194604

COPS: Innovations in Policing in American Heartlands

Marcia R. Chaiken, Ph.D.

LINC
PO Box 924
Alexandria VA 22313
703-549-8222

September 2001

Additional Product under Grant 95IJCX0047

Submitted to:

Brett Chapman
Project Manager
National Institute of Justice
US Department of Justice
810 7th Street
Washington DC 20531

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: _____

Date: 4/23/02

COPS: Innovations in Policing in American Heartlands

Marcia R. Chaiken, Ph.D.
LINC

September 2001

Executive Summary

Overview

This report describes changes in community-oriented policing in eight law enforcement agencies that participated in a locally-initiated research project sponsored by the National Institute of Justice in the late 1990s. The agencies included four police departments serving small- to medium-size cities (Eureka and Redding, California; Pocatello, Idaho; and Rapid City, South Dakota) and the four Sheriff's Offices responsible for policing surrounding counties (respectively Humboldt, Shasta, Bannock, and Pennington counties). The departments worked closely with the LINC researchers and exchanged promising practices among themselves.

The participating agencies represent only a tiny fraction of the agencies in the U.S. that enhanced their community policing activities during this period. Nevertheless, given the broad variations among problems and policing practices in the study sites, the report should be pertinent to many city and county officials, law enforcement administrators and officers, and citizen groups who are considering implementing community-oriented policing services. The report provides descriptions of varieties of community-oriented policing activities that departments were able to implement at different stages of development. The report also provides information about factors and strategies that helped move departments to function at progressively higher stages of community-oriented policing services.

The report is intended to be equally useful for officers and decision makers in *large* cities as well as *small and medium-size cities and rural counties* that are addressing concerns similar to those confronted by departments that participated in this study. Many problems and negative conditions identified and addressed by officers in this report are very similar to those addressed by officers in major metropolitan areas. Many forms of internal departmental resistance to change in policing strategies are also the same.

The findings presented in this report were derived from comparative case studies involving an iterative process of collecting and comparing data on community-policing activities carried out over five years by participating police departments. Data were collected through periodic onsite interviews (not only in the law enforcement agencies but also with city and county officials, residents, and business people), reviews and extrapolation of data from pre-existing documents, observations at departmental meetings, observations at meetings between law-enforcement officers and staff from other city and county and community-based agencies and citizen groups, ride-a-longs with teams of officers from different departments, and shadowing individual officers and recording their activities.

Five stages in the development of community-oriented policing services

All the participating departments carried out some form of community policing activities. For the purpose of helping readers understand the differences among the ways departments developed community policing, this report is structured around five progressive stages of departmental focus and priorities. In Stage 1, police activities are primarily driven by demands made by individuals who call to request emergency police response or other non-emergency services, and community crime prevention activities are separate from regular patrol and are carried out by civilians or officers with special assignments. In Stage 2, police activities are concentrated on reducing high rates of particular crimes and misdemeanors in specific neighborhoods. In Stage 3, police activities are partially shaped in meetings with neighborhood groups, and the department places a relatively high priority on collaborative projects that address specific local concerns. In Stage 4, police activities are planned as part of cross-agency/ community-wide coalition plans of action to prevent crime and delinquency. And in Stage 5, police activities are an outgrowth of integrated community-based approaches for engineering more productive and economically-sound use of neighborhoods and redirecting individual or group activities that present a high potential for harm to people or property.

Incremental introduction of community policing

In the participating departments, stage 2 of community-oriented policing was launched in geographically-defined neighborhoods, schools, shopping malls, downtown business areas, and far-flung isolated communities with high demands for service. Officers were mandated to reach out to residents and to focus response on local crime concerns. Some scholars recommend implementing community-oriented policing by involving the entire department and assigning officers for carrying out problem-solving approaches in all areas of the city. However, the departments in the LINC study considered this plan neither ideal nor feasible in an environment where radical change of any kind is viewed suspiciously — especially when promoted and funded by the federal government.

Each department selected specific residential neighborhoods and specific officers for their city's first community-oriented policing activities. All four of the participating police departments assigned officers to carry out community-oriented policing in downtown business areas; some assigned officers to shopping malls.

Compared to municipal police departments, territory that is under sheriffs' departments jurisdiction is typically substantially larger. Sheriffs' jurisdictions commonly include small incorporated cities and towns that contract for their policing services, as well as pockets of relatively densely populated unincorporated areas in far-flung reaches of their counties; these include trailer parks, settlements of religious and other sects seeking isolation from mainstream America, and, in the California departments that participated in this study, towns on Indian reservations. The approach taken by three of the four studied sheriffs' departments was to institute community policing in small, concentrated geographical areas; one sheriff's department took the approach of promoting innovative forms of community policing throughout the county.

Municipal police departments and county sheriffs alike adopted an early strategy of placing community-oriented officers in the schools.

Early staffing decisions

In most departments, top-level administrators were involved in selecting officers first assigned to community-oriented policing. For the most part, good community-policing officers were mature, experienced officers who realized the futility of trying to increase community safety by taking action offender by offender. They had previously demonstrated informal leadership skills, innovative thinking, and a willingness to listen to and consider ideas of people from different walks of life. They were committed to their community, and had the trust of their chief or sheriff.

In departments where community policing progressed furthest through the stages described in this report, an increasing number of officers with these characteristics were attracted to apply for and carry out community-oriented policing. In departments that stalled in their advancement of community policing, some of the officers who were first appointed grew frustrated and impatient about their inability to exercise their innovative skills.

From the onset, virtually all chiefs and sheriffs were concerned about the selected officers' becoming an elitist group, resented by officers not involved in community policing. Gaining the support of other officers and staff, especially those not initially directly involved with community-oriented policing, turned out to be key for making Stage 2 community policing actually work. An important role was played by community policing officers' first-line supervisors. Those who are advancing community-policing typically report on community-oriented policing efforts in roll call. They give credit to

officers who were not formally involved but who provided even the smallest degree of support. They listen carefully and considerately to officers who resisted the departmental shift in focus; rather than arguing the theory or philosophy of community-oriented policing, they point to "seeing is believing" successes from their own departments and give examples from other cities or counties where there have been significant impact on the types of problems they have right in their own areas.

Successful first-line community-oriented policing officers also went out of their way to provide support for other police activities in their cities or counties, and not behave as if community policing was separate from the activities of their fellow officers.

And, as with all innovations, support from the top leadership in the department was key to success in stage 2 and progress on to stage 3 of community policing.

Stage 2 community-oriented policing activities

In addition to fielding community-oriented policing officers in schools, shopping malls, downtown areas, and residential neighborhoods, all the participating departments recognized that increasing the visibility of police presence and arrests can at best bring about a temporary decline in an area's crime rate. For long-term crime reduction and for addressing problems that compromise quality of life, it is essential to foster ongoing and active participation of people who live and work in the area.

Chiefs and sheriffs in a number of departments inaugurated forums in which police officers and citizens could come together and learn about each others' views and concerns. Several departments began to offer "Citizens' Academies," in-class presentations from officers representing different units in the department and ride-a-longs with patrol officers. One police chief initiated annual "Block Parties" at the Police Department, providing a chance for residents and businesses to meet local law enforcement officers and emergency services personnel.

Several departments created mini-stations in store fronts, first floor apartments, and shopping malls. The officers who used these mini-stations were uniformly appreciative of their convenience for completing paper work, especially sheriff's deputies working in areas remote from their central department or substations.

All the departments tried to increase positive contacts between officers and people engaged in routine daily activities. Previously, officers had contact with criminals and victims, but they did not know most people in the neighborhoods they were assigned to police. Typical activities included pulling over to people engaging in routine activities, rolling down their window and engaging them in conversation, walking and talking the beat, and patrolling on bike. One sheriff required officers who wanted to take on community policing assignments in contract towns or remote communities to live in the

community. As a resident whose family has been using local public and private services, officers commonly have become part of the community in which they live, know a majority of people who live in the same town or village, hear about concerns on a day-to-day basis, personally volunteer for various civic responsibilities, and are in a position to officially organize community efforts to address concerns.

Increasing citizens' involvement in defining problems and priorities

Increasing face-to-face communication with residents and business people began the process of learning what concerns were on individual people's minds. However, the officers realized that more systematic methods were needed to find out how general these concerns were among people living or working in the areas they were policing. A variety of more or less successful ways of gathering this information were tried. These included conducting town meetings, forming citizen advisory boards, shifting responsibilities for neighborhood watch to community policing officers, reshaping the role of posses, conducting surveys, working with researchers, and developing departments' use of computers and the internet to engage citizens' interest in cooperative policing.

Coordinating with other groups

In Stage 3 of community policing, a priority develops for police to work with other groups to address specific legal concerns. Neighborhood clean-ups organized by joint efforts of community policing officers and local residents were among the most common projects carried out by the participating departments. Officers of all ranks and residents of all ages and backgrounds worked side by side to rid streets, vacant lots, pocket parks, playgrounds, and fields of moldy mattresses, torn tires, broken furniture parts, and other litter.

One department produced and published a Nuisance Abatement Guide. The guide describes steps landlords and property owners can legally take to prevent drug dealers or other offenders from moving into their housing units, steps to take for solving problems that are occurring, specific information relevant for problems involving illegal drugs, and laws and codes that can be used by landlords and other property owners to take actions against people creating community problems, and a list of contacts and their telephone numbers in state, city, and county departments for advice and cooperation in problem solving.

In another city, groups of youth who complete neighborhood improvement projects such as painting fences or cleaning out streams are rewarded with COPS dollar certificates. Endorsed by local merchants, COPS dollars can be redeemed at restaurants and other businesses popular with community youth. As a result, adolescents in formerly blighted

areas who previously hung out and got into trouble are now helping adult residents maintain an attractive environment.

In many communities, businesses have been providing paint for graffiti removal and for assisting elderly residents keep up the appearance of their homes. To persuade residents in a deteriorated neighborhood to improve their properties, the COP-on-the-Block officer in one city held a community meeting and invited real estate agents to attend. Once the agents explained the increase in home values that were realized from fixing broken porches, cleaning up yards, and planting trees and gardens, the neighborhood literally began to bloom.

Other types of cooperative projects were developed with faith organizations, non-profit service organizations, other criminal justice agencies, and schools.

Police focus on cross-agency community-wide coalitions

In Stage 4 community policing, a priority develops for collaborating on long-term programs to prevent crime and delinquency. In several cities and counties these coalitions emerged out of the successful outcomes of short-term cooperative projects. For example, in one city code abatement projects benefitted the police department by reducing complaints about deteriorated properties. The city benefitted from an increase in fines collected. And the citizens enjoyed an increase in property values and neighborhood pride. The city subsequently hired a "code officer" whose job was devoted to working with the police, other agencies, and community residents on an ongoing basis to monitor and when necessary take action in regard to property owners responsible for blight. Similar results arose from projects involving abandoned vehicle abatement in many of the participating cities and counties.

Two participating law enforcement departments made extraordinary progress in collaborating with schools and other youth-serving agencies. Both departments cooperated with their school and other community organizations to spell out in a youth guidebook in simple terms the laws that apply to juveniles and the services that are available to help them meet legal expectations. Both departments worked hand in hand with their communities to learn where, when, and why students were most likely to get into trouble. And both departments found very creative ways to redirect youth from these pitfalls.

The report also provides a detailed case study of cooperation among police, sheriff's office, and courts in a jointly-funded Juvenile Court Deputy. This deputy's office is in the court's reception area, where he can increase security for the building and quickly coordinate all activities with court staff. The assignment allows him to remind attorneys and other practitioners about interagency and community meetings. He also is

positioned to discuss informally with arriving kids where they were when they got into trouble, with whom, who supplied them with alcoholic beverages (if that is the case), and what they need to do in the future to stay out of trouble. He makes sure kids who have been brought in to detention during the previous night are added to the court calendar, checks on whether kids are receiving services they need and, if not, figures out what can be done to make sure they do. Not relying exclusively on his own skills to solve problems, he constantly and consistently considers others within and outside the sheriff's department who have the authority and know-how to bring about long-term solutions.

He and other officers in departments that reach Stage 4 of community policing are actively encouraged to "think outside the box," come up with innovative methods for preventing crime, discuss them within the department including with supervisors and top administrators, and suggest how the ideas could be put into action.

Characteristics of this department and other departments that helped promote developing an advanced level of community-oriented policing included a long history of continual self-scrutiny and increasing professionalism, open doors and open communication among rank and file, supervisors' trust in officers to know and to apply departmental priorities, open minds for promising ideas for accomplishing the police mission, viewing routine tasks and functions as opportunities for carrying out basic mandates and creating change for the better, assignment according to individual strengths and talents, and job performance evaluation with a focus on career development.

Strategic planning

In Stage 5 community policing, police activities are developed as part of city/county strategic planning. The department formally places high priority on participating in sustained, integrated community-based approaches for engineering more productive and economically-sound use of neighborhoods and redirecting situations and group activities that presented a high potential for harm to people or property.

The report presents a detailed case study in which the city's leaders saw an opportunity to increase its attractiveness as a place for major industries and businesses. Community-oriented policing was to be used as a stimulus for creating attractive and active shopping areas and a system of strong services in residential neighborhoods for families with diverse backgrounds and income levels. A concerted public-private venture was developed to obtain funds for home and neighborhood improvements and economic development and to sponsor events for promoting neighborhood pride. Community-policing officers who had initially focused on coordinated intensive supervision of repeat offenders who were terrorizing neighborhoods moved on to longer-term measures designed to break the generational cycle of crime.

