Mr. Phillips** said his street became known as "the strip," with prostitutes, crack dealers from Detroit, and gun sales destroying the neighborhood. His own son could not walk home from school safely. He and other residents called on the police and other agencies to assist in effecting change.

One of the first steps was to talk to city officials, who erected "No Parking" and stop signs. A "hot spots campaign" was then launched in cooperation with the police and the city housing department. The association sends letters to landlords of buildings where drug activity is conducted.

Copies of the letters are sent to the police and prosecutor. "Our only weapons," said **Mr. Phillips**, "are a number two pencil and a stamp." The association then checks with police to see how they have followed up. Association members also meet with landlords and help them screen prospective tenants. Members also go door to door to encourage residents to use cards on which they can anonymously report drug activity and other crimes. Cards are also distributed to businesses, individual churches, and a coalition of 13 churches.

There are few positive activities for teenagers in the community, and many have been seen congregating on various street corners. The association recently organized a task force to develop activities for teens. In response to a question about how to sustain residents' involvement over time, **Mr. Phillips** recommended making personal contacts and going door to door, getting churches involved, working toward a shift in attitude among residents, and staying in touch with residents' needs and concerns. He also said community organizers must develop strategies based on the knowledge that some landlords and residents benefit financially from the drug trade.

## Training Workshop: Performance Measurement and Appraisal of Community Policing

---

**Instructor:** Timothy N. Oettmeier, Lieutenant, Houston, Texas, Police Department

Lieutenant Timothy Oettmeier described his discussion as an effort to be useful to police departments that were interested in learning to convert to community policing organizations. He commented that the entire concept of performance evaluation needed to be overhauled in light of that perspective. He challenged the structure and usefulness of present-day performance evaluation methods and noted that there could be no "quick fix" to the changes involved.

Lieutenant Oettmeier recommended looking at community policing as a management philosophy that affects the results expected from the officers. It governs how citizen expectations and demands for police service are integrated with actions taken by a department to identify and address conditions that adversely affect the safety and welfare of community life. Formation of an interactive partnership with the community requires organizational changes that support the officer's ability to deliver neighborhood services.

Performance evaluation looks at knowledge, skills, and abilities exhibited in the individual's activities. Lieutenant Oettmeier pointed out the need to factor in the results achieved by those activities in order to make a more meaningful evaluation. He said the performance should be looked at as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. He tabulated various examples of police activities together with the desired result that they were intended to achieve: for example, the activity of preventive patrol would be intended to achieve a result of

deterrence to crime (visibility) and citizen satisfaction (receipt of adequate police assistance).

Criteria for the evaluation of the police officer's performance need to be altered to correspond with his or her tenure and experience, since the individual perfects different kinds of competency at different phases of the career. In the first phase, basic policing skills are explained and demonstrated, and the individual achieves success by performing those basic skills. This phase involves primarily *reactive* knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). In the intermediate and senior levels (sergeant, lieutenant, etc.), the necessary KSAs change to include more *coactive* and *proactive* skills, such as self-management, teamwork, negotiation skills, organizational savvy, innovation and creativity, and tactical planning. Lieutenant Oettmeier defined *coactivity* as an active outreach and systematic engagement between the police and the public to identify and address problems of crime and disorder.

For the department to conduct effective performance evaluations in this context, the supervisor and subordinate need to jointly target the employee's contributions toward ongoing organizational goals and form a partnership to continue to search for new work to be done towards those aims. Examples of self-directed activities were given, such as planning ways to address problems, informing citizens and teaching them problem-solving approaches, cultivating community resources for response to problems, and assessing effectiveness of different solutions. Lieutenant Oettmeier listed the following implications of this change in perspective for performance evaluation:

1. The performance assessment system should be constructed as a dynamic, progressive process.
2. The performance expectations should be aligned with an individual's professional development.
3. The outcomes associated with the performance assessment system should ultimately be anchored within the community.

## Plenary Panel: Community Government

---

**Moderator:** *Rose Ochi, Director, Criminal Justice Planning Office, Los Angeles, California*

**Panelists:** *Stephen Goldsmith, Mayor, Indianapolis, Indiana*

*Dave Mora, City Manager, Salinas, California*

*Matt L. Rodriguez, Superintendent of Police, Chicago, Illinois, Police Department*

The arson and violence that tore a path of destruction through Los Angeles after the Rodney King verdict shattered the public's confidence in the ability of government to protect lives, homes, and businesses. **Rose Ochi** said the King incident was a defining moment for Los Angeles, this country, and especially persons involved in the administration of justice.

The King incident thrust the issues of police use of excessive force and civil disorder onto the front burner of government and particularly law enforcement. Then-mayor Tom Bradley established the Christopher Commission to look at the situation and make recommendations. One of its paramount recommendations was to establish community policing.

The city's new police chief, Willie Williams, was selected because of his experience in instituting community policing in Philadelphia. He has been given a mandate to convert Los Angeles's traditional policing approach to a community strategy.

The new mayor, Richard Riordan, was swept into office on a public safety platform calling for the hiring of 3,000 more police. This is premised on the understanding that to rebuild its economic and social vitality, the city must first deal

with crime. Riordan, a successful businessman, knows that improving the economy and improving public safety must go hand in hand. He pledged to focus on crime prevention, gang reduction, and community participation in creating solutions to crime.

For the first time, even the criminal justice budget received scrutiny. Police officers have not received pay raises, and their morale has plummeted. As a result, the city is trying to find new sources of revenue. The goal is to free up more sworn officers for patrol duties in a community policing mode.

The situation in Los Angeles is similar to what other cities face. Similar riots were repeated elsewhere. But civil disorders are not inevitable like earthquakes. Prevention is the best step towards preparedness, and the best form of policing is community policing. It is necessary to rebuild neighborhood infrastructures. This is a community empowerment era.

A strong network of residents and community institutions contributes to a system of shared values that does not tolerate criminal behavior. This cohesiveness encourages concern for fellow citizens and increases the likelihood that the commission of illegal acts will result in swift detection and apprehension. The ideas of inner city residents have not been adequately tapped. Cohesive communities do not exist in most minority neighborhoods. Community empowerment seeks to rehabilitate not only individuals but also communities.

**Mayor Stephen Goldsmith** discussed community government in Indianapolis. For 18 months, Indianapolis has been rushing to implement community policing. The 12th largest city in the

country, Indianapolis has the same problems as other cities.

When looking at the most difficult neighborhoods, one sees a sanctioning system that does not work, that no longer significantly changes conduct. Moreover, as wealth moves out and government moves in, there has been an erosion of middle-class images, of mentoring, and of peer examples.

There is no conceivable way this country or any city can afford enough police officers to impose safety and security in such neighborhoods without participation from the leadership in the neighborhood. Even with an officer on each corner walking the beat, it could not be done.

How can police resources be used in a way that encourages and develops, or reignites, the indigenous capacity in each neighborhood? For the past 20 years, conservatives have called for more law enforcement and more prisons, while people on the other side have called for more economic opportunity, more racial equality, and more investment of public dollars in those neighborhoods. Now, it is recognized that neither approach is going to work without the other.

The question is how to combine social cures and consequences for crime. Governments can work to create safe environments and then, afterwards, put public money into a community to restore the houses. Alternatively, governments can restore the houses, give people hope, and then look for community safety to evolve. It is difficult to figure out which is the better route, so the answer must be to do both in a comprehensive and concurrent fashion.

Four simple principles of partnership are worth bearing in mind. First, no matter whether a city is large or medium-sized, its plan must be custom-designed. Second, communities need to be given authority to solve crime problems. Third, the police must be partners with other city and state agencies. Fourth, fear is as important as

crime itself. Fear of crime erodes neighborhoods even more than crime itself, because it affects the patterns of life and investments in those communities.

To expand on those points, with respect to custom design, police training must be addressed so that departments can decentralize geographically. Then, inside those decentralized geographical units, departments can devolve authority to the street officer to come up with locally managed solutions with community groups.

Regarding community power, in an underclass, crime-ridden neighborhood, it is easier to go in and make an arrest than to work through the steps that involve the community in the solution to that crime.

Working with the community is not a skill that many officers have. In departments that have not had community policing, a street officer who drives a patrol car into one of those communities views most of the people there as the problem, not the solution. Why? Because the only interaction that officer has with that community is at the moment of arrest.

It is important for police to enhance the credibility of persons who are willing to cooperate with them. When a few scared people in a public housing community receive enough cooperation from the police, they turn into a majority, come out of their apartments, and are willing to participate openly with the police department.

Such bridges can be built in many ways. How many police departments have officers trained to participate as partners with community development corporations, helping them evaluate safety in an area: what streets to close, what areas to light, and where officers should be redeployed? Those who are active in setting policy should look for ways that the police, city hall, and neighborhood groups can come together.

The police departments of this country are much farther along in the process of community government than the

rest of city hall is. If a really committed beat officer receives training in community policing and is put out on the street, it is only a matter of days before he or she complains that the rest of the bureaucracy is not being responsive to his or her phone calls. If officers are expected to be the outposts of government, they must have some authority to deliver the product.

In some cases, police departments and government are simply not set up right, in the sense that they are not geographically oriented. Most other departments of government are not. There is a street department, sewer department, etc. However, there is no department of the "near north side" of Indianapolis. Next year, Indianapolis may take all the service agencies of government and recreate them as generalists, giving them geographic responsibility that at least meets police precinct boundaries, if not the actual district boundaries as well.