One of the remarkable developments was the growth in the number of officers who were bringing about long-term solutions by improving the lives of formerly chronic offenders. Some major efforts included transforming previously run-down high-crime apartment complexes into crime-free housing, assuring mentally-ill street people had necessary services for regulating medication and re-establishing more healthful ways of living, and a city-wide effort to relocate families living in cramped, stressful housing for transients into long-term affordable housing.

Another major effort was educating youth about expectations for behavior and the consequences of delinquency, and providing immediate consequences for delinquency coupled with an opportunity for delinquents to redeem themselves. Core elements of this approach were a Youth Guidebook, the assignment of officers to high schools and junior highs, and a close working relationship with juvenile justice system and other youth-serving agencies. Community policing officers became an integral part of the teams of school administrators and other youth services providers who were tracking truancies, school absences, and other signs of failure to thrive, trying to figure out what was going wrong in the lives of the children, and coming up with a plan to assist them.

Findings and recommendations

Major advances in implementing community-oriented policing have taken place in small- and medium-size cities and rural counties. Four years of experience with heartland departments in this study suggests the following:

- Large cities have just as much or more to learn about community policing from small- and medium-size cities and rural counties as the converse. Officers in participating departments have grappled with and successfully addressed problems that are identical to those facing officers in large cities.

- As with any innovation in policing, if the Chief or Sheriff is not committed to change, the change is not likely to occur. However, for sustaining community policing, elected city or county officials must also be convinced of the need for change from the onset and be kept personally apprized of the benefits on an ongoing basis.

- Launching community-oriented policing services with a small cadre of officers can ultimately result in as large an impact on a department's mode of policing as restructuring the entire department at the start.

- While formulas for limited problem-solving projects can be taught to officers in classrooms, experiential on-the-job learning is much more valuable in the long-run for first-line officers and supervisors — and for

the communities they are policing. Exchanges of officers between law enforcement departments have provided an excellent resource for this type of learning.

- There is no one right way of implementing community policing. Approaches can be as diverse as the communities in which they are implemented and the teams of officers, staff in other agencies, and community members who develop and carry them out. A very important role that the federal government can play is to enable interchanges so that community policing teams can share ideas, concepts, goals, and experiences and shape these to meet the realities of their own neighborhoods.

COPS: Innovations in Policing in American Heartlands

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

The research on which this report is based was made possible by the contributions of over 200 professionals and community members in California, Idaho and South Dakota, as well as by key staff in the US Department of Justice and colleagues who directly cooperated in this study or who provided insights from their own studies of community policing. I especially would like to thank the administrators, officers, and civilian staff in the law enforcement departments in the following cities and counties who took part in our study and the staff in other agencies and key community members who collaborated with them for developing community policing and approaches for reducing violence against women and girls. Many titles and positions of named persons changed during or after the years the research was conducted.

Eureka/Humboldt County, California

Hoopa Tribal Administrators and Community Members Merv George, Jr., Chairman, Hoopa Valley Tribal Council; Leonard Masten, Director; Sergeant Tony Mattz, Sergeant Jude Hostlert, Deputy J.L. "Red" Marler, and Dispatcher Lenaire Alverez, Hoopa Valley Department of Public Safety; Sara Burcell, Director, Hoopa Child Welfare; and also tribal members John Robbins and Cindy Sylvia.

Yurok Tribal Administrators and Community Members:; Susan Masten, Chair, Yurok Tribe; Gary Markussen, Vice-Chairperson; Carol Melendy, Yurok Tribal Council Social Services Director, and her and her assistant Linda Crawford and clerical assistant, Casey, as well as Yurok Elder Bertha Peters.

Eureka Police Department: Arnold Millsap, Chief of Police; Captain Dave Douglas, Captain William F. Honsal, Sergeants Jim (Butch) Manos and Dennis Berry; Patrol Sgt. Leonard Johnson, Youth/Ethnic Liaison Officer John Turner, Investigators Lynne Soderberg, Neil Hubbard and James Armstrong, Officers Jeff Daniel, Steve Dunn, Kevin Lawson, Bill Nova, Robert Metaxas, Boyce Johnson, Crime Analyst, Marsha Allen, Crime Prevention Officer, Mary Kirby, Assistant to the Chief, and Shirley Kerrigan, Coordinator of Citizen Services. .

Humboldt County Office of the Sheriff: Sheriff Dennis Lewis

Schools: Louis Bucher, Superintendent of Schools, Humboldt County: Dr. James Scott, Superintendent, Eureka Schools: Dr. Larry Nicoll, Vice Principal, Eureka High School; Robert Steffen, Principal, Catherine Zane Junior High; Mr. Pat Faeth, Principal, Zoe Barnum Continuation High School, and Jim Sanders, Principal, Alice Birney Elementary School.

Other cooperating Eureka/Humboldt agencies Councilwoman Connie Miller; David Tyson, Interim City Manager; Asst. Chief Ralph Altizer, Eureka Fire Department; John Franks, Director, Humboldt County Department of Social Services; David Lehman, Jennifer Roberts and Mark Sousa, Humboldt County Department of Probation; Antoinette Martin, Chair, Juvenile Justice Committee, Humboldt County Commission on Crime; Patty Berg, Chair, Humboldt County Crime Commission Working with Law Enforcement; Bonnie McGregor, Executive Director of Humboldt County Victim Services; Sheri Johnson, Domestic Violence Coordinator, County of Humboldt Department of Health; Terry Farmer, District Attorney for Humboldt County and Bill Rodstrom, Domestic Violence Project Coordinator, Office of the District Attorney, County of Humboldt. .

Pocatello/Bannock County, Idaho

Pocatello Police Department: V. Lynn Harris, Chief of Police; Captain Michael Stayner; Captain Kirk Nelson, Lt. Garry Pritchett; Lt. Steve Findley, Lt. Jay Lusk, Lt. Dave Phelps; Lt. Bruce Wheatley, Sergeant Rick Capell, Corporal Moe Canfield, Officer Kirk Howe, School Resource Officers John Webster and Rory Olsen; Kim Ellis, Liaison, Neighborhood Watch Inc.; Donna Monroe, Assistant to the Chief of Police; Shauna Huerta, Manager, Record Division; Vicki Allen, Chair, Gretchen Vanek, and Mickie Adler, Citizens Advisory Board.

Bannock County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff Lorin Neilsen, Chief Deputy/Undersheriff Tom Canfield, Deputy Chiefs Jim Dalley, Jerry Hickman, and Mike Sanders, Lt. Kevin Fonnesbeck, Lt. of Detention Sylvia Hayball, Sergeant Tom Foltz, Detective Toni Vollmer, Deputy Dan Argyle, Deputy Alison Kitzmiller, and Deputy Howard Manwaring

Schools: Dr. David Peck, Superintendent of Schools, Pocatello Public Schools; John McCarthy, Principal, and Vice Principal Don Cotant, Pocatello High School; Frank Thomas, Principal, Irving Junior High School; Charles Wegner, Principal, Jefferson Elementary School; John Rauker, Co-chair, Bannock Youth at Risk, School District 25: and other principals and administrators, counselors, teachers, parents and students who attended the meetings on preventing school violence at Pocatello High School and Bonneville School.

Other Pocatello/Bannock County Agencies and Organizations: Chubbuck Chief of Police Jerry Rowland; Mayor Gregory Anderson and (former) Mayor Peter Angstadt, City of Pocatello and Rick Parker, Director of Information Systems; Child Protection Investigator Lisa Redford, Bannock County Department of Health and Welfare; Harry Neuhardt, President, Chamber of Commerce; Sil Martinez, Special Agent, Union Pacific Railroad; Catherine Scott, Executive Director, Pocatello YWCA; Vernon Alvarez, Chief of Police and Captains Clem Hidalgo and Don Davis, Fort.Hall Police Department (Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Law Enforcement): Counselors and other staff associated with Bannock Youth Foundation; Juvenile Magistrate Judge Bryan Murray; members of

the Children's Advocacy Network; members of the juvenile judiciary committee convened by Judge Murray and composed of representatives from probation, the office of the district attorney, the office of the public defender, the court clerks and police and sheriff's departments.

Rapid City/Pennington County, South Dakota

Rapid City Police Department: Thomas L. Hennies, Chief of Police; Dr. Dick Talley, Chief of Staff; Captain Craig Tieszin; Captain Doug Noyes; Captain Chris Grant; Lt. Frederick Brown; Det. Sgt. Tim Amos; Investigator Pete Ragnone; COP-on-the-Block Community Officers Sgt. Kevin Miller, Officer Doug Thrash, Detective Fred Eisenbraun, Officer Mike Lang, Officer Brent Gromer and Officer Tony Harrison; School Liaison Steve Oberman; Community Service Officers Gary Larson and Carole Boswell; John Beardsley, Computer Operations Manager; Ron Estes, Crime Analyst; Chaplains Bruce Cain and Timothy Steinert; and Administrative Assistant to the Chief Vicky Jaco.

Pennington County Sheriff's Department: Don Holloway, Sheriff; Domestic Violence Investigator Larry Kent, and Deputy Terry McLane

Schools: Pam Teaney-Thomas, Director of Prevention Programs, Rapid City Area School District; Wes Storm, Principal, and Vice Principal Doug Foly, West Junior High School;

Other Rapid City/Pennington County Agencies and Organizations: Mayor Ed McLaughlin, Rapid City Mayor's Office; Frank O'Grady, Alderman; Karen Bulman, Ward Four, Rapid City Common Council; City Ordinance Inspector Umit Spensor; Rev. Timothy W. Steinert, Woodhaven Church; Karen R. Waltman, General Manager, Rushmore Mall; Robert P. DeMersseman, President, Rapid City Area Economic Development Partnership; James F. McKeon, President, Rapid City Area Chamber of Commerce; Lila Doud, President, West Boulevard Neighborhood Association; L.J. Bulman, President, North Rapid Civic Association: Doug Wells, Executive Director, Pennington County Housing Authority; Chris Smith, Executive Director of Working Against Violence, Inc. (WAVI); Melanie Flatt, Executive Director, and Alys Lasler-Ratigan, Girls Incorporated of Rapid City, Inc. Alys played a major role in arranging, developing methods, and carrying out focus groups with residents in Rapid City.

Redding/Shasta County, California

Redding Police Department
Robert Blankenship, Chief of Police; Captain Chuck Byard, Administrative Services Division Commander; Captain Gary Dirks, Investigations Division Commander; Lieutenant Leonard Moty, Field Operations Watch Commander and primary contact for our partnership; Rick Blankenship and Dennis Kessinger, Crime Analysts; Sergeant

Dan Kupsky, Training Manager; and Investigator Tracy Hall. Members of the Neighborhood Policing Unit (NPU) include Sergeants Dave Mundy and Rich Nance, Corporal Steve Moravec, Investigator Roger Moore, and Officers Kirk Brenner, Patty Dikes, Pat Fogarty, Randy Gilstrap, Linda Gisske, Scott Mayberry, John Thulin, Rob Wilson, Bill Forrest, Steve Davis, Jay Guterding and Walt Bullington..

Shasta County Office of the Sheriff: Sheriff Jim Pope; Undersheriff Larry Schaller; Support Manager Janey Myers; Captain Rick Burnett, Lieutenants Harry Bishop, Herb Davidson, Arlin Markham, Bradd McDannold, Sergeants Tom Bosenko, Greg Wrigley, Detective John Hubbard, and Deputy Sheriffs Cliff Blankenship, Jose (Joe) Gonzalez, Joe Moffett and Pat Sandbloom; and Community Service Officer Carol Zacher.

Schools: Dr. Carol Whitmer, Education Department, Simpson College; Frank Adelman, Principal, Sequoia Middle School; Lorraine Hashey, Principal, Juniper Elementary School; and Dr. William Par, Principal, Cypress Elementary School.

Other cooperating Redding/Shasta agencies and organizations: Mayor David Kehoe, City of Redding; Michael Warren, City Manager; Deputy District Attorney John Loomis; Karen Bennett, McConnell Foundation; David McGeorge, former Mayor; Holly Hetzel, Director of the Shasta County District Attorney's Drug Endangered Children Program; Mary Stegall, Shasta County Women's Refuge, Deputy Chief Lou Rizzo, Shasta County Probation Department and Deputy Probation Officer II Patti Field.

Karuk Tribe of California: Alvis Johnson, Chairman; Suzanne Burcell, Chief of Staff; Karuk Tribal Staff Trista Perry, Maggie Peters, Angel Morton, and Joe Snap. Also, the community officer serving the Happy Camp area of the Karuk Tribe, Deputy Melum, Siskiyou Sheriff's Department (Charles Byrd, Sheriff).

Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice: Information requested by the collaborating tribes and law enforcement departments was provided on an ongoing basis by Ada Pecos Melton, Director, American Indian and Alaska Native Desk and her successor, Noreena Henry; Catherine Pierce, Violence Against Women Grants Office, and Jan M. Chaiken, Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Researchers: Many other researchers formally or informally provided skilled technical assistance, ideas, and insights during the course of this project. In particular I would like to thank Joel Garner, Lorraine Green Mazerolle, and Bill Geller for the time they devoted to working with the law enforcement departments named above and providing findings and observations as part of this process. I also appreciate the assistance provided by Dr. Heather Johnston Nicholson and Faedra Weiss at Girls Incorporated National Resource Center for generously sharing scenarios about violence involving girls which initially were incorporated in LINC focus group methods.

Reviewers: Two anonymous reviewers provided detailed suggestions for revising the penultimate draft of this report. Their recommendations for changes and additional materials are incorporated in this document.

This study was made possible by Grant 95-IJ-CX-0047 from the **National Institute of Justice**: Jeremy Travis, Director, provided the vision for the locally-initiated policing research collaborations that formed the foundation for this study. Sally Hillsman, Deputy Director, provided important insights and guidance at every stage of our research. Advice and administrative support were provided throughout the research by our project monitors, Dr. Phyllis McDonald and Brett Chapman. Joe Brann, Director, COPS Office, transferred funds to NIJ for this and many other studies designed to document and facilitate the development of community policing; Joe personally stimulated enthusiasm and encouragement for community policing in our study sites and throughout the nation.

Marcia R. Chaiken, Ph.D.
LINC
August 2001

COPS: Innovations in Policing in American Heartlands[1]

Marcia R. Chaiken, Ph.D.
LINC

September, 2001

INTRODUCTION

Faced with communities that had been racked with violent crime and drug wars during the previous decade, in 1994 the Federal government enacted the Crime Act. It provided resources for crime prevention and for increasing the numbers of police on America's streets and back roads. The Crime Act also incorporated the principle that to reduce crime, more effective policing was needed as well as more officers. The Act provided federal funds to law-enforcement agencies to stimulate them to implement community-oriented policing services or COPS. This form of policing had been gaining in popularity, but in 1994 in most departments it was still in an early or exploratory stage of development.

Not only were more officers to be put on the streets, but they were to be given the skills and strategies to work collaboratively with other local agencies, private organizations and groups of citizens to bring about fundamental community changes for reducing crime. During the three years after the Crime Act passed, the rate of local police department employment grew three times faster than in previous years, and from June 30, 1994 to June 30, 1997, 80% of police departments serving municipalities with populations of 25,000 or more had trained at least some of their officers to carry out community policing[2]. Sheriffs' departments employment increased less rapidly between 1993 and 1997, and a smaller proportion had trained officers in community policing techniques (55% trained in-service officers in 1997), yet over 80% of sheriffs' departments reported meeting with community groups during the year ending June 30, 1997[3]. By mid-1999, 86% of all U.S. residents were being served by law enforcement departments that had implemented some form of community policing.[4]

During this same period a broad-based shift occurred in all parts of the country — rates of violent crime and delinquency began to decline rapidly. Researchers disagree and will long argue about the role the Crime Act, and community-oriented policing services in particular, played in this reduction of crime and delinquency. However, this study shows that even in cities or counties where implementation of community-oriented policing was limited to a small number of officers, visible changes in communities' ability to deal with crime and delinquency occurred. All departments described in this report at

the very least shifted away from their traditional modes of operation so as to assign officers to schools; and school staff and students in all these schools reported fewer fights, quicker response to fights when they did occur, and feeling safer. As a result, school administrators became avid proponents of community-oriented policing.

> "The [community-oriented policing services] officer is part of a team effort in dealing with students holistically. The officer supports us in dealing with juveniles' [delinquency]. The kids feel safer; they like the attention to their safety. They can ask questions about problems that are happening off campus and get an immediate response. The officer is part of the education team and provides education for kids about juvenile law. An officer's participation in parent conferences sends a very strong message about better choices and informs parents about collaborations to support them at home, in school, and off campus. Fights can be dealt with as a law enforcement matter; students can be taken off in handcuffs. The presence of an officer establishes a vision of authority — that police are there to protect and serve and let students get an education. Officers have helped students form action plans that meet their needs — such as plans to prevent gang activity between groups from different parts of the Asian community. We're lucky to have the officers we have." — *Principal, Redding School*

Moreover, in cities and counties where a growing number of officers took on community-oriented policing activities, fundamental changes occurred:

- Visibly cleaner and more attractive residential neighborhoods
- Transformation of commercial districts from areas of urban decay and frequent incidents of disorderly conduct to attractive downtown blocks
- A higher quality of life for residents who are among the least affluent
- People including business owners, educators, and residents who say they feel safer
- Officers who take deep satisfaction in solving difficult community problems and openly grapple with new and effective ways for ongoing improvements.
- A growing recognition among many residents of the innovative roles and leadership officers can provide.

Based on research in a consortium of four small- and medium-size cities in America's heartland and the four rural counties that surround them, this report describes the development of community-oriented policing in the communities policed by these eight

departments.

Before community-oriented policing was implemented, these departments primarily emphasized traditional forms of policing; almost all officers were devoted to responding to crimes, one-by-one, after they occurred. (We call this **Stage 1** in the development of community-oriented policing within a law enforcement agency.) Four years later, one of the departments participating in this study, Redding (California) Police Department, reached what we call **Stage 5**: many officers at all ranks were working with teams of citizens and staff in other agencies on an ongoing basis; together they were successfully changing crime-producing conditions in neighborhoods to conditions that promoted economic growth and high quality of life. The other participating departments too made fundamental, but perhaps not as sweeping, changes in policing[5].

Because many of the changes made from Stage 2 through Stage 5 were innovative and brought improvements in their communities, this report was written to bring you the information you might need to understand or imitate these kinds of shifts toward community-oriented policing services. The report is written for city and county officials, law enforcement administrators and officers, and citizen groups who are considering implementing community-oriented policing services. The report provides descriptions of many different types of community-oriented policing activities that departments were able to implement at different stages of development. The report also provides information about factors and strategies that help move departments to function at progressively higher stages of community-oriented policing services.

The report is intended to be equally useful for officers and decision makers in *large* cities as well as *small and medium-size cities and rural counties* that are similar to the departments that participated in this study. Many problems and negative conditions identified and addressed by COPS officers in this report are the same as those addressed by officers in major metropolitan areas. Many of the barriers city, county, and policing administrators had to overcome to promote community-oriented policing services are also the same. And many of the creative ways officers developed to address problems and conditions can serve as a basis for stimulating similar approaches in other places, independent of the size of the city in which they are located.

BACKGROUND AND METHODS FOR THE RESEARCH IN THIS REPORT

In addition to greatly increasing the numbers of officers carrying out community-oriented policing services, a relatively small percent of the 1994 Crime Act funds were transferred each year from the federal COPS office to the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to carry out a program of research for evaluating changes in policing that had been expected to be stimulated through the COPS grants (and for assisting departments to carry out research integral to these changes). Although the funds transferred to NIJ were minimal in comparison to the funds that directly or indirectly went to law-enforcement agencies (figures here), they provided a major increase in resources available for research, compared to funds previously available for federally-sponsored policing research. This enabled scores of researchers to work with law-enforcement departments in every region of the country in a spectrum of diverse communities to document changes that were occurring and, at times, to facilitate implementation through their analysis and findings.

This report provides the findings of one of these research efforts, the results of a grant to LINC. Findings are drawn primarily from experiences in developing COPS among only a few of the agencies that received COPS funds. The departments described in this report were part of consortium of law-enforcement agencies and researchers, sponsored by NIJ to develop and carry-out an agenda of locally-initiated policing research and an exchange of promising practices.

The primary eight departments who participated with LINC researchers in this study were four police departments serving small to medium-size cities (Eureka and Redding, California; Pocatello, Idaho; and Rapid City, South Dakota) and four Sheriff's Offices responsible for policing surrounding counties (respectively Humboldt, Shasta, Bannock, and Pennington Counties). The characteristics of these departments and areas they serve are provided in Table 1. How these departments were selected, and specifics about the research and exchange activities carried out by these agencies, along with some nearby Indian tribal agencies and Sheriffs who were vital for the study, are detailed in another report[6].

---------- Table 1. (Attached) Goes about here----------

The findings presented in this report were derived from comparative case studies involving an iterative process of collecting and comparing data on community-policing activities carried out over five years by participating police departments. Data obtained during site visits were summarized after each site visit, presented to the department in the form of "mini-reports" on their community policing practices and progress, and after verification and approval from the chief or sheriff (approval was always given), provided to the other participating departments for future (or immediate on-line internet) discussion about similarities and differences in their community-policing approaches. The methods used to collect data included the following:

Table 1. Characteristics of participating departments and areas served

State	South Dakota		Idaho		California			
Locale	Pennington County	*Rapid City*	Bannock County	*Pocatello*	Shasta County	*Redding*	Humboldt County	*Eureka*
Original settlers	Lakota Sioux	Lakota Sioux	Shoshone Bannock	Shoshone Bannock	Indian bands	Indian bands	Yurok Hoopa	Yurok Hoopa
Date county/city created	1875	1876	1893	1882	1850	1887	1853	1850
Largest industries	Tourism, military, ranching, farming	Military, Medical, College	Mining Manufact. Railroad Agriculture	University High tech Railroad	Agriculture, tourism, timber	Retail, services	Lumber	Lumber
Form of Govern-ment	Board of 5 commis-sioners	Mayor/ council (5 wards)	Board of 3 Commis-sioners	Mayor/ Council (6)	Board of 5 Supervisors	Council (5)/ Manager	Board of 5 Supervi-sors	Mayor/ council (5)
Population[1]	83,000 est. 1995	57,000 est. 1995	66,000 est. 1995	49,000 est. 1995	164,500 est. 1994	80,000 est. 1994	126,900 est. 1995	28,576 1995
Square miles	2783	30	1113	34	3850[2] 3774 uninc	59.04	3573	17.71
N Sworn Law Enf. Officers[3]	48 (FT) (1996)	95 (1995)	107	84 (1999)	148 (1994)	96 (1994)	76 (1996)	50 (1994)
N Sworn Patrol Officers	NA[4]	51[5] (1995)	19	55	49[6]	61	50	40
N initial COPS neighbor-hoods	1 town	6 + mall+ down-town	---	0	3 towns	1 area (others added progres-sively)	----	4 zones + downtown footbeat area
COPS officers primary duties	Patrol/ Problem-solving at officer discretion	Patrol/ weekly 2-4 hours outreach problem-solving	Problem-solving/ crime prevention expected from ALL officers	Patrol; rapid response to all calls	Patrol; at least one ongoing problem solving project	Reduce crime; Problem solving; outreach back up patrol	---	Patrol; outreach nuisance abatement

Table 1. Characteristics of participating departments and areas served (Continued)

1999 status of COP areas	Reduced	Increase	Increase (informal)	City-wide (beats)	Reduced	Increase	---	Reduced
School COPS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

1. Rounded

2.Includes City of Shasta Lake policed by Sheriff

3. Includes administrators and supervisors

4. Approximately 190 part-time deputies could be deployed by the sheriff

5. An addition 22 reserve officers were also available as well as 12 cadets.

6. Includes 11 officers assigned to Shasta Lake

- *Initial meetings and in depth discussions with CEOs about plans for and barriers to community policing.* The chiefs of police[7] of participating departments met for two days in Washington, DC in January 1996, and the sheriffs met in January 1997. They compared strategies, tactics, initial problems and successes while the researchers asked questions about details and took notes.

- *Periodic Interviews (over five years)* with a broad spectrum of law-enforcement officers and civilian employees in participating departments, administrators and other staff in departments with whom they were cooperating to carry out community policing, city and county officials, and residents and business people in areas in which community policing was taking place. (See the Acknowledgment section for the names of the study's primary respondents.) To enable comparisons across cities and counties and across time, structured but open-ended protocols were used in these interviews.

- *Reviews and extrapolation of data from pre-existing documents,* including annual reports of counties and cities; reports of community police officers to supervisors and neighborhood groups; results from surveys of citizen satisfaction with police services conducted by city governments, individual police departments, and community police officers; strategic plans developed by participating law-enforcement departments; and policy and practical directives from top- and mid-level administrators to officers and civilian staff.

- *Observations at departmental meetings,* including formal meetings between community police officers and their supervisors, roll-calls, and informal discussions in 'break' rooms and in hallways (while officers were waiting to see watch-commanders).

- *Observations at meetings between law-enforcement officers and staff from a wide-range of other city and county and community-based agencies and citizen groups.* These included meeting attended by officers (at times, the chief or sheriff) with school staff, juvenile courts staff, code enforcement officers, women's shelters and other victim service providers, neighborhood watch groups, special task forces, clergy, county boards of supervisors, city councils, child advocates/service providers, ethnic liaisons, citizen patrol groups, and may others described in this report. To enable comparisons across cities and counties and across time, structured protocols were also used to record these observations.

- *Ride-a-longs with teams of officers from different departments.* As part of our project, officers from consortium departments visited other

participating departments for the purpose of sharing best practices in community policing. Researchers accompanied officers during these exchanges and (once again using structured protocols) recorded relevant information about community policing discussed by visitors and host. officers.

- *Shadowing individual officers and recording their activities.* Before community policing was implemented, observation of activities carried out by individual field officers could for the most part be carried out during ride-a-longs in patrol cars. After community policing was implemented, researchers accompanied officers and collected information about their activities outside their patrol cars as well.

The places and conditions under which the study departments operated varied considerably, as did the places where community-oriented policing efforts were launched. They included low-income housing complexes such as urban apartment buildings and rural trailer parks, well-to-do residential areas, downtown shopping areas and suburban malls, schools, small communities in isolated mountain areas, extensive lands on Indian reservations, and ethnic enclaves of homes and businesses on the fringe of central cities.

FIVE STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

All the departments carried out some form of community policing activities to which they justifiably point with pride. Some departments' efforts were confined to a limited number of discrete approaches that helped solve problems of concern to residents in specific neighborhoods, other departments developed broader innovations incorporating fundamental changes in policies and practices that some scholars say are integral to advances in community policing. To help readers understand the differences in ways departments developed community policing and to enable the reader to compare the approaches described in this report with community policing in their own cities and counties, practices and policies are described as elements of five progressive stages of departmental focus and priorities:

- **Stage 1:** Police activities were primarily driven by demands made by individuals who called to request emergency police response or other non-emergency services. The department placed highest priority on rapid response to all requests for crime-related services, whether or not they were actually emergencies. Community crime prevention activities were separate from regular patrol and carried out by civilians or officers with special assignments.