Cities must do whatever they can to reclaim spaces so people have an opportunity to lead decent lives. Community policing provides many weapons citizens can use. Indianapolis furnishes a full-time lawyer to community organizations to sue local nuisances, whether they might be massage parlors, liquor stores, or crack houses.

Regarding fear, community-based surveys have found that particular fears vary from one neighborhood to another. In one, the main concern may be garage burglaries; in another, it may be molestation; and in another, it may be public drunkenness at a particularly important intersection where people have to walk by.

Community government is difficult because the political process does not give neighborhood groups much authority. But if those groups do not have enough authority, they cannot be effective partners to the police.

The United States is in transition, noted **Dave Mora**, facing unemployment, homelessness, lack of housing, and lack of confidence in government at all levels.

Local governments have fewer resources but greater demands for service. Residents are demanding to be a part of solutions to community problems. Although community-oriented policing is the topic of this conference, it is not the total answer. It is one part of a total solution that must involve all levels and branches of government. It must also involve public-private partnerships and residents in local communities, cities, counties, and states.

Crucial to the total solution is the concept of community government or community governance. *Governance* is the act of governing, while *government* is the organization and structure involved. Community governance and community government must express a strategy that is capable of answering a few key questions: Who is really in charge? The residents of cities and counties. Who pays the bill? Those same residents. Who knows the problem and the solution best? Again, the residents. And who can help and be part of the solution? Police and government.

Local government can be an effective part of problem-solving. An important part of local government is assuring public safety and protecting life and property. So community-oriented policing can be an integral part what can be called community-oriented public services.

What constitutes community-oriented public services? In Salinas (population 115,000), it is the attempt to recognize who is in charge, who pays the bill, and who really knows what the problems and solutions are. A key element in the Salinas strategy was to involve the whole government organization, including elected officials, line employees, union presidents, department directors, and supervisory and management personnel.

Beyond the police, the city's library, recreation, and neighborhood cleanup programs must be part of the total strategy to deal with the needs of residents. The effort might be coordinated through police agencies, but the overall challenge is to make sure all city resources are responsive to local community needs.

Commitment by locally elected officials is a fundamental requirement. Few city managers, chiefs of police, or individual officers have final authority. However, those appointed officials must make sure they listen to the elected officials.

Community-oriented public services can work. In May of 1991, some Salinas council members and local neighborhood residents took city staff on a tour of an abandoned bakery warehouse, an 8,000 square foot building that had been vacant for a couple of years. Those giving the tour told the city staff that there were no recreation facilities in the area and something needed to be done.

The staff, of course, gave the usual response: "Yes, we don't have any recreation facilities in the area, and we don't have any plans, and we don't have any money. However, if you really want a program, it will probably take 18 to 24 months and \$2 million." In this case, however, the bakery warehouse was acquired, rehabilitated, and furnished as a recreational facility just four months after it was identified as a potential site and three months after the city council decided to do it.

It was successful because people came in and said they wanted it. They built it. The total cash investment by the city was less than \$500,000. It was built with the free labor of neighborhood residents; union contractors gave of their time; materials were donated; city employees volunteered. It is a gem, and its continued success is an indication that if governments listen, not just hear, they will be able to meet people's needs.

Community-oriented public services, inclusive of community-oriented policing, can result in responsive community government that can deal with aggressively involved neighborhoods and local residents. A responsive government can ensure the survival of local communities. The challenges are significant but must be accepted.

**Superintendent Matt Rodriguez** noted that for police executives managing the transition from traditional to community-oriented policing, few issues are more important than the relationships between police departments, other agencies of city government, and the community. Chicago's community policing program is called CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy). This is Chicago's unique version of community policing, not a strategy defined by any other city; it is a new way of policing.

CAPS is still new, having been introduced on April 29, 1993, as a prototype in five of Chicago's 25 police districts. The five CAPS districts are spread throughout the city and are diverse in their racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic compositions as well as their crime problems.

Under CAPS, police officers are working with the community to identify and solve problems, not simply treat their symptoms. At the police officer level, the program has beat teams and rapid response teams. The rapid response teams handle 911 calls, freeing up time for the beat teams to address long-range problems. However, both groups of officers are expected to engage in proactive, problem-solving activities.

The community is involved at all levels of the organization. At the district level, a formal community advisory committee has been established in each prototype district. At the officer and supervisor levels, the community is engaged through neighborhood meetings, foot

patrols, and other face-to-face contact with beat officers.

Identifying, prioritizing, and solving problems at the beat level is supported by a process called beat profiling and action planning. Beat officers record chronic problems on their beats and identify resources to address them. Police officers, other city employees, and members of the community then use the beat profile to develop a plan of action for each beat.

Another key element of CAPS is training. Earlier this year, 1,750 police officers from the prototype districts were trained over a three-month period. They studied interpersonal communication, problem-solving, and alliance-building. The training took place in a community center on the city's south side, where civilian experts taught many of the classes alongside sworn personnel from the police training division. Community leaders sat in on some sessions.

In each prototype district, computers are being installed to improve data collection and crime analysis at the neighborhood level. The computers will also allow districts to electronically map crime hot spots and to track neighborhood problems such as graffiti, abandoned vehicles, and problem liquor establishments.

The critical elements in CAPS—beat profiling, training, computerization, communication, and evaluation—involve not just the police department but also city government as a whole. From the beginning, Chicago Mayor Daley made it clear that community policing was to be a priority for the whole city government. He has begun to articulate a single strategic vision of stronger neighborhoods and a better quality of life for citizens. All department heads are beginning to work from the same playbook, and they are being held accountable for achieving results.

Cross-training helps. The police department recently conducted a two-day training class for representatives of other

city agencies, exposing them to the concepts and structure of CAPS. City employees are going on rides with police officers and observing other operational units, and police officers are being exposed to the duties and procedures of the other agencies they need to work with.

This is important because the efficient processing of requests for city services is a key to success. The process of identifying and solving problems that involve multiple agencies is streamlined by the mayor's Office of Inquiry and Information. It serves as a single point of contact for service requests from the police, city agencies, and the public.

When an officer on the beat observes a problem, or when citizens bring a problem to the officer's attention, the officer immediately completes a special CAPS service request form. The form is sent to the Office of Inquiry and Information, where it is logged into a computer and directed to the appropriate agency. Emergency requests can be called into a 24-hour hot line established for the CAPS prototype districts. This approach saves officers from having to learn the inner workings of each agency in city government.

Another key element is follow-through. Not only must potholes be filled and abandoned cars towed promptly, but beat officers and the community must be provided with information on the status of problems they have identified. When citizens bring a problem to the attention of the police, they want action. Most citizens understand that not every problem can be fixed right away, but they want honest answers to such questions as: Who's working on the problem? What will it take to get it fixed? When might that happen?

The Office of Inquiry and Information provides each CAPS district with a weekly computer printout on the status of all service requests. That information helps officers identify chronic

neighborhood problems and improves their credibility with the community.

A final element is the issue of collective responsibility. It is devastating to the credibility of police officers and potentially disastrous to policing efforts if the police—and not city government as a whole as well as the community—are the only ones who accept ownership of neighborhood problems. One of the most promising outcomes of the CAPS program in Chicago has been the significant increase in communication and networking among city employees at all levels. Every month, CAPS project managers meet with top managers of other agencies to go over recent

problems and develop plans for the future.

City government can work in a seamless fashion to solve problems, but should police departments always take the lead role? Can cities rely on a policing strategy as a primary vehicle for achieving their broader strategic goals? Can cities achieve community government strictly through community policing? The answer to these questions is obviously "no."

For now, the leadership role assumed by police in Chicago and other cities is appropriate, as public safety is the anchor for strong neighborhoods. But in the future, all city agencies must become involved as active partners in community government.

## Community Policing in Public Housing

---

**Moderator:** *Sylvester Daughtry, Chief of Police, Greensboro, North Carolina, Police Department*

**Panelists:** *Deborah Lamm Weisel, Senior Research Associate, Police Executive Research Forum, Raleigh, North Carolina*

*William M. Rohe, Professor of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

*William H. Matthews, Director of Community Police and Criminal Justice Programs, International City/County Management Association, Washington, D.C.*

Deborah Lamm Weisel discussed approaches that have been found effective in the public housing environment. No single approach has an advantage over others. Many successful public housing communities have used more than one of these approaches.

**Cultural Awareness.** The public housing culture must be understood before effective community policing programs can be introduced. Police must know the demographics of the development, the language, the variety of behaviors, and the public housing authority bureaucracy and policies. Unfortunately, there exists too much stereotyping of public housing residents, which inhibits understanding. To aid understanding of the culture, police departments need innovative approaches. A department could have recruits live in public housing for short periods of time. Resident police officer programs have the assigned officer live in the public housing community where he or she works. Field training officers (FTOs) also should be well

informed and knowledgeable about the public housing culture. The department should review existing policies and procedures (for example, on use of force, racial sensitivity, and language) to strengthen those policies that support public housing residents.

**Trust-Building.** Trust-building, particularly engagement of the community, is one of the cornerstones of community policing. Unfortunately, lots of organizational baggage (failed programs, broken promises, poor management and administration, fiduciary improprieties, etc.) comes with public housing (both on the national and local levels). Many local police do not understand the public housing bureaucracy. Most residents and housing staff do not understand criminal justice procedures. To develop mutual trust, several police programs have been initiated in public housing developments, including citizen ride alongs and citizen police academies. Police problem solving is particularly effective if the police address the residents' problems.