- **Stage 2:** Police activities were concentrated on reducing high rates of particular crimes and misdemeanors in specific neighborhoods. Neighborhood outreach and targeted response to specific types of offenses became a departmental priority.

- **Stage 3:** Police activities were shaped in meetings with neighborhood groups: the department placed a relatively high priority on collaboration on short-term projects addressing specific local concerns

- **Stage 4:** Police activities were planned as part of cross-agency/ community-wide coalition plans of action; the department placed a high priority on collaboration for long-term programs to prevent crime and delinquency.

- **Stage 5:** Police activities were developed as part of city/county strategic planning; The department placed high priority on participating sustained, integrated community-based approaches for engineering more productive and economically-sound use of neighborhoods and redirecting situations and group activities that presented a high potential for harm to people or property. Officers carrying out community oriented activities were integral to patrol units and throughout the department; many officers actively discussed ways to work with communities to prevent and reduce crime.

The stage achieved by each department during the period of the study varied. This report describes the activities undertaken in each stage, the efforts that were necessary to consolidate the gains in each stage and move on to the next, and the factors that appeared to foster progress to more advanced stages. Departments at any one stage of development tend to feel that they have "full-fledged" community-oriented policing. This report will help understand the possibilities that lie ahead at each stage of development and the efforts that will need to be undertaken to move on to the next stage.

As those who have implemented community-oriented policing already know, it is not a simple process that you can learn from a book, a brochure, or a research report. It is a demanding enterprise that has to be tailored to your specific community and is subject to various setbacks and dead-ends. Even the dead-ends are described here as guidance for other departments, either so they can be avoided or because they might not actually be dead-ends in other locales. Yet, on the whole, most of the activities begun in Stage 2 were considered valuable and were continued into successive stages, and the same with Stages 3 and 4. For this reason, the activities that are described in each of the stages should be of interest to agencies or researchers who have not yet experienced them.

Initially, there were extremely diverse interpretations of "community-oriented policing services" as a philosophy.

The meaning of "community-oriented policing services" was the topic of a decade of debate among academic policy-analysts and researchers for almost a decade before the federal COPS office was established pursuant to the Crime Act. While some viewed "community-oriented policing services" as an essential change in police management or practice, others viewed the concept as a return to an older, less "professional" form of policing. A third camp proclaimed "community-oriented policing services" to be empty rhetoric[8]. The most general view that emerged out of these differences was that "community-oriented policing services" was as a philosophy rather than a specific mode of policing.

After the 1994 Crime Act, as major federal funds for police hiring supplements were switched from relatively broad crime-related formula allocations to states, administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), to direct grants to local agencies, administered by the COPS office, administrators and grant-writers in the departments participating in this study formally embraced the idea of the "COPS philosophy."

For some this was not a far reach. Most of the participating departments in California had been introduced to COPPS (Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving) well before they received their initial funds. This is the status that we call Stage 1.

In Stage 1, the chiefs and sheriffs by-and-large saw the primary component as responsiveness to community concerns, a philosophy that most generally saw as

"nothing new, something we've always done." The sheriffs, as elected officials, could state as a matter of fact that if they weren't out in the community, listening and responding, they could not have been elected to their jobs. As they considered if and how to implement community-oriented policing services in practice, the value of policing innovation promoted by federal agencies and researchers was viewed as a tradeoff against the important value of immediate response to individual calls for police services.

Stage 1: Police priorities were driven by individual callers, and value was placed on rapid response to all reports of crimes and incidents that appeared to be crime-related. Reactive services were driven by community concerns about crime and high demands for police services

Before community-oriented policing services efforts were initiated, most people living in communities covered by the LINC study viewed crime as a major problem and viewed rapid police response to individual calls as a top priority for police. For example, in Eureka, while a 1993 citizen survey conducted by the City Manager's Office showed that 91% of the 150 surveyed residents rated the overall quality of life in the city as "good" or "very good":

- 78% said that crime was one of the 3 biggest problems facing Eureka in the next five years
- 62% said that Eureka has a serious or very serious problem with drugs
- 98% said that police services were very important or important for the quality of life in Eureka
- Under 25% *opposed* increased taxes for better police services

Citizens demands for police services in the study cities were very high in comparison to demands in large cities. Fifty-two percent (52%) of those who responded to the survey in Eureka had called the Department at least once during the past year. (By contrast, a citizen survey in a larger city — Portland, Oregon — found that 32% of respondents had contact with their police in 1994, 34% in 1996, and 30% in 1998[9]. This survey also counted contacts that had been initiated by the police.)

> *The police force is largely a reactive one due to the high crime rate and the large number of calls for service ranging from problems with sick raccoons and abandoned cars to assaulting behavior and homicides. Identifying the difference between what a "Police Problem" is versus what a "Community Problem" is, is still unclear in both the police and citizens minds. There is a need to establish a police-community partnership seeking community solutions for community problems.* (Chief Arnie Millsap memo to the City Manager shortly before his appointment as chief, May 27, 1993.)

Rapid City citizens too placed a relatively high demands on their police. In a 1993 survey of residents who were registered voters, close to half (45.1%) reported at least one contact in the past year with police. Under one percent of these contacts (.6%) involved an arrest of the person who had the police contact, and only 15% of these contacts were a result of being a victim of a crime[10].

Remarkably, citizens surveyed clearly differentiated between and placed higher priority on law enforcement services than other services that within a couple of years

became cornerstones of COPS in later stages. In Eureka in 1993, while 75% of those surveyed said that police services were "very important" for the quality of life in Eureka, well under half considered as very important, park maintenance (15%), recreation programs (23%), senior resources (33%), traffic control (41%), street lighting (42%), street cleaning (19%), and street repair (37%). While citizens indicated that they did not consider these services as important as "police services," in fact many calls for services involved non-crime related matters.

In Rapid City, South Dakota, there was also an overall incompatibility between citizens' reasons for making demands for police services and their perception of the importance of police activities. While most contacts with the police were not crime-related, on the whole survey respondents ranked police activities involving criminal incidents as much more important than activities involving public-order offenses such as liquor law violations, loud parties, juvenile curfew violations, and panhandling vagrants[11].

Over the following years a redefinition of the importance of different types of police activities took place. As later stages of community-oriented policing took hold, police officers and community members alike began to realize the importance of demands that citizens were actually already making — these involved public order rather than felonious crime: providing supervised recreation for children, safe parks, removing abandoned cars, and productive activities for seniors. All of these were paramount concerns in the relatively high crime areas designated for Eureka's Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) Units. And Rapid City police, as well as officers in other study departments, began to organize efforts to alleviate problems that generated high demands for service in specific neighborhoods and other locations.

Stage 2: COPS were launched in geographically-defined neighborhoods, schools, shopping malls, downtown business areas, and far-flung isolated communities with high demands for service ; officers were mandated to reach out to occupants and to focus response on local crime concerns.

Similar to the development of community policing in large cities *[footnote here in final draft]*, the law enforcement departments in the LINC consortium began COPS efforts as focused responses to particular crime-related concerns in specific urban residential and commercial neighborhoods. Although the actual numbers of incidents demanding police response were obviously lower than in large cities, the types of crimes and criminals, the rates of crimes per resident, and the numbers of crimes per officer were as high or in some cases higher than central cities in major metropolitan areas. For example: *[Rape rates go here in final draft]*. Also as in large cities, rates of crime vary from neighborhood to neighborhood. Analysis of where crimes rates and demands for services were highest provided a major basis for initial decisions about beginning COPS

A variety of strategies were used for initiating assignment to specific residential neighborhoods within the cities

According to scholars who have conducted policing research in large cities, the ideal strategy for implementing COPS is to involve the entire department and assign officers for carrying out problem solving approaches in all areas of the city. The majority of departments in the LINC study considered this plan neither ideal nor feasible in an environment where radical change of any kind is viewed suspiciously and often with hostility — especially when promoted and funded by the federal government. Except for the Pocatello Police Department, which essentially delayed any major change in the way police were assigned to neighborhoods, the departments began COPS on a much more limited basis. Each selected a subset of specific residential neighborhoods and selected a subset of specific officers for launching COPS. Dubbing its COPS effort with a different name, each department adopted a different strategy for initial implementation.

Eureka (California) Police Department assigned four teams of two Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) officers to four contiguous neighborhoods with mixed residential and business use. Maps prepared by the department analyst had demonstrated that these areas had the highest rates of crime and calls for service. The officers were charged with responding to crime and other neighborhood demands as well as carrying out projects to reduce crime. Supervised by one sergeant, the effort was also closely monitored and developed by a captain who was a strong proponent of community-oriented policing services, as was the chief of police. The chief, who had laid out a the need for a plan for NOP prior to being appointed to his position, actively participated in many of the crime prevention projects.

Redding (California) Police Department also focused on neighborhoods with relatively high rates of crime; however rather than assignments to a number of specific neighborhoods, designated officers were given full-time assignments to a special Neighborhood Policing Unit headed by a sergeant and supervised by a lieutenant. The chief of police, who had actively participated in state-wide planning for community policing, realized that a central tenet of COPS was to stimulate officers to "think out of the box — beyond the dots." He saw his role as strategic planning rather than direct supervision or participation. The unit was given a general plan that was roughly a "weed-and-seed" strategy; together the first-line officers were to concentrate on reducing the most serious crimes in neighborhoods, beginning with the neighborhood with the highest rate of crime, build the capacity of the community to cooperatively keep crimes in check, designate one member of the team as their ongoing contact, and then move on to the area with the next highest crime rate and repeat the process. A general focus on preventing juvenile delinquency was also part of their mandate. Other than being assigned to conduct patrol in the NPU area and an informal understanding that they would volunteer to respond to calls in other areas during down time, how they were to accomplish this mission was pretty much up to the first-line officers and their sergeant.

Rapid City (South Dakota) Police Department began with the most ambitious goal among this group of four. It wanted to establish 25 Cop-of-the-Block programs throughout of city. In reality, however, at first only six officers were assigned to carry out special projects on a part-time basis, each in a specific neighborhood, in addition to carrying out regular patrol — not necessarily in their Cop-of-the-Block area.

> "Over the next five years the Rapid City Police Department has a goal of establishing twenty-five community oriented policing Cop-of-the-Block programs in Rapid City. As an estimate, for every twenty-five neighborhood block areas will require approximately 50 to 75 hours per week of officer discretionary patrol time to be directed at performing community-oriented policing activities."

The Cop-of-the-Block program was designed by and carried out under the direct supervision of Chief of Staff Dr. Dick Talley, who, as a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice, was well versed in the theory and research on community policing. Realizing that maintaining a long-term COPS effort is dependent on support of influential citizens, he not only assigned officers to carry out problem solving in neighborhoods with relatively high rates of crime, but also selected a middle-class neighborhood where residents were already organized for civic action. The chief of police was representative of many law enforcement administrators who viewed COPS as "something we've always done." However, he viewed his appointment of a Ph.D. Chief of Staff as a major and innovative decision, and he was fully supportive of Talley's decision to implement the initial Cop-of-the-Block Program.

Pocatello (Idaho) Police Department was the last of our four municipal departments

to implement COPS involving residential neighborhoods. As of early 1999 the entire city of Pocatello is divided into five COPS areas. After considering different divisions, the senior staff decided to match the initial COPS areas to the traditional beat structure, which had been originally defined by major geographical barriers: the river, train tracks, and main thoroughfares. Plans are to review this geographical configuration at the end of the first year to see if any adjustments are needed.

Each area is assigned a COPS team headed by a lieutenant and consisting of 15 to 21 officers, including supervisors and patrol officers from all shifts, detectives, dispatchers, records staff, and school resource officers (SROs). Since officers working different shifts are assigned to the same COPS team, loose-leaf notebooks have been set up for each team to share information relevant to ongoing problem-solving taking place in the beat to which the team is assigned.

In addition to their team assignment, the team members also maintain their affiliation with more traditional functionally-defined units. Even officers assigned to the Community Services unit – established before the COPS teams were formed – belong to COPS teams.

All four municipal police departments assigned officers to carry out COPS in downtown business areas; some assigned officers to shopping malls.

Assignment of officers to focus on solving problems in downtown business areas was the least controversial and had the most favorable response, both immediate and long-term, in all four cities. Highly visible problems that made these areas prime targets for COPS were virtually the same across cities; historic buildings were deteriorated and often painted with graffiti, vagrants wandered the streets accosting shoppers and tourists verbally and occasionally physically; juveniles claimed sidewalks and roads for activities such as skateboarding that often endangered passers-by as well as themselves; seedy motels and abandoned buildings gave the areas a down-and-out undesirable appearance as well as attracting criminal pursuits.

The strategies with minor variations were very much the same: assign one or two officers to intensely patrol the area, provide a substation or store front where the officers could fill out reports, increase officers' face-to-face contacts with business owners and others using the area, and organize efforts to clean the place up and relocate groups and individuals who increased fear of crime and threatened the economic viability of the area.

One variation on the downtown assignments was assignments to shopping malls. The motivation for placing COPS in malls varied from city to city. For example, Eureka had an increase in gang activity in a mall including a shooting. Redding had a rash of burglaries from cars parked by shoppers. Rapid City saw placement of COPS in the area's largest shopping mall as an anchor point for COPS in the neighborhood

surrounding the mall and an opportunity for crime prevention outreach to the many people from the city and region who shopped there. Although motivated by different reasons, the strategy for implementation was quite similar to COPS in downtown areas: increase visibility and face-to-face interactions between the police, business owners, and the public and organized the business owners to prevent crime — in this case primarily shoplifting.