The police must remember that residents view problems in the public housing communities differently than the police (e.g., noisy neighbors, graffiti, gangs, and poor maintenance). Police usually define problems as drugs, robberies, assaults, shootings, etc. The police can translate some of the residents' perceived problems into crime-causing issues. In Newport News, Virginia, the police were able to interpret residents' complaints about inadequate, broken, or nonfunctioning apartment doors, windows, walls, etc., as the cause of burglaries and larcenies. The police must market their program. An effective technique is involving public housing development children to reach the adult residents.

### *Improve Police/Community*

**Communications.** Often police and public housing staff believe public housing residents are apathetic and just do not care. One reason for this perception is the lack of effective communication. Public housing environments have different customer bases and need different approaches. In some housing developments, 40 percent to 50 percent of the units do not have telephones. More effective communication in public housing starts with looking for other ways to reach out to the community. Posting and delivering newsletters door to door, conducting door-to-door surveys, and resident meetings are ways of communicating between police and residents. Some police have conducted focus group sessions with residents to help identify actual and perceived problems. Police have responded in some jurisdictions by providing beepers, radios, or telephones to selected residents so they can conveniently and rapidly communicate with officers.

**Crime Prevention Activities.** Some of the more effective community policing activities carried out in public housing developments are directed at preventing crime. Unfortunately, some public housing communities were poorly designed; their physical structures, poor maintenance, and lack of aesthetic qualities are an invitation to crime. Police departments can work with public housing authorities to plan and implement crime prevention through environmental design techniques. Traditional target hardening tactics such as lighting, improved locks, secure doors and windows, controlled access, and permit parking are all techniques used by a number of the authorities. Improving the physical conditions, such as trash pickup, graffiti removal, and landscaping can help the perception that people care and that crime and destruction of property will not be condoned.

### *Building Effective Partnerships.*

Police, residents, and public housing personnel must work together to build partnerships. One way of building partnerships is for each stakeholder to play an active role in solving specific problems. The property manager can use lease enforcement (expanding upon the failure to pay rent) to bring about stability in a housing development. At the same time, the police can support the manager by screening tenants. Residents can report improper tenant behavior, and the police can drop off reports involving tenants. Residents and police can work together with property maintenance personnel to reduce trash, graffiti, and vandalism. Police can look for other ways to assist public housing communities through public housing authority (PHA) boards and members; facilitating service to the residents by explaining regulations and how the system works; helping residents get the appropriate service; and providing transportation, etc.

**Dr. William Rohe** explained that public housing has been influenced by social disorganization. Public housing contains most of the problems associated with drugs and violence and receives most of the publicity that perpetuates only the stereotyping of its residents. Some public housing developments have high crime rates, with up to 70 percent of the families having some involvement in drugs. These facts erode support for all public housing and tend to make other communities lump all public housing together. Unfortunately, many public housing authorities and police departments do not have adequate databases to identify the types and magnitude of incidents occurring in and around public housing developments. The federal government expends large amounts of money on the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), yet most public housing comes under local public housing

authorities. Public housing developments are part of the greater community.

Too often in public housing there is a diffusion of responsibilities and "buck passing." This diffusion does not allow for the development of partnerships and trust. There is a history of ineffective communication between police, residents, and public housing officials. Parties do not come together in a timely manner, nor is sufficient information shared.

The Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program (SNAP) in Charlotte, North Carolina, has effectively closed the communication gap by involving residents, police, and public housing officials. Five residents have been hired to provide victim assistance services to the tenants. Three retired police officers have been hired to conduct investigations within the various housing developments. The police department has assigned a liaison police officer, who conducts weekly meetings between police, residents, and public housing management. The result has been that, in the SNAP target area, there has been only a 1 percent increase in reported crime, while other public housing areas have had a 22 percent increase in crime.

The current location, design, and occupancy of public housing is not conducive to crime prevention or crime control strategies. Most inner city public housing developments are too large and too isolated. Often public housing authorities lower eligibility requirements to keep vacancy rates low. While some public housing developments have evolved effective governance among residents, public housing management, service providers, and police, the majority of public housing communities have stakeholders who lack the skills associated with being an active partner in community policing. They have no training in activities such as collaboration, consensus decision making, and problem solving. The lack of these

skills and poor prior public housing management have created a culture whose collective behavior and action revolve around suspicion of government, suspicion of authority (particularly police), and even suspicion of neighbors.

Sufficient resources have not been directed at public safety and support services. In the broader context, local government has downplayed its responsibility to provide adequate resources to public housing developments. The federal monies have not necessarily been spent wisely or directed to public safety or improving the residents' quality of life.

**Dr. Rohe** pointed out the special opportunities for community policing in public housing. Some public housing developments have established strong and effective resident associations. In other developments, the public housing authority has made a concerted effort to screen out and evict problem tenants (such as Chicago's "Clean Sweeps"). Residents are willing to participate when they see serious commitments from the police and PHAs to introduce and follow up on the sanctions.

At the federal level, more monies need to be provided to local jurisdictions. HUD needs to streamline policies and procedures. Eligibility criteria, rent/employment ratios, etc., must be changed so residents have hope to get out of the dependency cycle. BJA and the Department of Justice must continue to support innovative programs at the local level. Public housing authorities must improve their management skills, and they must be consistent and fair in enforcement of the lease provisions. There must be substantial coordination and collaboration between police and the PHAs. Special efforts must be directed at getting residents involved.

**William Matthews** reported that recent HUD programs have sparked renewed interest in increasing the safety of public

quality of life. Such programs as HUD's Public Housing Drug Elimination Grant, Operation Clean Sweep, Law Enforcement Analysis, and Technical Assistance in Public Housing are requiring PHAs, residents, and local law enforcement agencies to work together. Recently, the Bureau of Justice Assistance and HUD joined together to provide training and technical assistance to jurisdictions planning and implementing community policing in public housing. Six regional workshops are planned for the remainder of this year and early next year.

Community policing is not well understood in the general population, and it is even less so within public housing. From the side of local law enforcement agencies, public housing communities are often stereotyped as not wanting to become involved. The truth is that public housing residents are substantially more victimized than other community citizens. Public housing residents are four times as likely to be a victim of robbery, 11 times as likely to

be a victim of homicide, and twice as likely to be burglarized or raped. The residents who live in distressed public housing developments (inner city high-rises) are confronted with living conditions hard for anyone even to visualize.

Public housing residents often hear that the reason they receive slow or inadequate police response is that there is a lack of police resources. When the political pressure gets "hot," the police increase their community relations activities and containment programs; when all else fails, they conduct a sweep. These eventually have an adverse effect.

There is no commitment by government to involve the residents in revitalizing their neighborhood. Community policing, honestly and aggressively led, can make a difference. Community policing stresses helping the most vulnerable in a community. Those who live in distressed public housing may be considered among the most vulnerable.

## School Violence: Partnerships for Community Policing

---

**Moderator:** Clarence Edwards, Chief of Police, Montgomery County, Maryland, Department of Police

**Panelists:** Zachary Tumin, Executive Director, Division of School Safety, New York City Public Schools

Ann B. Madison, Director, Human Relations and Staff Development, Norfolk, Virginia, School District

Ellen Brickman, Director of Research, Victim Services Agency, New York, New York

**Chief Clarence Edwards** set the tone for the panel discussion by pointing out several factors that contribute to violence among youth and in the general population, such as dysfunctional families, poverty, racism, gang activity, weapons, community apathy, and lack of community services. With these factors in mind, **Ann Madison** described the Norfolk School District's efforts to curb violence in the school system, called SMART or School Management And Resource Teams.

**Ms. Madison** explained that the SMART program is a model for problem-solving and management, first pinpointing problems and then working together with the youth to find solutions. Some of the program elements are safety or security audits, incident profiling, district and school-wide efforts, and interagency coordination. **Ms. Madison** said the program grew out of the belief that discipline is *everyone's* responsibility. Working with this belief, the school district intensified training for teachers and began training the police, community, students, and parents. Under SMART, the school district conducts a needs assessment every

other year on levels of safety, fear, and other violence-related issues. One of the primary findings was that teachers did not feel safe or capable of handling problems. Therefore intensified training was developed to provide them with more skills and self-confidence in dealing with youth problems.

The SMART program distinguishes between criminal and delinquent behavior. If a student commits a criminal act, then he or she is punished as a criminal. If the problem is discipline, then other actions are taken. She explained that the school reclassified actions as disciplinary, illegal, or attendance related. The district then developed disposition codes for parents and students so that they know in advance what the consequences of certain actions will be.

If a student acts inappropriately, the teacher will first intervene to solve the problem. If the problem is not solved, he or she fills out a disciplinary form that is entered into the SMART database and stored with the student's record. A team that includes teachers and youth meets to develop a plan for the student, based on other information included in the SMART database. Using this model helps teachers and administrators identify chronic behavioral problems.

**Ms. Madison** reported the following preliminary results of the SMART effort:

- In 1992, there were 25 gun assaults in Norfolk's schools. In 1993, there were 6 gun assaults.
- In 1992, there were 108 suspensions for gang-related incidents. In 1993, there were none.
- In 1992, there were 29 suspensions for drugs, while in 1993, there were 23.

Part of the decrease in suspensions can be attributed to a revised strategy of suspension. According to **Ms. Madison**,

instead of suspending students, the students are "sentenced" to do community work.

Another component of the SMART program is student conflict mediation. Students with problems can go to the student conflict mediation committee to get advice on resolving conflicts. Also, if members of the committee observe conflicts, they can go to the administration to report the conflicts or step in to help mediate a solution.