The strategies used by Sheriffs for selecting areas for launching COPS were shaped by the realities of extensive territories policed by relatively few officers

Compared to municipal police departments, territory that is under sheriffs' departments jurisdiction typically ranges from quite a bit larger to extraordinarily more extensive. (See Table 1 for the characteristics of sheriffs' departments in the LINC consortium.) Sheriffs' jurisdictions typically include small incorporated cities and towns that contract for their policing services as well as pockets of relatively densely populated unincorporated areas in far-flung reaches of their counties; these include trailer parks, settlements of religious and other sects seeking isolation from main steam America, and, in the California departments that participated in this study, towns on Indian reservations.

The Sheriff of Shasta County, for example, polices 3850 square miles. In 1994, when consideration of COPS was under way, the Sheriff had 49 sworn patrol officers available to cover this territory — over 78.5 square miles per officer, and of course no single officer is on duty every day and night. Obviously, the comprehensive form of COPS assignments suggested by scholars of big-city policing was unthinkable. The ways the sheriffs in the LINC consortium adapted to this reality differed remarkably.

Shasta County's Sheriff selected three widely-distant towns within the county for concentrated COPS activities. Although his officers had extremely large territories to police, including vast tracks of mountainous terrains, the Sheriff, who had participated in California state-level planning for COPPS, was convinced of the value of "getting officers out of their cars and rattling door knobs." Each of the three towns selected for COPPS was assigned an officer who was required to live in the area.

As most neighborhoods selected by municipal police, the selected Shasta areas had generated relatively high-rates of demand for services. Some of these demands were related to crimes similar to those found in central cities areas including homicides. As in the counties policed by the other Sheriffs, other demands were based on problems that can be seen as an outgrowth of their geographical isolation: illegal methamphetamine labs set up by offenders who moved into hidden cabins, mentally-ill residents who came to the area seeking social isolation, groups of troublesome adolescents who truly had "no place to go, nothing to do," inmigration of fringe groups who opposed mainstream American society and law, and elderly retired residents who settled in the area because

of the natural beauty and inexpensive housing — but had become extremely fearful of local crime. Natural disasters too came with the territory including wild fires that burned through wide tracts of land taking numerous homes in a matter of hours. As the most accessible public officials, the officers assigned to these areas were required to address this full spectrum of concerns.

Pennington County (South Dakota) and Humboldt County (California) had limited geographically-defined COPS efforts. In addition to wide expanses to police, both departments were struggling with very limited budgets. However, the Pennington County Sheriff took his cue from the Rapid City Police Department and assigned an officer to carry out community policing in a small town located in the Black Hills during the summer months when the population swells with tourists.

The Humboldt County (California) Sheriff's Department was actually under intense outside pressure to implement COPS. The Humboldt County Board of Commissions established The Humboldt County Crime Commission Working with Law Enforcement in 1994. The commission was charged with responsibility, "To assist law enforcement and the community of Humboldt County in developing preventive strategies which will empower communities to create safe, crime free neighborhoods"[12]. This mandate meshed well with a primary focus of the Sheriff — empowering the Hoopa Tribe, in particular the tribal police serving Hoopa Valley, the tribal reservation within Humboldt County, to assume greater responsibility for law enforcement on their own lands. Operationally, the strategy was the converse of those in the other study counties — sheriff's deputies already assigned to police Hoopa Valley were to play a less intensive role. Conceptually, however, the strategy was the same — officers were to assist the community to define pressing problems and work together to solve them.

In Bannock County, no special assignments were made by area. However, the Sheriff and Undersheriff made it clear that innovative forms of community policing throughout the county were an integral part of the job. Although Bannock County when measured by square miles is the smallest area policed by a Sheriff in the LINC consortium, the social distance between areas within the county are extreme. They include separatist groups some of which do not recognize the authority of the US government, farming towns settled primarily by members of the Church of Latter Day Saints, upscale suburbs of vacation homes of residents from Salt Lake and other urban areas, trailer parks that are inhabited by people living in abject poverty, others with extensive criminal records; and picturesque tourist towns. As Humboldt County (California), Bannock County encompasses tribal lands; however, unlike Humboldt with major responsibility for policing on the reservation, the Bannock deputies are responsible only for crimes committed by non-Indians. In practice, deputies must work out jurisdictional issues with tribal law enforcement officers on a daily basis. Rather than selecting one or two of these varied areas for COPS, the Sheriff and Undersheriff expect deputies to interact with and find ways to address concerns of members of all these diverse communities. The Sheriff, however agreed with one special assignment

that became the corner-stone of COPS in almost all departments: officers in schools.

The strategy of placing COPS officers in schools was adopted by municipal police and sheriffs alike.

For several of the departments in the LINC consortium, basing officers in schools was far from a new approach. The Pennington County Sheriff had dedicated officers in schools for a decade before community-oriented policing became a federal focus. The Rapid City Police Chief, who had established a very close working relationship with the Sheriff, also provided schools with officers well before school crime was a national concern. A primary focus, then as now, was on working with school staff to identify children who were involved in crimes as victims as well as participating in delinquent acts, and use available resources for helping the youth. One of the first of the Sheriff's school officers was an American Indian who was able to gain the trust of Indian youth who came to school with telltale signs of abuse.

Although most of the departments did not have as long a history in basing officers in schools, all had a previous association with schools through their crime prevention efforts. Most had provided DARE programs, or DARE-like programs designed for drug prevention; some had added GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training) to the programs in which officers were involved. Although a series of evaluations have questioned the effectiveness of DARE and other prevention programs *[add footnote in final draft]* police provide in schools, the programs had opened school doors for police to play a more substantial role in solving youth problems in school-based COPS approaches.

As in assignments of officers to neighborhoods other COPS areas, the reasons and strategies for placing officers in school differed from department to department and ranged from focused patrol to a city wide strategy for more effective youth development. For examples, Rapid City Police Department and Pennington County saw school officers assignments as an approach that worked well in the past to unearth and address cases of abuse and neglect as well as to more quickly respond to conflicts between students.

Pocatello Police Department schools officers were seen as needed for efficient response to increasing calls for service involving student and staff safety. Initially the community was divided about whether or not police officers should be based in schools. Many were concerned that the presence of uniformed officers would be interpreted as indicating more violence than actually was occurring in the schools. Several proponents of bringing police services into schools volunteered to carry out a study of the number of times police were called by the schools to deal with incidents involving students or non-students who created problems on the school grounds. Their findings showed that officers were spending an increasing number of hours driving to schools — primarily those serving adolescents — in response to a proliferating volume of calls.

This convinced the city administration and the Chief that placing officers in high schools and junior high schools was a justifiable cost saving measure.

Eureka had experienced a rise in youth violence and gang involvement; some activity was due to youth who had been indoctrinated into gangs in large California cities and had at least temporarily moved into the area; other youth will simply imitating actual gang members. Other forms of youth conflict appeared to be a result of cultural and language misunderstanding between adolescents who belonged to a spectrum of ethnic groups rapidly increasing the rich diversity in the city. Independent of the motivation for youth violence, weapons use was resulting in an increase in lethal or close to fatal incidents in and around schools. The initial challenge to the youth officer/ethnic liaison assigned to the school experiencing the most conflict was to find ways to work with the students and staff to reduce the violence. Similar reasons and approaches also provided a basis for placing efforts in Shasta County schools.

Redding Police Department's and Bannock County Sheriff's mandate for officers working with schools was part and parcel of a boarder COPS strategy. As in other cities and counties part of the mandate was seen as more efficient response to incidents involving students or outside troublemakers. However, the primary motivation was to work with the schools, families, and other community organizations to reduce behavior harmful to wholesome adolescent development and to provide students with new opportunities in the non-school hours for increasing their long-term potential as well as ongoing contribution to their communities.

Giving officers time, direction, discretion, and motivation for carrying out community-oriented policing services

One key to successfully launching COPS efforts in all departments appeared to be selection of officers and supervisors initially assigned. For the most part they shared the following characteristics and skills:

- They were mature, experienced officers who still enjoyed chasing down and locking up "bad guys;" but they also realized the futility of increasing community safety by taking action offender by offender.
- They had the whole-hearted respect and trust of their fellow officers and fully realized that any smack of elitism in their new assignments would endanger this desirable perception.
- They had previously demonstrated informal leadership skills, innovative thinking, and a willingness to listen to and consider ideas of people from different walks-of-life.
- They were committed to their community and most felt that there was no

better place in the world to live or work.

- Their chief or sheriff trusted them to consider the impact of actions they took on the department as a whole.

In most departments, top-level administrators were involved in selecting officers first assigned to COPS duties. In Bannock County, where all officers were encouraged to carry out COPS, the Sheriff's deputies who emerged as exemplary COPS officers also were found to have these characteristics.

In departments where community policing progressed furthest through the stages described in this report, an increasing number of officers with similar characteristics were attracted to apply for and carry out COPS innovations. In departments that stalled in their advancement of COPS, some of the officers with these characteristics who were first appointed to COPS grew frustrated and impatient about their inability to exercise these skills; they worked hard to help shift the department toward more proactive community efforts.

Discretion and direction given to the officers was as important as officer characteristics in the advancement of community-oriented policing. The types and amount of discretion and direction given to COPS officers varied considerably among departments. The most explicit direction among our study sites was provided in Rapid City, where the program was headed by Chief of Staff Dick Talley. Individual officers were assigned to specific Cop-of-the Block areas; each was given a twelve-page manual of instructions for carrying out[13] their assignments and allowed two to four hours each week for COPS. During other hours they were to carry out regular patrol duties — not necessarily in the area in which they were assigned as a Cop-of-the Block. Talley met the officers on a weekly basis to review their COPS progress. For all other assignments, they were a part of regular patrol and answered to their sergeant.

In Bannock County with the least structured approach, all officers were encouraged to take on COPS projects. Those who did so were rewarded by "atta-boys", by the Sheriff publically giving officers credits for their projects, and by evaluations and promotions that showed that innovative methods of community policing were not only expected, but were the means of advancing in the department. Officers were encouraged to find out about effective advances being made by other departments whenever they had a chance to visit — and to come up with a plan for why and how similar approaches could be carried out in Bannock County. The Sheriff and Undersheriff took great delight in supporting a spectrum of efforts by providing the officers time and training to carry them out, small amounts of departmental funds for equipment and supplies, and, if necessary, the Sheriff presented and justified the approaches to the county commissioners.

Redding Police Department managed their COPS approaches with maximum balance

between officers' discretion and administrative direction. This balance was in part due to the management skills of the (MBA) lieutenant who provided oversight for the NPU, the determination of the Chief to support but not micro-manage the Unit, the extraordinary people skills of the Sergeant who directly supervised the officers in the unit, the deep trust between the three, and the roles each played.

The lieutenant worked closely with the sergeant to stimulate ideas and to stimulate the officers to generate ideas that appeared to be worth while (and not likely to cause any counterproductive uproar in the community). Before fielding the NPU the whole unit traveled together to other cities in California carrying out COPS to learn about the nitty-gritty details of implementation. This not only generated many ideas for implementation in Redding — any potential approach that both the lieutenant and sergeant thought worthwhile for Redding was actively encouraged — but created a team approach rather than just individual initiatives.

Once back home, the lieutenant deftly handled bureaucratic procedure to obtain resources needed for projects. The sergeant coached his officers through complexities of dealing with staff in other agencies and community members. At times the lieutenant needed to stand firm when the chief was concerned about ramifications; in rare instances, the chief overruled him, placed specific approaches on the back burner or simply said 'no'.

Gaining the support of other officers and staff, especially those not initially directly involved with community-oriented policing, turned out to be key for making Stage 2 community policing actually work. From the onset, virtually all chiefs and sheriffs were concerned about COPS officers becoming an elitist group, resented by officers not selected for these special assignments. To counteract this possibility, the heads of the departments formally and informally structured supervision and reporting so that the COPS officers were part of "regular" patrol. As such, COPS officers formally were available to be in their cars conducting surveillance of specific areas and dispatched to 911 and other calls for police service. The problem lay in trying to convince administrators, supervisors, and other officers that other activities were equally as important as traditional patrol and response.

Some chiefs and sheriffs tried to assure that first line officers and supervisors understood the purposes and goals of COPS by assigning materials to read as part of mandatory ongoing training. One sheriff strongly recommended that his officers read *Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Communities.*[14]. Although a few officers who actually read the book thought the ideas had merit; other apparently "read enough" and reported that they did not find the book convincing.

In Redding, all officers were required to read the California Department of Justice brochure on community policing and problem solving issued by the State Attorney General Office's and developed by a committee of law enforcement department

administrations[15]; after reading, officers completed and submitted a training card. The pamphlet was also incorporated into training in other California Departments. Many officers in the California departments in the LINC consortium reportedly found this report informative. However, more than a few of the officers still did not agreed with the value of community-oriented policing.

Disagreement among rank and file about the value of community-oriented polcing directly effected the COPS officers in two primary ways. Patrol supervisors who considered community-oriented policing to be a waste of time simply assigned COPS officers to places, times, or tasks that virtually made it impossible to spend any concerted time in community outreach or projects. Nor were dispatchers instructed to consider officers engaging in COPS activities as temporarily "out of service" for response. As a result, for example, an officer who had just started a discussion with business owners who were concerned about apparent drug distribution among students in the alley behind their buildings was dispatched to an address miles away to take a report from a man whose wife had decided to leave him three weeks before and had taken some of "his" possessions.