**Zachary Tumin** reported on New York City's approach to combating violent crime in the school system. He said, "The accumulation of fear-inducing events creates a critical mass of onlookers who see themselves as potential victims and fear for safety. When this happens, the terrain and the possibilities for the institution change considerably, putting its vitality at stake. The schools are certainly a prime example of this today."

**Mr. Tumin** noted that schools are facing a tremendous challenge in combating violence and facilitating an environment conducive to the learning process. He suggested monitoring changes in street-level conditions and disorders, which the children bring with them to school each day as "baggage." Teachers offer the most help for at-risk youth by molding, shaping, remaking, and remodeling them. Schools must become aggressive on their own behalf to deal with the problems of crime and violence in the schools.

**Mr. Tumin** offered several suggestions for meeting these challenges. First, schools must reach outward to form partnerships with other agencies that are active in the community, such as public housing authorities, transit systems, police departments, child welfare agencies, parks and recreation departments, and others. "Left to their own devices," he said, "agencies will observe their institutional boundaries and let the problem migrate elsewhere if at all possible."

**Mr. Tumin** concluded that the challenge for the coming years is to forge a natural bridge—between school-based management and community-based enforcement efforts—to help solve the problems of crime and disorder that are affecting school vitality.

**Dr. Ellen Brickman** presented information on her work on violence prevention in middle schools. She pointed to risk factors, or those experiences that put children on a trajectory toward violence, as the focus of prevention efforts. **Dr. Brickman** asked a critical question that helped define the scope of her work in prevention: "Where do kids learn violent responses to conflicts?"

Exposure to violence in the family, on the street, and on television, along with access to firearms, are key influences on children's responses to conflicts. **Dr. Brickman** reported that boys are more likely than girls to be violent in a family relationship, while girls are more likely to be the victims of violence. Using this knowledge of risk factors, she worked to develop a multifaceted violence prevention program that focuses on conflict resolution, including mediation, violence prevention, and counseling. For this effort, she conducted a survey of 1,300 students in the seventh and eighth grades to get baseline data on their perspectives of crime and violence. Some of the results are as follows:

- In all four schools, 59 percent had seen a mugging, 48 percent had seen a murder or someone who had been murdered, and 20 percent had had their lives threatened.
- In one school, 60 percent had seen a murder or someone who had been murdered, and 27 percent had had their lives threatened.
- In two of the four schools, half the students carry weapons for protection. Over half reported it is

easier to get weapons than drugs or alcohol.

- Half the students say “fighting gets you respect.”
- Forty-two percent said they would seek revenge if someone insulted or hurt their family.
- Half disagreed with the statement that carrying a weapon earns no respect.

**Dr. Brickman** said that to reduce the multiplicity of violence and the corresponding risk factors in children’s lives requires a comprehensive effort. For community policing, it is important that partnerships be formed with the schools and social service agencies. It is also important to remember that violence is a learned behavior; community policing, working with others, can help young individuals unlearn and prevent violence.

## Mediating Disputes in the Community

---

**Moderator:** *Frederick E. Woods, Staff Attorney, Standing Committee on Dispute Resolution, American Bar Association*

**Panelists:** *Karen Donegan, Attorney, Richmond, Virginia*

*Eric B. Garrison, Director, D.C. Mediation Services, D.C. Citizens Complaint Center, Washington, D.C.*

*Mori Irvine, Civil ADR Training Manager, Dispute Resolution Division for the Washington, D.C., Superior Court*

**Frederick Woods** began the session by asking members of the audience to state briefly how they would like to benefit from the presentation. Many participants wanted ideas for how to improve mediation programs already in operation; others wanted to know how to establish them. While most respondents sought ideas in general, there were several particular themes that emerged:

- How to overcome problems associated with cultural diversity
- How to mediate situations that are not criminal, but to which police are called
- How to mediate landlord/tenant disputes
- How and what to consider in including a mediation component in Weed and Seed efforts
- How to build consensus in a divided community to better achieve community policing

**Mr. Woods** then showed a short video that introduced the concept of alternative dispute resolution (ADR). ADR seeks to resolve disputes before a trial takes place and, preferably, even before a lawyer is needed.

**Eric Garrison** defined mediation as a system that empowers disputing parties to come to agreement without transferring this power to someone else. Mediators, he said, must not have agendas favoring either party. A mediator's responsibility is to get disputing parties to communicate and negotiate. **Mr. Garrison** outlined the terms of ADR by discussing the dispute resolution process.

At the entry point, the disputing parties tend to avoid disputed issues but weigh opportunity costs and determine whether it is worthwhile to engage further in the dispute. At the next stage, both parties acknowledge the dispute but do not act. At the third stage, both parties recognize one another and decide to negotiate for their respective agendas. The fourth stage is reached if there is an impasse in the negotiations. Then, a mediator is called upon as a third party, though a mediator has no power to enforce any decision.

If a decision cannot be reached with a mediator, an arbitrator is called upon. An arbitrator decides the outcome of the case, and both parties must comply with the decision. If arbitration does not yield resolution, the dispute then goes into litigation. A lawyer is used to reach an agreement at this point. If settlement of the dispute is not reached during litigation, the litigation then goes into adjudication.

With community policing, disputes often involve solving problems associated with how to accomplish community policing (e.g., From where do we get community policing officers? To which community are they deployed? Who pays for what?). The community usually has no process through which to resolve problems, while the police department does, by virtue of being organized and having resources. Decisions are reached faster and can be implemented within the organization. Disputes between

the community and police can be lessened if both sides are aware of what the other wants and expects from the partnership as a whole.

**Mr. Garrison** recommended that police receive training in dispute resolution but not necessarily that they be used as mediators. It is important that those in mediator roles be perceived as impartial; however, police present themselves as authoritative and not impartial. The fact that they have "guns, uniforms, and attitudes" makes it difficult for the community to accept officers as mediators. Police are inclined to arbitrate and can enforce their decision through the threat of arrest of those who do not comply. The usefulness of mediation training for officers comes in the handling of small disputes that, left unattended, may become major disputes that do require police involvement. This can enhance an officer's ability to assess and preempt conflict, and perhaps to make referrals to an ADR center.

**Karen Donegan** has extensive experience as a mediator and trainer in mediation, and she specializes in building ADR skills in schools. She considers working with children and youth as critical in building the capability of the community to solve its problems. ADR, she said, promotes community-building and the prevention of violence and drug use. Violent behavior is the result of not perceiving alternatives to violence, she said. ADR promotes nonviolence because once youth are armed with ADR, they can use it for any situation. ADR prevents drug use because when people can work out their problems, they can overcome pain, feel good about themselves, and not have to resort to drug use to achieve this. The presence of mediation centers in schools and communities gives people a place where they know someone will listen to their problems and care that they are solved.

While **Ms. Donegan** teaches ADR to youth, she emphasized that the training is

the same as that given to adults. The key elements are listening, communication, problem solving, and neutrality. The purpose of conflict resolution is to heal, and this begins with listening. ADR training begins with teaching the importance of listening; people must hear what is being said and also what is not being said. Communication skills must be developed so that people know how to talk and listen to one another. Problem solving involves self-esteem building; thinking skills; problem and solution identification and evaluation; and attempts not to impose solutions but help parties reach resolution on their own. It is important that people learn how to have a non-blaming and non-biased stance, to avoid judging who is right or wrong. The goal is to inculcate principles of how to accept others who are different, rather than discuss others' differences; and to talk openly about problems, concerns, or fears, rather than who is to blame.

**Ms. Donegan** also extolled the importance of police training in ADR. Police can serve as role models to espouse nonviolence to people, especially children, in their handling of daily conflicts. She cited an article, appearing two days earlier in the *Washington Post*, that reported how the Fairfax County, Virginia, Community Liaison Unit officers go into neighborhood schools before trouble occurs to help teenagers talk through their problems. These officers serve as mediators between rival groups and teach youth how to deal with anger peacefully. The program is based on the hope that nontraditional approaches will help curb an escalation of youth violence. **Ms. Donegan** strongly objected, however, to the article's headline, which referred to the unit as "the Touchy-Feely Squad," and said that "if we continue to refer to alternatives to violence in demeaning or diminishing terms, violence will never go away."

**Mori Irvine** is currently responsible for recruiting, training, and evaluating approximately 450 attorneys who serve as mediators, arbitrators, and neutral case evaluators in the District Superior Court's ADR programs. She stated that the other panelists addressed much of what she would have said, but she added that interpersonal conflict must also be considered in dispute resolution. Interpersonal conflict, she noted, is based on personal values that people have, and strong emotions and misperceptions are often involved. To deal with problems that stem from this, resolution must avoid defining problems in terms of values, and

parties "must be willing to agree to agree and disagree." Also, she added, mediation must consider that conflict is based on important needs and wants and that it is difficult to satisfy all of these. She reiterated the comments of others in stating that communication must first improve before conflict can be resolved. While it is important to review the history of the conflict for factual information, the disputing parties must stop focusing on who started the problem or how. "Conflict," Ms. Irvine pointed out, "looks back, and mediation looks forward."

## Technology and Community Safety

---

**Moderator:** *Patrick J. Sullivan, Jr., Sheriff, Arapahoe County, Colorado, Sheriff's Office*

**Panelists:** *David G. Boyd, Director, Science and Technologies Division, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice*

*John E. Granfield, Program Manager, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Alexandria, Virginia*

*E. A. Burkhalter, Jr., Vice Admiral USN (Ret.), President, Burkhalter Associates, Washington, D.C.*

*Harlin R. McEwen, Chief of Police, Ithaca, New York, Police Department*

**Dr. David Boyd** noted that the National Institute of Justice is the only research and development source that most state and local law enforcement agencies have. NIJ looks for technology that is useful to the user, that is, the cop on the street.