Fellow officers who disagreed with the concept used subtle and not so subtle informal ways to demean community-oriented policing activities. These included complaints about officers' failure to carry their own weight, constant biting sarcastic remarks (as opposed to typical good natured kidding) about the appropriateness of COPS activities, and shutting officers out of discussions about "real" police work. Since typically law enforcement officers look primarily to each other for comradery and validation of a job well done, these disparaging comments prevented COPS officers from taking pride in carrying out nontraditional activities.

Some departments tried to cope with these forms of dissension by formal methods. For example, in Rapid City, Cops-on-the-Block officers formally submitted requests to the patrol supervisor for time off regular patrol to carry out COPS; the Chief of Staff reviewed requests and responses to requests to assure that time was being permitted for COPS. However, formal methods did not alleviate the subtler forms of subversion. In one law enforcement department where two of the top administrators widely disagreed on the value of COPS, the proponent formally was charged with leading the effort; however since both were vying for a higher position, many officers were concerned about overtly endorsing COPS until they knew whether the proponent or opponent would attain the higher position.

In Pocatello, bringing officers on board for community policing presented a special problem since the entire department shifted to COPS assignments. Reorganization was preceded by formal training in Problem Oriented Policing for the entire department by a consultant who introduced the officers and administrators to the SARA model of problem-identification and resolution *[footnote in final draft]*. Some officers took to the model and tried to apply it in their jobs; others thought the method was not useful. But the greatest resistence among officers seemed to be based in the rigidity of geographic

and team assignments rather than the view of policing as problem solving.

Recognizing that mandatory COPS team assignments would not necessary be viewed as a positive development among most Pocatello patrol officers, the senior staff proposed an initial three-month "experimental" team assignment, followed by a departmental-wide review of the new structure and assignments. According to both the top- and mid-level supervisors and the field officers, most found the team assignments "not too bad."

To sweeten the process of assignment to teams, officers (based on seniority) bid for their preferred COPS team as well as the shift they preferred. Since preferences are diverse – for example, some want to be in their own home area while others want areas where there are lots of problems to be addressed – most officers seem to wind up in COPS areas where they would prefer to be. A common complaint that persists is "feeling confined" to one area. But a more frequent concern — one that seems to reflect officers' growing acceptance of proactive policing and community problem-solving — is "being run from place to place" to respond to non-emergency calls relayed by dispatchers and therefore not having enough time to concentrate on community problems.

This concern was somewhat alleviated in Pocatello by 1) conducting a manpower study, 2) adjusting the numbers of officers assigned to each shift to better reflect workload patterns, and 3) overlapping two shifts at the time determined to be peak workload hours (2 pm to 5 pm). The shift overlap during these hours makes more manpower available to respond to calls and potentially could free officers to meet with community groups and carry out problem-solving activities. However, even after these steps the problem still was evident.

Overcoming resistance to community-oriented policing promotes success in Stage 2 and progress toward Stage 3

The approach that overcame most resistance from the troops and supervisors alike consisted of strong leadership from the top together with a willingness among first-line and supervisory COPS officers to pull more than their weight yet credit others for successful efforts.

COPS received leadership from the top Two examples of strong leadership at the top are the actions taken to stimulate COPS by Chief of Police Bob Blankenship in Redding and Sheriff Lorin Neilsen in Bannock County. These two CEOS had very different styles of leadership. In leading his department, Blankenship relies on his chain of command. Strategic planning and major operational decisions are for the most part made by the "top brass" and implemented by rank and file. The Chief likens his role to that of an orchestra conductor. "I don't play the instruments. I have excellent musicians that can play the instruments. I set the overall tone and give general

instructions when needed. 'A little quieter in the brass section. A little louder in the strings.' "

Neilsen, on the other hand, involves many of his officers at all ranks in thinking about strategy and operations. He keeps an open door, and officers feel free to approach him — in fact they not uncommonly follow him around the department — to brainstorm about ideas they have for new departmental approaches or changes in ongoing operations. However, officers also realize that although they are free to suggest, the final decision is his, and they know that his decisions are not arbitrary but often made in careful deliberation with the Undersheriff.

Both Blankenship and Neilson have earned a reputation for good leadership among the vast majority of their officers. Both came up the ranks in their departments and were respected for their fairness and integrity by officers who knew them from their earliest years in law enforcement, as well as younger officers and city and county officials. Both had a "buck stops here" policy when it came to taking personal responsibility if operations backfired, both have a track record of quietly but firmly going to bat for their officers when city or county budget or political considerations threatened cuts in equipment or other resources that were needed for their officers to function safely and effectively, and both are always searching for new ways to improve the quality of their policing.

In a major sense the process of making departmental decisions about implementing COPS strategies were not very different from other decisions. Blankenship involved his commanding officers and administrators, as well as his departmental analyst in designing an overall strategy. Neilsen involved many of his officers at different ranks in considering what types of approaches could be used. However launching COPS involved some special steps:

- Both paid particular attention at the outset in selecting COPS administrators, first-line supervisors, and field officers that were the best of the best in terms of people skills, management skills, adaptability, and a vocation for community service as well as law enforcement. However, they also made clear from the onset that all other officers who had an interest in carrying out COPS assignments would eventually have the opportunity.

- Both paved the way within the department as well as outside by explaining the potential for COPS to benefit all without over-promising what could be accomplished.

- Both sent officers to places where community-oriented policing had progressed and arranged for them to spend time with officers of their own rank who were already deeply involved in COPS. These emissaries often "caught fire" and were anxious to get back to their own cities and counties

and try some of the innovative procedures they learned first-hand.

- Once COPS was started, both stepped back as much as possible and let their officers develop their own day-to-day activities. They both asked for reports on activities and each "kept their nose to the wind" for any possible problems. Both had deep personal interest in the approaches being developed but by stepping back gave their officers carrying out community-oriented policing the degree of independence needed for them to create innovative approaches and at the same time did not appear to be showing favoritism to officers selected for COPS.

- Both made sure that the first line officers who developed and carried out community-oriented policing projects were the ones who received the credit and favorable publicity. As the results of COPS began to make front-page news, the officers most involved with the particular approach were the ones interviewed and featured. At the same time, they promoted recognition of officers who, with less fanfare, were solving cases and literally putting themselves in the line of fire.

- Both encouraged officers who were not formally assigned to COPS duties to carry out their own community policing projects — and they backed up this encouragement by taking on their own. For just one example, Chief Blankenship in keeping with the department's strategy for preventing delinquency, became a recognizable spokesman on TV for gently reminding parents' to supervise their children. "It's 10 o'clock — do you know where your children are?" .

- As COPS advanced, more and more agencies and community groups began to claim ownership for ideas and successes. Realizing that this was a beneficial development, both the Chief and Sheriff encouraged them to do so.

Leadership at the top is always important. A maxim in policing is, "If the Chief doesn't buy it, it's not going to happen." In order to bring along officers who were not initially involved, and some outright hostile to COPS, also required leadership from the first-line officers and supervisors first selected to initiate COPS.

COPS first- line supervisors also provided strong leadership. As discussed above, in departments in which COPS made most progress, officers and supervisors who carried out the first COPS activities were selected for their previously demonstrated leadership skills. These included sergeants, corporals, and field training officers, and who not only "thought beyond the dots" themselves but had a history of stimulating other officers to also do so in the following ways.

- They coached officers rather than simply issuing commands. They often

were the first to see a clear and creative solution to a problem in which a first line COPS officer was involved. But rather than laying out the solution, but asking key questions, they led the officer through a process of considering alternative approaches until the officer either came up with the same solution or another solution that was equally innovative and potentially as likely to reduce the problem. As important, they also began coaching officers not initially involved in COPS through the same type of problem solving analysis, in hallway conversations, in break rooms, and when ever opportunities presented themselves for doing so.

- They reported on COPS efforts in roll call and always gave credit to officers who were not formally involved in COPS but who provided even the smallest degree of support for COPS efforts.

- They listened carefully and considerately to officers who resisted the departmental focus on COPS and rather than arguing COPS theory or philosophy, gave "seeing is believing" real examples from other cities or counties where COPS approaches had made a significant impact on types of problems ongoing in their own areas.

- If and when other officers or staff consciously or unconsciously tried to sabotage COPS activities by demanding that officers pay attention to 'real policing' such as response to cold case calls, the supervisors went to bat for their officers and assumed full responsibility for officers not meeting such demands.

- They reported to other supervisors on ongoing intelligence gathered by COPS officers that were important for the success of other departmental operations; they made clear that the COPS officers were supporting other officers ability to take credit for clearing cases, carrying out sting operations, and locating fugitives. And they constantly reminded their COPS officers that this support to other officers was an important part of COPS.

> "There's always a dispatcher or officer who doesn't get community policing, who's going to try to pull NPU officers out of classrooms or community meetings for a call they think is more important. I tell them that if they have a problem with an NPU officer saying that they are not clear for calls, to take it up with me. If they can't find another officer -- to radio me. I'll take the call." Sergeant Dave Munday, Redding Police Department

First-line COPS officers went out of their way to provide support for other operations In the cities and counties where COPS advanced, rather than being nominally a part of patrol or so much a part of patrol that they had little time for COPS, the officers struck a careful balance between law enforcement priorities and other

priorities for community policing. Whenever time allowed, they took calls as they came over the radio. Whenever they observed or community members gave them information related to crime or local criminals, at the first opportunity they asked for a rendezvous, and parking their car head to tail with the car of another officer, rolled down their window and passed on the information.

COPS officers in these cities and counties are almost all assigned to day shifts to allow them to meet with community members. They began briefing patrol officers who policed the area at night about illegal activities residents had reported were taking place after dark and worked out appropriate responses. And when they had clearly established a pattern of wrong doing, they cooperated in planning and carrying out evidence collection and arrests. Even some of the most resistant officers were converted to COPS when they realized that COPS "weeded" as well as "seeded".

COPS officers brought other officers into projects at times when activities were very enjoyable and the results very satisfying. Many of the projects carried out by COPS officers took weeks of planning and preparation. They invited other officers to join in after all activities were organized and the other officers just had to show up, participate in community events, and share the appreciation of the community and city leaders. As COPS progressed, some of the officers were initially most resistant to COPS had "war stories" about their participation and accomplishments.

> "It [COPS] wasn't what I thought of real police work. But I got a charge out of some of the stuff we've done. It's fun and it gets stuff done that the city or someone should have done years ago. Like clearing the tramps out of that park I told you about and cleaning it up so that families with kids can enjoy it." — Formerly skeptical officer

Typical projects carried out by COPS officers in Stage 2

Some of the first projects COPS officers took on helped to establish their credibility among other officers. In response to chronic problems reflected in calls for service by community members, they focused on 'bad guys' and other trouble makers.

COPS in schools School-based COPS officers in almost all the departments in the LINC consortium initially were involved in deterring violence and other crimes in and around schools by highly visible preventive patrol. The presence of a black-and-white patrol car and a uniformed officer reportedly prevented youth coming onto campus who didn't belong there; and those who still wandered on campus with some vague excuse ("we're just here to shoot hoops, man") when confronted by an officer almost always chose to leave quickly and quietly. The high visibility of the officer in the halls and outside the building also sent a powerful message to students attending schools who were prone to violent episodes for various reasons, including ethnic and racial tensions, actually or "wannabe" gang affiliations, fights over dating relationships, or simply

uncontrolled adolescent hormonal reactions.

In Eureka, for just one of many examples, a growing number of assaults involving youth (including drive-by shootings near one school) were essentially eliminated after the police department appointed an experienced officer to serve as a school-based youth/ethnic liaison officer. The officer himself was born outside the United States. During school breaks and before and after school hours, the officer patrols the streets surrounding the school and stays in radio contact with school staff monitoring school property and nearby areas. If and when school staff notice a push-and-shove incident, they immediately call for the officer before the incident escalates.

He, in turn, monitors the school periphery and surrounding streets for offenders who have warrants for previous crimes, who are known to have gang affiliation or are suspects in drug distribution or other types of cases, or who are on probation or parole. If the campus is quiet, he typically provides a first response to incidents involving such people and, if there is cause, radios another officer to carry out an arrest. He calls for patrol response to such incidents if the students are changing classes or at other times when the campus is roiling with activity. During periods of maximum activity he is often surrounded by students who have questions related to incidents that have taken place off campus or who simply seem to feel safer when they "hang out" in his vicinity. As discussed below, his functions and the roles played by school officers from other departments came to involve far more than preventive patrol.

Redding Police Department, as part of the overall COPS strategy of reducing delinquency and promoting wholesome childhood development, immediately went beyond deterrent patrol in schools. Together with the school board they allocated funds for an officer dedicated to reducing truancy. In addition to following up on cases involving chronic truancy, the officer became the single point of contact for all patrol officers who found unsupervised children wandering around the streets or hanging around malls during school hours. Whether or not the children offered an excuse that appeared valid for being out of school, other officers relayed the information to him for verification.

The Redding officer pulled up next to a young adolescent boy riding a skateboard and rolled down his window. "Come over here, son." The youth approached looking apprehensive. "Do you live around here?" "Down the street."

"Why aren't you in school today?" "My mom said I should stay home because I have a doctor's appointment." "Are you sick?" "No, I have to get shots or something." "What time is your appointment?" Not til this afternoon but my mom said I should stay home." "Is your mom at home now?" "No, she's at work but she said I should stay home until she came and got me."

"Well, son. If your mom told you to stay home, you should stay home. Not riding around the streets." Now I'm going to take your name and address and phone number for Officer G----. Do you know who he is?" "Yes, but I'm not skipping school; my mom told me to stay home." "Well Office G__ will call your mom. Not because you're skate-boarding when she told you to stay home. But to figure out way that maybe next time you have to see a doctor whether she can pick you up at school instead. Ok?" "Ok!".