The Science and Technologies Division of NIJ consists of the Office of Law Enforcement Standards, the Information Center, the Technology Assessment Program Advisory Committee, and the Less Than Lethal Weapons Panel.

Why should government undertake research and development in the criminal justice field? Basically, because the scale of criminal justice is so large that even small percentage increases in efficiency or reductions in crime amount to major improvements. For example, a 1 percent reduction in murder and rape across the United States would mean 230 fewer murders and 1,000 fewer rapes per year. Similarly, preventing even one riot could save a billion dollars (the estimated cost of the Los Angeles riots) and many lives (42 lost in those same riots). Preventing one tort

judgment for injuries resulting from a car chase could save \$100 million (the amount of a judgment recently levied against New York City). That sum, **Dr. Boyd** pointed out, is more than 53 times the NIJ budget for the development of less than lethal weapons.

For budgetary reasons, NIJ's Science and Technologies Division works with off-the-shelf technology from the military and industry, uses available technology that needs only moderate changes to be useful for law enforcement, and only rarely builds technologies from scratch. Technology transfer is seen as the most cost-effective route. The research and development burden is eased by funding work in industry and in other government agencies.

Among the law enforcement scenarios that would benefit from new technologies are cell extractions, high-speed chases, and officer gun confiscations. Technologies currently being tested include aqueous foam (bubbles), sticky foam, and a remote crisis intervention system, which consists of tiny, wearable video cameras and computers that transmit images and information back to a central monitoring point.

**John Granfield** related how 2,000 years ago the Chinese used pepper as a weapon, throwing it into opponents' eyes. Today, more than 2,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States use a concentrated form of pepper—oleoresin capsicum (OC)—as an alternative to their nightsticks. The OC is delivered in the form of a spray or mist that is shot from a small canister.

Used like such tear gases as CN and CS, OC has several advantages over those chemicals. A dose of OC directed at a suspect generally does not also contaminate police, cellmates, desk officers, and others. Because OC works by inflammation, not irritation, it works well on people whose

nervous systems are not functioning normally, such as persons under the influence of drugs or alcohol. OC also works well on animals and is safe for humans.

A drawback of OC is that the substance must hit the suspect's mouth, nose, or eyes in order to be effective. By contrast, CN and CS vaporize, so when they hit anywhere on the suspect's body, the chemical vaporizes up to the face.

OC is effective at disabling suspects and reduces the number of injuries that occur to both subjects and police officers during arrests. In Portland, Maine, subjects were injured in 69 percent of arrests in 1990. Then the police adopted the use of OC. Subject injuries dropped 88 percent in 1992, and officer injuries dropped dramatically as well. Similarly, the Kansas City, Missouri, police have received no complaints from subjects after 409 sprayings of OC.

One conflict that has developed regarding the implementation of OC is over whether to spray police officers with OC to familiarize them with its effects. Many police officers are less than eager to be sprayed, but proponents of officer spraying feel the process may help police develop empathy with sprayed subjects, understand the decontamination process, and learn how well they (or a subject) can perform after being sprayed.

One officer in Howard County, Maryland, was sprayed with OC during a conflict with a subject and was still able to shoot the subject. The officer said he was able to function as well as he did because he had been sprayed by his department. He therefore was not afraid of the chemical and

had an idea of how well he could function when suffering its effects.

**Admiral Burkhalter** heads a less than lethal weapons task force that works with the Technology Assessment Program Advisory Committee to ensure that various technologies are in fact useful for law enforcement. For example, the task force is helping NIJ study delivery systems for OC in order to lessen the number of items an officer must carry. One possible solution is the use of batons that also shoot out OC. The task force is also examining various forms of simulation to use in training. For example, it hopes to develop scenario practice methods for such dangerous police activities as high-speed chases.

As chairman of the Technology Assessment Program Advisory Committee, **Chief McEwen** emphasized the opportunity presented by changes in the U.S. military. As the military changes, law enforcement has the opportunity to acquire formerly classified military technology. Also, money that was traditionally spent on the military is being transferred to civilian use, and law enforcement is taking advantage of that transfer.

Another technology-related opportunity for law enforcement comes from the realm of computers. Computers and other technologies can be used to ease officers' paperwork burdens and provide them with more time out on the street, interacting with the public. For example, placing a mobile data terminal with a laptop computer in an officer's vehicle would enable the officer to fill out reports while he or she is still out in the field. That technique would save time and keep officers out among the public longer.

## Partnership Panel: Office for Victims of Crime

---

**Moderator:** *Duane Ragan, Training and Program Coordinator, Office for Victims of Crime, U.S. Department of Justice*

**Panelists:** *Lucy N. Friedman, Executive Director, Victim Services Agency, New York, New York*

*Joanne Tulonen, Executive Director, Maryland Alliance Against Family Violence, Baltimore, Maryland*

*Mark Wynn, Sergeant, Nashville, Tennessee, Police Department*

**Dr. Lucy Friedman** explained that for 15 years, Victim Services Agency, a nonprofit organization in New York City, has provided an array of services to crime victims, including battered women. The agency assists 120,000 victims each year and has staff located in police precincts, hospitals, courts, and other agencies. Typically, the workload for a full-time victim advocate involves reviewing 50 police reports a day, calling 15 victims, visiting 5, and handling 20 to 40 walk-in requests.

This conference, said **Dr. Friedman**, presents a challenge to combine community policing and victim assistance objectives. Victims often feel powerless, isolated, frightened, and angry. Victim Services Agency has involved victims in helping run support groups (e.g., for homicide survivors). In addition, battered women have provided training to police, an experience that has been both educational for the officers and empowering for the victims. Victim Services would like to get more victims involved in crime prevention and would welcome ideas for doing this.

**Joanne Tulonen** directed a domestic violence and child abuse program for the Seattle prosecutor before moving to Maryland. The Seattle Police Department had a mandatory arrest policy for domestic assault cases. **Ms. Tulonen** emphasized that she does not want to see community policing become a substitute for mandatory arrest, but she believes that community policing techniques can provide a valuable missing link in services to domestic violence victims. Victim assistance agencies never have enough staff to make personal visits in all cases. One way to increase staff is to use battered women, perhaps employed through a Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) program, to work with other battered women. There is also a tremendous need for networks and safe houses for battered women. For example, there is only one battered women's shelter in the city of Baltimore.

**Ms. Tulonen** noted several ways in which community police officers could assist victims of domestic violence, e.g., by identifying informal community leaders, providing information about available services, calling on certain homes to check on children's safety, identifying families in trouble, serving as role models for children, and helping victims develop safety plans.

**Sergeant Mark Wynn** referred to a statement made by Stephen Goldsmith during a plenary session: "The soul of a city is in its neighborhoods." In Sergeant Wynn's view, the soul of a city is in its families. Children learn violence in violent homes. No crime has as great a power to destroy communities as domestic violence. Well-intended police and others "have killed people through mediation," an approach once widely advocated as an appropriate option in domestic assault cases. "To treat

this crime as a non-crime is a civil rights violation," he said.

**Sergeant Wynn** related some of his personal experiences and feelings about growing up in a violent home, emphasizing that he and the other children were like prisoners of war. He compared domestic violence to terrorism, and battered women's

shelters to refugee camps. "What the Ku Klux Klan does to a community, battering does to a family," he said. There are a number of cities that have effective domestic violence programs and policies, and homicide rates in these cities are going down. They include San Diego, Knoxville, Newport News, Albuquerque, and Dallas.

## Training Workshop: Introduction to Problem Solving

---

**Instructors:** John E. Eck, Associate Director of Research, Police Executive Research Forum, Washington, D.C.

Susie Mowry, Lieutenant, Newport News, Virginia, Police Department

This workshop examined problem solving by discussing the basic SARA model. SARA stands for scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. The focus of the workshop was how problem solving can make community policing easier.

John Eck began the workshop with a background of the SARA process. In 1984, the Police Executive Research Forum in conjunction with the Newport News, Virginia, Police Department, was awarded a grant from NIJ to create a basic model of problem solving that could be taught to police officers over a two-day training session.

The advantage of the SARA model is that it is basic enough to be the core of any type of problem solving. Prior to this model, it seemed that officers would skip the two A's (analysis and assessment). That is what most needs to be developed in training an agency. It is not a question of resistance to change; the officers just did not want to get confused or make things complicated, so the model was made simple and flexible. The SARA model is very similar to many other planning processes, and it can be modified, abandoned, or replaced. It provides, however, an excellent starting point.

Mr. Eck concluded by stating that problem solving is less effective and more time-consuming without community participation. All major stakeholders in the problem need to be involved in the solution. In that way, the solution's success is easily analyzed. One can develop a complex

research study for a problem, but it is easy to see whether or not the problem is still happening.

Lieutenant Susie Mowry provided a description of the entire SARA process. She began by stating that an advantage of this process for police departments is that it can be done without extra officers, supplemental income, or overtime.

*Scanning* is the identification of the problem. It is irrelevant whether this is done by a line officer, a city manager, a community resident, or the media. For officers, determining problems often occurs when making site visits or by talking with residents or other officers. A problem needs to be taken to the next step of SARA when two or more incidents occur that are alike in nature or when they can cause injury and the police are expected to handle them.

*Analysis* consists of two major questions: (1) What do I need to know about the problem? and (2) Where do I need to go to get information? A survey can be done to see if others perceive a problem as well. Sometimes a police officer may find that a community's top problem isn't violent crime but abandoned cars. For many officers, the response is the fun part and the analysis is better left to researchers. However, it becomes apparent that the response cannot be effective if the problem has not been analyzed. It is also important to note that one does not have to give up traditional policing in order to solve problems. Problem solving is best suited for recurrent "hot spots."

*Response* planning must recognize that the cause of a problem is, in fact, the real problem. Not every response can result in complete elimination of the problem, but a solution can be designed to eliminate the problem, reduce the problem, deal with a problem better, or remove the problem from

police consideration. Removing the problem from police consideration means handing it over to an agency better equipped to deal with the problem.

*Assessment* means looking at the solution to see if it works. Assessment is necessary throughout the process, not solely after response. This is the most important stage, because effectiveness defines the extent to which a program achieves its goals or produces certain results. The findings from an assessment must be usable, to help the officer understand why the problem was solved, reduced in scope, or not affected. Assessment needs to be done in a way that is relevant to the assessor. In other words, for a police officer, the questions that need to be answered include these:

- Were there fewer calls for service relating to the problem?
- Were the residents satisfied?
- Did the policy makers notice a difference in complaints?

An actual example was given of a police officer in Newport News who used the SARA model effectively. The police department was receiving repeated calls for service to the same house, for gunshots being fired on vacant lots near the house. Whenever the police responded, no one was around. The officer then decided to scan, to check for other indicators of a problem. He then analyzed 60 calls for service that occurred within 45 days. The calls were all from one individual complaining about gunshots. The officer interviewed the

complainant and discovered that cows in the area had been shot and killed, trees were dying of lead poisoning, and the complainant himself had been fired upon. The officer collected six-inch long cartridges and .45 caliber slugs as physical evidence. He also interviewed other officers who had responded to these calls. He found that although many officers had responded, no one had ever caught a person on the complainant's premises.

The officer then used several different response techniques. He got power of attorney from the owner of the property in order to prosecute for trespassing. He also received permission from the railroad company to prosecute violators on those premises. He then discovered that people were parking near the lots on the street, so he arranged to post "No Parking" signs all around the vacant lots near the complainant's house. Finally, the officer met with the judge, who took judicial notice that any person visiting those lots would be trespassing and that discharge of a weapon there would also be illegal.

The officer wrote letters to the military and the gun shops. The whole assessment of results was done by the officer over a span of five years. He found that there had not been one call for service since 1985, and the citizen is satisfied. The officer spent 15 hours, in total, using a problem solving model. Previously, complaints in the matter had taken 20 hours a week in other officers' time.

## **Appendix**

**Community Policing for Safe Neighborhoods  
Partnerships for the 21st Century  
Speaker List**

David L. Armstrong  
Judge/Executive  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
527 W. Jefferson Street  
Louisville, KY 40202  
502-574-5359

Peter D. Blauvelt  
Chairperson of the Board  
National Association of School  
Safety and Law Enforcement Office  
507 Largo Road  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772  
301-336-5400

Virginia B. Baldau  
Director, Research Applications  
and Training Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530  
202-514-6204  
202-307-6394

Barbara Bostick-Hunt  
Executive Director  
Community Building in Partnership  
Sandtown-Winchester Project  
1137 North Gilmore Street  
Baltimore, MD 21217  
410-728-8607  
410-462-6869

Ted Balistreri  
Captain  
Madison Police Department  
835 West Badger Road  
Madison, WI 53713  
608-266-5939  
608-266-4453

David G. Boyd  
Director  
Science and Technologies Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2942

Joe Balles  
Sergeant  
Madison Police Department  
211 South Carroll Street  
Madison, WI 53710  
608-266-5939

William J. Bratton  
Police Commissioner  
Boston Police Department  
154 Berkley Street  
Boston, MA 02116  
617-343-4500

Ellen Brickman  
Director of Research  
Victim Services Agency  
346 Broadway, Room 206  
New York, NY 10013  
212-577-7700  
212-385-0331

David W. Brown  
Chief of Police  
Tempe Police Department  
120 East Fifth Street  
Tempe, AZ 85280  
602-350-8215  
602-350-8337

Clara K. Brown  
Chairperson  
Columbus S.A.L.T. Council  
6400 Green Island Drive, #6  
Columbus, GA 31904  
706-322-3801

Lee P. Brown  
Director  
Office of National Drug Control Policy  
Executive Office of the President  
750 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20500  
202-514-2000

Robert H. Brown, Jr.  
Chief, Crime Prevention Branch  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-616-3297

Jonathan Budd  
Program Manager  
Research and Program Dev. Division  
Office of Juvenile Justice and  
Delinquency Prevention  
633 Indiana Avenue  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-6235

Michael Buerger  
Visiting Fellow  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0500

VADM E.A. Burkhalter, Jr.  
President  
Burkhalter Associates  
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-857-0191

John A. Calhoun  
Executive Director  
National Crime Prevention Council  
1700 K Street, N.W., 2nd Floor  
Washington, DC 20006-3817  
202-466-6272  
202-296-1356

Betsy Cantrell  
Director  
Crime Prevention Triad  
National Sheriffs' Association  
1450 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-836-7827

George E. Capowich  
Criminal Justice Consultant  
4917 Ridgewood Road  
Alexandria, VA 22312  
703-750-1189

Robert Coates  
Senior Manager  
Neighborhood Policing Services  
National Crime Prevention Council  
1700 K Street, N.W., 2nd Floor  
Washington, DC 20006-3817  
202-466-6272

Elizabeth Cocke  
Program Analyst  
Drug-Free Neighborhood Division  
Office of Public and Indian Housing  
U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development  
451 7th Street, S.W., Room 4116  
Washington, DC 20410  
202-708-1197

Jay M. Cohen  
Deputy District Attorney  
Kings County District Attorney's  
Office  
210 Joralemon Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11201  
718-802-2156  
718-852-8705

George C. Crawley  
Assistant City Manager for  
Public Safety  
City of Norfolk  
1101 Union Street  
City Hall Building  
Norfolk, VA 23501  
804-441-2471  
804-626-0952

Marilyn Culp  
Executive Director  
Miami Coalition for a Drug-Free  
Community  
University of Miami  
400 S.E. Second, Avenue  
4th Floor  
Miami, FL 33131  
305-375-8032

G. David Curry  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology and  
Anthropology  
West Virginia University  
P.O. Box 6326  
Morgantown, WV 26506  
304-293-3569

Abdelkarim A. Darwish  
Research Associate  
Office of International  
Criminal Justice  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
740 W. 31st Street  
Chicago, IL 60616  
312-996-9595

Sylvester Daughtry  
Chief of Police  
Greensboro Police Department  
P.O. Box 3136  
Greensboro, NC 27402  
919-373-2450

Edwin J. Donovan  
Assistant Professor  
Administration of Justice  
Pennsylvania State University  
914 Oswald Tower  
University Park, PA 16802  
814-863-0277  
814-863-7044

Beverly Watts Davis  
Executive Director  
San Antonio Fighting Back of  
United Way  
1023 North Pine  
San Antonio, TX 78202  
210-299-1057

John Doyle  
Project Director  
National Sheriffs' Association  
1450 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-836-7827

Julius Debro  
Associate Dean of Graduate  
School  
University of Washington  
201 Administration Building, AG-10  
Seattle, WA 98125  
206-543-5900

John E. Eck  
Executive Director  
Crime Control Institute  
1063 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-337-2700

Scott Decker  
Professor, Chair  
Criminology and Criminal Justice  
Department  
University of Missouri at St. Louis  
598 Lucas Hall, 8001 National  
Bridge Road  
St. Louis, MO 63121  
314-553-5031

Peter Edelman  
Counselor to the Secretary  
U.S. Department of Health and  
Human Services  
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20201  
202-690-8157

Karen Donegan  
Attorney  
2301 Park Avenue  
Richmond, VA 23220  
804-358-7811

Clarence Edwards  
Chief of Police  
Montgomery County Department  
of Police  
2350 Research Blvd.  
Rockville, MD 20850  
301-279-1052  
301-217-4095

**Dean M. Esserman**  
Assistant Chief of Police  
New Haven Police Department  
1 Union Avenue  
New Haven, CT 06519  
203-787-6266  
203-772-7294

**Paul F. Evans**  
Superintendent-in-Chief  
Boston Police Department  
154 Berkeley Street  
Boston, MA 02116  
617-343-4577  
617-343-4480

**Julian Fantino**  
Chief of Police  
London Police Force  
601 Dundas Street  
London, Ontario N6B1X1  
519-661-5670  
519-661-5999

**Peter Finn**  
Research Analyst  
Abt Associates  
55 Wheller Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-492-7100

**William K. Finney**  
Chief of Police  
St. Paul Police Department  
100 East 11th Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

**A. Tony Fisher**  
Chief of Police  
Takoma Park Police Department  
7500 Maple Avenue  
Takoma Park, MD 20912  
301-270-1100

**Gayle Fisher-Stewart**  
President  
DA'VO, Ltd.  
7515 Dundalk Road  
Takoma Park, MD 20912-4122  
301-589-3032

**Dan W. Fleissner**  
Planning Manager  
Seattle Police Department  
ISD-156 610 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-684-5758  
206-684-8197