The officer paged the school officer, relayed the particulars to him, and made sure that the youth returned home safely.

COPS in shopping malls As in schools, one of the first functions of COPS officers assigned to malls was also deterrence through preventive patrol both inside and outside the mall buildings. Rapid City was one of the first departments in the LINC consortium to establish a presence in a mall. In September 1995, a Rapid City Police substation was established in a former customer service center in the Rushmore Mall. The mall covers 850,000 square feet and includes 120 stores serving over 20 surrounding counties. The substation was formed in response to a departmental analysis of the location of incidents occurring in the city and concern on the part of businesses owners and shoppers about disturbances and other incidents involving groups of teens and young adults. According to the mall manager, the first reaction to the highly visible presence of police officers was concern -- "if the police are here, something bad must have happened." Within a few months of providing COPS, the police were considered a integral part of the scene and often called on for advice from business owners as well as shoppers and residents living in the neighborhood surrounding the mall. As a result of the outreach conducted by the officers, the local AARP chapter volunteered their services to help out in the substation.

COPS in downtown areas As COPS officers began more focused policing in downtown areas, they were confronted with many of the same types of chronic problems that disgruntled business owners and residents had complained about for years: Most of the areas suffered from a number of badly neglected commercial buildings, graffiti and litter, and chronically inebriated transients and mentally-ill homeless people who appeared threatening to tourists and middle-class residents alike. Downtown hotels included both reconstructed historic buildings attempting to appeal to affluent tourists and cheap motels that attracted marginal residents, drug dealers, and drifters involved in other criminal pursuits. Unlike COPS in schools and malls, where increased visibility of a police presence appeared to be sufficient to reduce crime and convince fellow officers that COPS was about catching bad guys, the problems confronting COPS officers in the downtown areas were too entrenched to respond

quickly to deterrent patrol.

However, in each of the cities and in some contract towns, *graffiti removal* became a quick remedy for making a visible impact on the area. COPS officers noted the location of the graffiti, noted whether gang symbols were part of the graffiti, if relevant notified the gang unit, obtained permission for repainting from business owners whose buildings had been defaced, and arranged for repainting by officer or civilian volunteers with paint provided by the city or county or commercial donors. These efforts literally changed the faces of cities and towns.

Code abatement remedies also were common first steps taken by COPS officers assigned to downtown areas and also, as described below, specific neighborhoods. In partnership with city and county code officers, they began to deliver letters to owners of the deteriorated buildings telling them to literally clean up their acts or be assessed fines for civil ordinance infractions. Some of the owners were absentee landlords who responded by firing onsite managers and hiring managers who brought the buildings up to code. Most, however, were not convinced until the economic ramifications of fines for not repairing their buildings were greater than allowing them to deteriorate. More than a few quit ownership; and in the cases of the most deteriorated buildings beyond repair, the city or county bulldozed the building, creating an empty lot available for new construction. As the worst buildings disappeared, so did the drug dealers and other offenders who frequented them. And within a relatively short period of time, the downtown areas began to look like quaint historic districts that were attractive for tourists and residents alike. Still chronic problems involving disorderly people rather than disorderly buildings remained to be addressed as COPS advanced.

COPS in residential neighborhoods The initial forms of COPS carried out in neighborhoods depended on the types of neighborhoods involved in first assignments. Officers who were assigned to middle-class areas primarily were involved in addressing vehicular problems; often these involved chronic concerns about drivers speeding down streets where young children played. Other problems, especially in middle-class isolated rural areas, involved residents' suspicions about out-of-area cars. Such suspicions were not without foundation. Rural areas policed by more than one sheriff in the LINC consortium had experienced one or more horrific homicides by murderers who had left an interstate highway intent on burglary but went on to kill their victims. And a number of sightings had resulted in the arrest of sex offenders on conditional release.

As already described, most departments located their COPS officers in neighborhoods where crime was high. Whether isolated trailer parks in the fringes of the cities or far flung reaches of the counties or tracts of small homes or public housing complexes within the cities, the problems that were present were very much the same. In addition to the same type of blight addressed in downtown areas through graffiti removal and code abatement procedures, the officers also found themselves dealing with other constant problems, including groups of unsupervised juveniles who vandalized public and private property; houses used to manufacture and sell drugs, whose clientele

terrorized the neighborhood; substandard housing — some without running water or heat — rented to essentially homeless families with children who could not afford better shelter; and extremely deteriorated housing with yards full of junk that were scattered among carefully tended homes and gardens.

Some of the more flagrant problems could immediately be addressed by the COPS officers gathering information themselves and passing the information on to drug units or city code officers. For example, in the first Redding (COPPS1) area; the NPU officers intensified enforcement of traffic violators, not infrequently visitors to houses harboring drug dealers, and intensified night-time enforcement to control theft, vandalism, harassment of residents, and other criminal acts committed by teenage delinquents who often gathered in an area park. They also intensified surveillance of residences identified as drug houses and worked with their narcotics officers to arrest

> *During our first 4-month period [in one small COPPS area], we made almost 500 arrests. [In subsequent months] compared to the same period last year...total calls for services declined 5.9%, assaults declined 14.8%, disturbance calls declined 28.2% vandalism declined 30.4%*...Chief of Police, Redding

drug distributors. The results were remarkable.

However, in Redding as in the other cities and counties, the more lasting results were brought about by reaching out to the people who lived and worked in the area and eliciting their cooperation in addressing problems they identified as a group as high priority.

Community outreach and problem identification

All departments in the LINC consortium recognized that while simply increasing the visibility of a police presence and arrests can bring about major changes in reported crime in an area, the ongoing and active cooperation of people who live and work in an area is essential for long-term crime reduction and for addressing problems that compromise quality of life. A spectrum of outreach efforts described next were launched to build bridges between the department and the community.

Meeting, greeting, and learning events. Chiefs and sheriffs in a number of departments inaugurated a spectrum of forums in which police officers and citizens could come together and learn about each others' views and concerns. Several departments, such as Pocatello Police Department, began to offer "Citizens' Academies." The academies include in-class presentations from officers representing different units in the department and ride-a-longs with patrol officers. However, most officers involved appeared to view the academy training as an opportunity to teach citizens about the realities of and limitations on policing rather than a chance to learn

more about citizens concerns. And citizens who had completed the course said that they did have more of an understanding of why the police could not address many community concerns.

Other events also were more conducive to enhancing the image of the department than trying to learn about community concerns. For example, Eureka's Police Chief initiated annual "Block Parties" at the Police Department providing a chance for residents and businesses to meet local law enforcement officers and emergency services personnel. The first Block Party held in 1993. Funding was provided by businesses, civic associations and private individuals. Tours of department, games, a police rap and rock band (from another department) food booths, crime prevention displays, and child finger printing demonstrations.) While a good time was had by most, the event did not lend itself to learning about community problems.

Other events were purposely geared to balance opportunities to increase positive experiences with law enforcement officers and at the same time address important concerns. For example, in Shasta County, the Sheriff's Cultural Awareness Council was initiated in 1992 to alleviate mounting tensions between diverse racial and ethnic groups and to increase communications with the Office. Representatives of ethnic groups including Indian, African-American, Jewish, Japanese, German, and Filipino communities meet every three months with the Sheriff and his top level administrators to exchange information and to plan activities for bridging differences. Attendance by captains is mandatory. One of the first Council activities consisted of training for deputies by Council members about the customs of each group they represent. For the past three years, the Council has organized a public festival in a mall during which dances from a spectrum of cultures are performed and arts and crafts exhibited. Other relevant groups, such as the Sheriff's Citizen patrol organizations, provide information about their activities and recruitment in booths staffed by their volunteer members.

Establishing mini-stations in COPS areas Scholars in policing research have been lamenting the closing of neighborhood-based police station houses and recommending reestablishing local stations as a key component of a return to local policing in communities.[16] Several of the departments heeded this advice and created mini-stations in store fronts, first floor apartments, and as noted above, shopping malls. The officers who used these mini-stations were uniformly appreciative of their convenience for completing paper work, especially sheriff's deputies carrying out COPS functions in areas remote from their central department or substations. However, the extent to which these stations helped increase community outreach varied from community to community. Some of the considerations in this variation appeared to be these.

- Visibility of officers in the mini-station. The interior of some of the mini-stations could not be seen from street level. Passers-by or citizens in distress could not immediately tell whether an officer was available. They had to knock or ring a bell and wait. Some appeared upset when they

received no response. On the other hand, mini-stations with interior visibility from the street or parking lot or mall corridors seemed to have a stream of visitors whenever an officer could be seen.

- Types of activities in the ministation initiated by officers. Some officers exclusively used the mini-station for report preparation and departmental coordination. Other officers used the space for community meetings, one-on-one conferences with youth or adults who were in difficulty, and other outreach activities.

- Types of use by auxiliary organizations. A few of the departments encouraged Neighborhood Watch captains, Citizen Patrol directors, social service agencies, and neighborhood groups to leave literature at the mini-station or use it for carrying out coordination activities. These uses increased contact between COPS officers and citizens who actively sought to assist the police or were seeking help from police and other city and county agencies.

Mini-stations that attracted local residents and business people to visit and participate in COPS activities were highly valued by the community and officers. Any suggestion that the mini-station might be closed resulted in vocal opposition. Mini-stations with minimal activity were abandoned when budgets became tight — and their abandonment was scarcely noted in the community.

Increasing positive contacts between officers and people engaged in routine daily activities

Virtually all COPS officers in the LINC consortium departments realized that other than criminals and victims they simply did not know most people in the neighborhoods and other areas they were assigned to police. They had little or no idea of who were the local leaders that could be called on to help direct neighborhood projects. Most people who saw them drive by either averted their eyes and studiously ignored them or gave them a 'one finger salute.' Aside from the officers who taught DARE or other classes in school and those who were specifically asked to attend a Neighborhood Watch meeting, they spent most of the time when they were responding to calls driving around literally looking for trouble. To get to know the people who lived or worked in their neighborhoods they carried out the following activities:

Pulling over to people engaging in routine activities, rolling down their window and engaging them in conversation. At first the usual response was 'what's wrong?' Gradually people began to recognize the officer, come over to chat, tell them what was happening in the neighborhood, ask advice about problems, and invite them to neighborhood events. Many took this opportunity to express appreciation for officers' attention to drug houses and unruly youth.

Within a couple of months, most people smiled and waved (with all fingers) when the car rolled by and some waved the officer over to chat or provide intelligence about some previously arrested offender who was back in the neighborhood.

Walking and talking the beat. Officers assigned to schools, malls, and downtown areas began to spend many more hours walking around their assigned areas and engaging people who were taking a break from work- related activities in conversation. Most school officers were assigned their own place to sit, typically sharing space with guidance counselors. However, except when they were in a staff meeting or having a private conversation with youth who needed direction or redirection, officers most admired by administrators, teachers, students and other staff spent their time in halls, cafeterias, playing fields and other outside congregation areas chatting with different groups about school teams, school activities, and activities planned by different ethnic communities.

> *While on bicycles, our officers felt it was much easier to contact the children who live in the area and, in a relaxed atmosphere, discuss with them their concerns or fears of living in this particular neighborhood. This is vital to our effort since we have identified the 6 to 12 year olds as the most important juvenile group we must communicate with to be successful in the long run.*
> Robert P. Blankenship, Chief of Police, Redding

Officers assigned to downtown areas and malls often walked from one end of the area to another, approaching groups of teens hanging out, making themselves available to distraught shoppers who forgot where they parked their car (helping them contact mall security for help), and poking their heads in stores to wave at the store managers and sales people and listening to any concerns that they had.

Patrolling on bike. COPS officers in both police departments and sheriffs departments were equipped for and receiving special training for using bikes to patrol areas. They reported that using their bikes seemed to make people feel more comfortable about approaching them. In Pocatello and in "contract cities" in Bannock County, business owners and residents alike welcomed the first warm days of spring when officers appeared in the downtown areas on their bikes.

Although not all officers took well to the physical demands of using bikes, those who did realized a benefit that was in addition to increasing the numbers of people with whom they had positive contact. They also realized that they could see more and access more places where previously offenders believed

themselves to be hidden. For example, Redding NPU officers accessed places in parks where juveniles thought it safe to smoke marijuana or drink. Rapid City officers covered parts of a riverside bike trail where women and girls had been accosted. Bannock County officers suddenly appeared in hill areas where juveniles had secreted and tapped a keg as well as areas in trailer parks where drugs were being distributed.

Connecting with kids Although officers on bikes had enhanced capabilities to find places where youth were engaging in harmful acts, many other adolescents reported thought COPS officers on bikes were "cool." The bikes themselves provided a positive topic for opening conversations between officers and kids outside the school setting.

Trading cards with officers' pictures, personal information and their direct line telephone were developed with the youngest children in mind. However, adolescents in some COPS areas also liked collecting them and would approach officers to see if they could help them locate the card of an officer who was missing from their collection.

In Eureka, officers learned that youth from Southeast Asian countries missed playing sports common in their native lands but for the most part unrecognized in the United States. They petitioned the Chief for a very small amount of department funds for equipment needed for the sports, established a place in a park to set up the equipment, and often stopped by and participated in the games. As discussed in later sections, COPS officers subsequently took the lead in coordinating community projects for providing youth with opportunities for building academic and social skills through other after school activities the young people truly enjoyed.