**Charles C. Foti, Jr.**  
Criminal Sheriff  
Orleans Parish Criminal  
Sheriff's Office  
2800 Gravier Street  
New Orleans, LA 70119  
504-827-8501

**Craig B. Fraser**  
Director of Training  
Richmond Police Training Academy  
Richmond Police Department  
1202 West Graham Road  
Richmond, VA 23220  
804-780-6119  
804-780-6193

Lucy N. Friedman  
Executive Director  
Victim Services Agency  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, NY 10007  
212-577-7700

Stephen J. Gaffigan  
Project Director  
International Association of  
Chiefs of Police  
515 North Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-836-6767

Eric B. Garrison  
Director of D.C. Mediation  
Services  
D.C. Citizens Complaint Center  
Superior Court Building  
515 5th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-724-8215  
202-724-7999

William A. Geller  
Associate Director  
Police Executive Research Forum  
2116 Thornwood Avenue  
Wilmette, IL 60091  
708-256-0017  
708-256-0111

Andrew J. George  
Sergeant  
Lansing Police Department  
120 West Michigan Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48933  
517-483-4663  
517-483-4824

Phyllis Gervais-Voss  
Project Director  
La Plata Prevention Partners  
La Plata County Hospital  
District  
3801 North Main Avenue  
Durango, CO 81301  
303-259-2166  
303-247-4322

Stephen Glaude  
President  
Hillen Group  
1701 K Street, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-331-2483

Stephen Goldsmith  
Mayor  
City of Indianapolis  
2501 City County Building  
200 East Washington  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
317-327-7977

Herman Goldstein  
Professor  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
975 Bascom Mall  
Madison, WI 53706  
608-262-1227

Heike Gramckow  
Research Associate  
Jefferson Institute for Justice  
Studies  
1910 K Street, N.W., Suite 601  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-659-2882

John E. Granfield  
Program Manager  
International Association of  
Chiefs of Police  
515 North Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-836-6767

Kimi O. Gray  
President  
Kenilworth/Parkside Resident  
Management Corporation  
4500 Quarles Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20019  
202-399-4477

Lorraine Green  
Assistant Professor  
College of Criminal Justice  
Northeastern University  
360 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02115  
617-373-2000

Kim Greene  
Project Director  
Miami Coalition for a  
Drug-Free Community  
University of Miami  
400 S.E. Second Avenue  
4th Floor  
Miami, FL 33131  
305-375-8032  
305-371-6645

Randolph M. Grinc  
Senior Research Associate  
Vera Institute of Justice  
377 Broadway  
New York, NY 10013  
212-334-1300

Ron Hadfield  
Chief Constable  
West Midlands Police  
Colmore Circus Queensway  
Birmingham, England, B46NQ  
011-44-21-236-5000

Donna L. Hansen  
Chief of Police  
Ft. Myers Police Department  
2210 Peck Street  
Ft. Myers, FL 33901  
813-338-2153  
813-334-2539

Carl R. Harbaugh  
Sheriff  
Frederick County Sheriff's Office  
100 W. Patrick Street  
Frederick, MD 21701  
301-694-2071  
301-694-1011

Clarence Harmon  
Chief of Police  
St. Louis Police Department  
1200 Clark  
St. Louis, MO 63103  
314-444-5624  
314-444-5958

Adele V. Harrell  
Senior Research Analyst  
Urban Institute  
2100 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-857-8738

Steven R. Harris  
Chief of Police  
Redmond Police Department  
15670 N.E. 85th  
Redmond, WA 98052  
206-556-2528

Frank Hartmann  
Executive Director  
Program in Criminal Justice  
Policy and Management  
Kennedy School of Government  
Harvard University  
79 JFK Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-495-5188

David Hayeslip  
Program Manager  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2959

Elaine S. Hedtke  
Chief of Police  
Tucson Police Department  
270 S. Stone  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
602-791-4441

Astrid Heger, M.D.  
Director, Suspected Child Abuse  
and Neglect Program  
School of Medicine  
University of Southern California  
1129 North State Street  
Pediatrics - Trailer II  
Los Angeles, CA 90033  
213-226-3961  
213-226-2573

Gerard J. Hoetmer  
Assistant Executive Director  
International City/County  
Management Association  
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002  
202-962-3634

James C. Howell  
Director  
Research and Program Development  
Division  
Office of Juvenile Justice and  
Delinquency Prevention  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0586

Wayne Huggins  
Executive Director  
Commission on Accreditation for  
Law Enforcement Agencies  
10306 Eaton Place, Suite 320  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
703-352-4225  
703-591-2206

Beth Hughes  
Executive Director  
Columbus Housing Partnership  
610 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-221-8889

Gil Kerlikowske  
Chief of Police  
Ft. Pierce Police Department  
P.O. Box 1149  
Ft. Pierce, FL 34954  
407-461-3820  
407-468-6867

Mori Irvine  
Civil ADR Training Manager  
Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division  
for the Superior Court of D.C.  
500 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 4242  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-879-1774

Alex Kinlaw  
Project Coordinator  
Police Neighborhood Resource  
Center Program  
Greensboro Police Department  
300 W. Washington Street  
Greensboro, NC 27402  
919-373-2262

Joan E. Jacoby  
Executive Director  
Jefferson Institute for Justice  
Studies  
1910 K Street, N.W., Suite 601  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-659-2882  
202-659-2885

Felice Kirby  
Director  
Neighborhood Anti-Crime Center  
Citizens Committee for  
New York City  
305 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10001  
212-989-0909

Johnnie Johnson, Jr.  
Chief of Police  
Birmingham Police Department  
417 6th Avenue, South  
Birmingham, AL 35205  
205-254-1700

Robert B. Kliesmet  
President  
International Union of Police  
Associations-AFL-CIO  
1016 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-549-7473

William Johnston  
Deputy Superintendent  
Bureau of Investigative Service  
Boston Police Department  
154 Berkley  
Boston, MA 02116  
617-343-4527  
617-343-4780

Thomas G. Koby  
Chief of Police  
Boulder Police Department  
1805 33rd Street  
Boulder, CO 80301  
303-441-3310  
303-441-4330

Ronald C. Laney  
Acting Coordinator, Missing  
& Exploited Childrens Program  
Office of Juvenile Justice and  
Delinquency Prevention  
633 Indiana Avenue  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5940

Steven Marans  
Harris Assistant Professor  
of Child Psychoanalysis  
School of Medicine  
Yale University  
P.O. Box 3333  
New Haven, CT 06510  
203-785-3377

Deidre Levdansky  
Executive Director  
Pittsburgh Mediation Center  
2205 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15203  
412-381-4443  
412-481-5601

Marsha A. Martin  
Executive Director  
Interagency Council on the  
Homeless  
451 7th Street, S.W., Room 7274  
Washington, DC 20410  
202-708-7480

Richard Lewis  
Research Associate  
Police Executive Research Forum  
2300 M Street, N.W., Suite 910  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-466-7820

Emily C. Martin  
Director  
Training & Technical Assistance  
Office of Juvenile Justice and  
Delinquency Prevention  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5940

Alexander N. Luvall  
Second Deputy Chief/Liaison  
Detroit Police Department  
1300 Beaubien, Room 309  
Detroit, MI 48226  
313-596-1835  
313-596-1579

Stephen D. Mastrofski  
Visiting Fellow  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2963

Ann B. Madison  
Director, Human Relations and  
Staff Development  
Norfolk School District  
P.O. Box 1357  
Norfolk, VA 23501  
804-441-2780

Jennifer Adams Mastrofski  
Faculty Associate  
Center for Research in Conflict  
and Negotiations  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802  
814-237-3882

Bobby Mathieson  
Master Police Officer  
Virginia Beach Police Department  
319 18th Street  
Virginia Beach, VA 23451  
804-428-9133

William H. Matthews  
Director of Community Policing  
and Criminal Justice Programs  
International City/County  
Management Association  
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002  
202-962-3532  
202-962-3500

J. Thomas McEwen  
Principal  
Institute for Law and Justice  
1018 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-684-5300

Harlin R. McEwen  
Chief of Police  
Ithaca Police Department  
120 East Clinton  
Ithaca, NY 14850-5689  
607-272-3245

Robert D. Miller  
Director  
NRP/C.A.R.E. Program  
105 Fifth Avenue South, Room 425  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
612-673-5141

Carole Miller  
Assistant Director, Neighborhood  
Based Alliance Program  
New York State Department of  
Social Service  
40 North Pearl Street  
Albany, NY 12243  
518-474-0013

William Modzeleski  
Director, Drug Planning and  
Outreach Staff  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Room 1073  
Washington, DC 20202-6123  
202-401-3030

Dave Mora  
City Manager  
City of Salinas  
200 Lincoln  
Salinas, CA 93901  
408-758-7412  
408-758-7368

Steve Morreale  
Special Agent  
Drug Demand Reduction Coordinator  
U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration  
700 Army-Navy Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202  
202-307-7936

Jane Morrison  
Project Director  
Boston Against Drugs Through  
Empowerment and Mobilization  
City Hall, Room 708  
Boston, MA 02201  
617-635-3283  
617-635-3498

Susie Mowry  
Lieutenant  
Newport News Police Department  
2600 Washington Avenue  
Newport News, VA 23607  
202-466-7820

Robert K. Olson  
Commissioner of Police  
City of Yonkers  
104 South Broadway  
Yonkers, NY 10701  
914-377-7202  
914-377-7213

Patrick V. Murphy  
Director  
Police Policy Board  
U.S. Conference of Mayors  
1620 I Street, N.W., 4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-293-7330

Terry Orr  
Director of Youth Fair  
Chance Demonstration Evaluation  
Academy for Educational  
Development  
100 5th Avenue  
New York, NY 10011  
212-243-1110

John O'Connell  
Director  
Delaware Statistical Analysis  
Center  
60 The Plaza  
Dover, DE 19901  
302-739-4846

Ana Palmer  
Executive Assistant  
Office of Employment Development  
417 E. Fayette Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
410-396-1910

Rose Ochi  
Director  
Criminal Justice Planning Office  
City of Los Angeles  
200 North Spring Street, Room 1404  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
213-485-5707

Antony Pate  
Director of Research  
Police Foundation  
1001 22nd Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-833-1460

Timothy N. Oettmeier  
Lieutenant  
Houston Police Training Academy  
Houston Police Department  
17000 Aldine Westfield Road  
Houston, TX 77073  
713-230-2312  
713-230-2314

Lee Pearson  
Assistant Manager  
Criminal Justice Services  
American Association of Retired  
Persons  
601 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20049  
202-434-2222  
202-434-6474

Susan Pennell  
Director  
Criminal Justice Research Division  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-5383

Carol Petrie  
Director  
Planning and Management  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2942

Randall Phillips  
Community Leader  
Muskegon Heights Neighborhood  
Association  
2401 Baker Street  
Muskegon, MI 49444  
616-733-9874

Kenneth Powell  
Medical Epidemiologist  
National Center for Injury  
Prevention and Control  
Mail Stop K-60  
Atlanta, GA 30333  
404-488-4646

David J. Powers  
Lieutenant/Chief's Executive  
Assistant  
Los Angeles Police Department  
P.O. Box 30158  
Los Angeles, CA 90030  
213-485-3202

Robert J. Prinslow  
Sheriff  
Marion County Sheriff's Office  
100 High Street, N.E.  
Salem, OR 97308  
503-588-5116  
503-588-7931

Roger Przybylski  
Coordinator of Research  
Chicago Police Department  
721 S. State  
Chicago, IL 60605  
312-747-6203

Duane Ragan  
Training and Program Coordinator  
Office for Victims of Crime  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5948

Larry Ray  
Director  
Section of Dispute Resolution  
American Bar Association  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-331-2660  
202-331-2220

Janet Reno  
United States Attorney General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Main Justice Building  
10th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530  
202-514-2001

Jim Roache  
Sheriff  
San Diego County Sheriff's  
Department  
9621 Ridgehaven Court  
San Diego, CA 92123  
619-974-2240  
619-974-2244

William M. Rohe  
Professor of City and Regional  
Planning  
University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill  
CB #3140  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599  
919-962-5204  
919-962-5206

Laurie Robinson  
Acting Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5933

Dennis P. Rosenbaum  
Director, Center for Research  
in Law and Justice  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
P.O. Box 4348 (M/C 2222)  
Chicago, IL 60607  
312-996-7199

George A. Rodriguez  
Special Agent in Charge  
Los Angeles Field Division  
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
and Firearms  
350 South Figueroa, Room 800  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
213-894-4812  
213-894-0105

Paula N. Rubin  
Visiting Fellow  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0649

Matt L. Rodriguez  
Superintendent of Police  
Chicago Police Department  
1121 South State Street  
Chicago, IL 60605  
312-747-5501  
312-747-2430

Julie Rusk  
Manager  
Human Services Division  
City of Santa Monica  
1685 Main Street, Room 212  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
310-458-8701

Michael J. Russell  
Acting Director  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2942

Joseph Ryan  
Visiting Fellow  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2964

Susan Sadd  
Project Director  
Vera Institute of Justice  
377 Broadway  
New York, NY 10013  
212-334-1300  
212-941-9407

Diane M. Salen  
Corporal  
Prince George's County Police Department  
7600 Barlowe Road  
Landover, MD 20785  
301-336-8800

Rana Sampson  
White House Fellow  
White House Domestic Policy  
Council  
Executive Office of the President  
Room 217  
Washington, DC 20500  
202-456-2164  
202-456-7739

Peter Scharf  
Director of Technology and Technical  
Assistance  
Police Foundation  
1001 22nd Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-833-1460

Ellen Scrivner  
Visiting Fellow  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2955

Jeff Seifert  
Executive Director  
Ecumenical Social Action  
Committee  
P.O. Box 4  
3134 Washington Street  
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130  
617-524-2555

**Billy Sifuentes**  
Senior Officer  
Austin Police Department  
715 East 8th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512-480-5000

**Ronald Stephens**  
Executive Director  
National School Safety Center  
4165 Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 290  
Westlake Village, CA 91362  
805-373-9277

**Andrew L. Sonner**  
State's Attorney  
Montgomery County, Maryland  
50 Courthouse Square, 5th Floor  
Rockville, MD 20850  
301-217-7300  
301-217-7441

**Dewey R. Stokes**  
National President  
Fraternal Order of Police  
520 South High Street, Suite 205  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-221-0180  
614-221-0815

**John Spevacek**  
Director, DUF Program  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0466

**Patrick J. Sullivan, Jr.**  
Sheriff  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Office  
5686 S. Court Place  
Littleton, CO 80120  
303-795-4701  
303-797-4444

**Norm Stamper**  
Executive Assistant Chief  
San Diego Police Department  
1401 Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-531-2705  
619-531-2530

**Michele Sviridoff**  
Director of Research  
Midtown Community Court Project  
The Fund for the City of  
New York  
121 Sixth Avenue  
New York, NY 10013  
212-925-6675  
212-925-5675

**Darrel W. Stephens**  
Chief of Police  
St. Petersburg Police Department  
1300 First Avenue, North  
St. Petersburg, FL 33705  
813-892-5577

**Marty M. Tapscott**  
Chief of Police  
Richmond Police Department  
501 9th Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-780-6700  
804-644-1210

Fred Thomas  
Chief of Police  
Metropolitan Police Department  
300 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-727-4218

Albert J. Toczydowski  
Assistant District Attorney  
Chief, LINE Program  
Philadelphia District Attorney's  
Office  
1421 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
215-686-8700

Robert Trojanowicz  
Director, National Center for  
Community Policing  
School of Criminal Justice  
Michigan State University  
560 Baker Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-2322  
517-336-1787

Joanne Tulonen  
Executive Director  
Maryland Alliance Against  
Family Violence  
University of Maryland  
525 W. Redwood Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
410-706-5472

Zachary Tumin  
Executive Director  
Division of School Safety  
New York City Public Schools  
600 East 6th Street  
New York, NY 10009  
212-979-3284  
212-979-3283

Ed Turley  
Deputy Director  
Community Youth Gang Services  
1821 W. 60th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90047  
213-778-9470

Craig Uchida  
Acting Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Research  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2959

Bill Walsh  
Lieutenant  
Dallas Police Department  
106 S. Harwood, Room 225  
Dallas, TX 75201  
214-670-7075  
214-670-5099

William F. Walsh  
Director  
Southern Police Institute  
School of Justice  
University of Louisville  
Louisville, KY 40292  
502-588-0330  
502-588-0335

Richard H. Ward  
Acting Director, Discretionary  
Grant Programs Division  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-5943

Richard H. Ward  
Associate Chancellor  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
1033 West Van Buren M/C 777  
Chicago, IL 60607  
312-996-2614

Elizabeth M. Watson  
Chief of Police  
Austin Police Department  
715 E. 8th Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
512-480-5209

Steven D. Weaver  
Chief of Police  
Newport Police Department  
120 Broadway  
Newport, RI 02840  
401-847-1306  
401-849-0214

Deborah Lamm Weisel  
Senior Research Associate  
Police Executive Research Forum  
16 West Martin Street, Suite 806  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
919-834-0078  
919-834-0049

Ralph A. Weisheit  
Professor  
Department of Criminal Justice  
Illinois State University  
Normal, IL 61761  
309-438-5038  
309-438-7289

Chuck Wexler  
Executive Director  
Police Executive Research Forum  
2300 M Street, N.W., Suite 910  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-466-7820  
202-466-7826

Debra Whitcomb  
Senior Research Associate  
Education Development Center, Inc.  
55 Chapel Street  
Newton, MA 02160  
617-969-7100  
617-244-3436

Cathy Spatz Widom  
Professor, Criminal Justice and  
Psychology  
School of Criminal Justice  
University of Albany  
135 Western Avenue  
Albany, NY 12222  
518-442-5603  
518-442-5226

Gerald Williams  
Director, Law Enforcement,  
Education, and Research Project  
North Carolina State University  
P.O. Box 8102  
Raleigh, NC 27695  
919-515-5071

Joseph M. Wright  
Executive Director  
National Organization of Black  
Law Enforcement Executives  
908 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
202-546-8811  
202-544-8351

Dave Williams  
Assistant Chief  
Portland Police Bureau  
1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-823-0000  
503-823-0342

Mary Ann Wycoff  
Project Director  
Police Foundation  
767 Chesapeake Drive  
Tarpon Springs, FL 34689  
813-938-3766  
813-934-6886

John J. Wilson  
Acting Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5933

Mark Wynn  
Sergeant  
Nashville Police Department  
200 James Robertson Pkwy.  
Nashville, TN 37201  
615-862-7747

Frederick E. Woods  
Staff Attorney  
Standing Committee on Dispute Resolution  
American Bar Association  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-331-2200

David Yang  
Officer  
St. Paul Police Department  
ACOP 1541 Timberlake Road  
St. Paul, MN 55117  
612-488-9272