Living in the community The Shasta County Sheriff took perhaps the ultimate step in increasing contacts between officers and people engaged in routine daily activities — residential requirements for some community officers. Officers who wanted to take on COPS assignments in some contract towns or remote communities were required to live in the community.

Establishing a working relationship with residents and business owners can be very difficult for officers in law enforcement departments that police very large territories. Typically, officers patrol hundreds of miles a day, spending minutes in any given area, meeting only people who are in trouble, and returning at night to their home which is in or closer to the central city than the area they are assigned to police. For some of the areas in Shasta County most distant from Redding, the Sheriff has established a requirement for officers to live in the area which they are assigned to police.

As a resident whose family is using both public and private services, officers commonly become part of the community in which they live, know a majority of people who live in

the same town or village, hear about concerns on a day-to-day basis, personally volunteer for various civic responsibilities, and are in a position to officially organize community efforts to address concerns. They heard on a daily basis whether on duty or off about the concerns of their neighborhoods. And given that they and their families were effected by the same problems, they were highly motivated to organize citizen groups and other agencies to take action.

Increasing citizens' involvement in defining problems and priorities

Increasing face-to-face communication with residents and business people began the process of learning what concerns were on individual people's minds. However, the officers realized that more systematic methods were needed to find out how general these concerns were among people living or working in the areas they were policing. A variety of more or less successful ways of gathering this information were tried. These included the following.

Conducting "town meetings." In Humboldt County, the county commissioners took the lead in developing a process for obtaining citizen input. Humboldt County Board of Commissions established The Humboldt County Crime Commission Working with Law Enforcement in 1994. The commission was charged with responsibility "To assist law enforcement and the community of Humboldt County in developing preventive strategies which will empower communities to create safe, crime free neighborhoods"[17]. Beginning in March 1995 the Commission held a series of "town meetings." At initial meetings, information essentially flowed in one direction; representatives from law enforcement agencies serving the towns presented residents with information about specific programs they offered. However, after the Commission involved professionally trained and experienced group facilitators to plan and steer the meetings, representatives from the law enforcement agencies and residents used the town meetings as forums for determining the concerns of residents, prioritizing the concerns, and beginning to "brainstorm" about solutions[18]. Priorities that emerged during those meetings varied from community to community. Most generally, they involved some crime-related issues; neighborhood drug distribution continued to be a serious concern as did burglary. But many high-priority concerns in all neighborhoods centered on the quality of life issues that were civil rather than criminal including city housing code violations or involved unsupervised community youth. And since law enforcement officers had played a passive role in unearthing these concerns many appeared to be less committed to actively seeking solutions than officers in other departments using methods they themselves had developed to learn about citizen concerns.

Forming citizen advisory boards Another effort that actively involved top law enforcement administrators and had immediate payoff for getting COPS off the ground but faltered in the long run was the Citizen's Advisory Board in Pocatello. The Board consisted of members recruited by the Community Services Unit. Initially the Board

was very active in identifying specific needs for innovative policing. Several members of the Board had volunteered work on the report mentioned earlier — calculating the amount of time officers were spending responding to incidents in and around schools. The number of hours they calculated reportedly provided convincing evidence that assignments of officers to schools could be a cost-effective allocation of resources and resulted in the formation of the school resource officer program.

However, after the first success in launching the COPS in schools, some of the most active members became discouraged with the pace of implementing other types of programs. They cautioned that while several of the top administrators and middle managers in the Pocatello PD "really get the idea," not all officers are equally receptive to working with civilians. They also cautioned that many civilians are likely to volunteer to work with the police immediately after a highly visible crime; however, although only a relatively small number are likely to be committed over a long time period, a small group of committed volunteers can provide a solid source of support for COPS. Ultimately, even the most active members interpreted their recruitment and involvement as less a commitment on the part or the department for involving citizens than the department's temporary focus on demonstrating citizen input in order to obtain federal funds.

Building on Neighborhood Watch. A much more sustained effort for successfully involving Pocatello citizens is an innovative form of Neighborhood Watch. Through the vigorous efforts of a civilian police department employee who settled in the area after retiring from the military, Neighborhood Watch groups began to proliferate. Under his direction, Neighborhood Watch was incorporated as a nonprofit organization — reducing the potential liability of police officers. Membership in each area reportedly increased after an annual fee of $5.00 was charged per household. According to members (interviewed for this report), the benefits of membership come from having the civilian employee as a liaison. He is able to provide them with information about types and locations of crimes that have occurred in and around their areas and in turn, they are organized to provide ongoing information to the department, usually investigations, about houses and other buildings where drug use or criminal acts appear to be taking place.

A more common way of building on Neighborhood Watch in the other LINC consortium departments was shifting the responsibility for meeting with the groups from one or two officers or civilian staff in crime prevention units to the COPS officers. Rather than listening to the concerns of members and relaying the concerns to someone else in the department, the COPS officers are more likely to lead a brainstorming session with the members about what they can do, what the officer and other patrol officers can do, and

what can be done together. For just one of many examples, in several cities and counties when members voiced concerns about dangerous speeding in the area, the COPS officers said that they could have the area targeted for ticketing providing everyone agreed that if they or someone else in their family or among their friends received a citation, they would be very vocal about supporting the police for giving the ticket. In virtually all cases, the groups agreed and the members followed through.

Reshaping the role of posses Creation of posses, groups of men temporarily deputized by a Sheriff, is one of longest United States traditions for involving citizens in law enforcement. As incorporated cities replaced frontier towns, the law enforcement function of posses dwindled. However the tradition of the posse coming to the aid of the sheriff was kept very much alive in the Search and Rescue team volunteers that assist sheriffs serving expansive counties such as those in the LINC consortium. And as COPS developed, these groups became the source for new forms of involvement for COPS.

For example, the Sheriff of Shasta County, California, who heads the largest sheriff's department in the LINC consortium created citizen patrols as one of his first COPS initiatives almost eight years ago as a way of increasing voluntary community service. Two previous efforts laid the basis for creating the patrols. First, the Search and Rescue program, which is integral to many rural Sheriffs offices, was expanded from 50 to 250; the total number of volunteers, to over 550 — providing a pool of people who already were committed to supporting the efforts of the sheriff on an emergency basis. Second, in response to an increase in drug trade in their communities in the 1980's, a few towns and villages had previously organized groups to work with the sheriff's office and other agencies to shut down dealing. Although, according to one of the sheriff's early community organizers, the collective community effort disappeared when the drug trade was suppressed, the collaborations established at that time were easily reconstituted for the more recent community patrols.

Conducting surveys As discussed above, well before COPS efforts were under way, a number of city and county administrations used surveys as a way of determining residents' priorities and concerns. However these surveys focused on many quality of life issues and the information was typically summarized for the whole city. To learn more about citizens' crime concerns Humboldt County published some questions in the local paper, the Times-Standard. However, to gather more detailed information for specific areas, most law enforcement departments in the LINC consortium found it more effective to design and distribute their own questionnaires.

> I told the driver [of a speeding car] to pull over and walked up to the car. She [the driver] was all red and embarrassed. She had been at that meeting and she was one of the people who most wanted the speeding to stop. She just said 'I know I deserve it and I'm not at all mad you stopped me; but we don't have to tell the others do we?' — COPS officer

To gather more detailed information for specific areas, officers began to design and carry out their own surveys. The NOP supervisor in the Eureka Police Department developed and widely distributed a one page mail-back Community & Officer Problem Spots form; residents provide information to the Neighborhood Policing Unit about "suspicious persons," "suspicious drug abuse and other problems" and "vehicles" and where the problems are occurring. Optional information provided by the respondent includes their name, address, and telephone number. The supervisor provides copies of completed forms to the NOP officers assigned to the area where the problem has been reported (and periodically checks back with the officers to see what action has been taken).

Although Rapid City Police routinely hires a student in criminal justice to conduct a quality assurance survey of residents, the Cop-of-the Block officers were each asked to conduct a door- to-door survey of problems and concerns in their area. This

> "I didn't know what to expect and neither did they. I had been in the area many times, but usually to break up a fight or arrest someone for drugs or to take a report. It was the first that they had an officer knock on the door just to say, 'hello, how can I help you.' Some of them took a while before they wanted to talk to me. I learned that there are some really good people who live in [the area] along with the really bad people, and they learned that police don't just walk up and arrest someone just because they are a [minority member]. — Cop-of-the-Block

accomplished two purposes. The survey provided a positive reason to introduce themselves to the community members. In addition, it provided a basis for calling a community meeting, reporting the findings, to begin to build consensus about actions that could be taken to resolve the problems, and to organize community groups to address the concerns.

Redding NPU officers mailed out surveys to residents and businesses in neighborhood designated as first COPPS areas but later as they added areas shifted to door-to-door surveys. Whether mailed or door-to-door distribution, they followed up with meetings to describe the COPPS philosophy and set priorities. Subsequently, they held monthly meetings to get feedback from the residents about progress toward solving problems and meeting concerns. In partnership with the schools Redding also conducted student surveys to find out whether or not students felt safe in their school and neighborhoods, what keep them from feeling safe, and their ideas for making their schools or neighborhoods safer (some very reasonable such as "have police patrol around school before it starts and when it gets out for speeders"[19]

Working with researchers to inform COPS The LINC consortium was initially formed for the purpose of carrying out locally-initiated policing research sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, the research arm of the U.S. Department of Justice. As part of this researcher/police partnership (described in more detail in another report),

LINC developed structured methods for COPS officers to convene neighborhood groups and learn about crimes of violence being committed against women, whether victims were reporting these assaults to police, if not, why not, and what the women and girls thought they could do in partnership with the police to reduce violence. The officers were trained to "listen and learn; not teach or preach." Although some were clearly disturbed by what they learned, several officers later led efforts to address issues raised.

Using new technologies Coincidental to the development of COPS was the development of the departments' use of computers and the internet to engage citizens interest in cooperative policing. Eureka Police had one of the first law enforcement department web sites. The site provided descriptions about programs including their "NOP" unit and information about opportunities for working in cooperation with the department.

> "We agreed that burglaries would be a good starting point for the subject matter. We have received a lot of local praise and recognition regarding the site. It seems to be a good P.R. tool and a good information source for Eureka folks" Officer Jim Armstrong, Eureka Police Department.

The site also presented crime maps. The first map listed the residential and commercial and vehicle burglaries that took place in Eureka in the first months of 1996. The maps also appeared in the local newspaper along with their home page internet location (URL). Within the first month they logged 800 visitors and soon received 20 to 30 "hits" a day. The officer who functioned as the "web master" was encouraged to participate in an ongoing publicity campaign to publicize the site.

As more and more people began to respond to these efforts to learn about their concerns they became willing and able to join with the officers in carrying out projects for addressing these concerns.

Stage 3: Police focus shaped by meetings with neighborhood groups: priority for coordination for short-term projects addressing specific legal concerns

Other than in Rapid City where the Chief of Staff provided clear direction for COPS, officers assigned to COPS typically reported walking around in a fog for a few months trying to figure out how to tackle issues that didn't involve criminal pursuits. They knew how to deal with drug dealers and other bad guys. They knew actions to take in cases involving kids who were clearly delinquent.

But many of the concerns they heard about had more to do with gray-area issues involving groups of people who lived, visited or had businesses in their area. These included parolees, offenders on probation who had previously committed crimes in the neighborhood and now were back, and mentally-ill or down and out transients who, while feared by residents, legally were neither a threat to themselves or others; groups of youth who by-and-large were good kids but whose loud and frenetic activities often got on the nerves of adults; absentee landlords who walked the fine edge between legal culpability and rights of private property in permitting their properties to deteriorate, immigrant groups who did not understand the customs of mainstream America and whose native customs offended those whose families had immigrated a century before; members of local Indian tribes who had deep hostility for the descendants of European immigrants who had systematically attempted genocide and the community that still denied their human rights, and the European descendants who bitterly resented the changes taking place in their formerly all white communities. The types of issues that generally caused them most personal concern involved families with young children, independent of race of ethnicity, that were living in deep poverty under conditions that literally could turn their stomachs — families in which the women were often battered, the babies neglected, and the older children often hungry, literally freezing during weeks with sub-zero weather, and not infrequently victims of sexual assault.

The officers who had engaged in the most vigorous outreach activities gained the confidence of people in the community, including elders and spokespeople for different ethnic groups. This gave them the confidence to "think beyond the box" and take the lead in the following types of projects.

Projects carried out in partnership with groups of neighborhood residents

Neighborhood clean-ups organized by joint efforts of COPS officers and community residents were among the most common projects carried out by the departments in the LINC consortium. Officers of all ranks recruited by the COPS officer and residents of all ages and backgrounds worked side by side to rid streets, vacant lots, pocket parks, playgrounds, and fields of moldy mattresses, torn tires, broken furniture parts, and cumulatively across cities and counties tons of other litter. Weeds and bramble that previously screened hiding places for derelicts and drunks were chopped down and cleared. The results were immediate and dramatic. Whole areas were transformed

from places neighbors feared to walk to places where they began to congregate and socialize.

More ambitious projects were taken on to solve youth problems and provide places for children to play safely. In several cities and towns, where parks had been taken over by bullies and grounds strewn with empty liquor bottles and cigarette butts, the parks were cleared, play equipment restored and intensively policed until the use shifted back to children and families. In a residential neighborhood in Rapid City that had no near-by park, officers and community members cleared a neglected field of trash and then built a playground. In Redding, in an area where youth skate-boarding on sidewalks and streets were endangering themselves and others, officers led the community in transforming a vacant lot into a challenging skate-board park. In Shasta County, in an isolated community where youth legitimately declared they had 'no place to go, nothing to do,' the COPPS officer located an unused barrack which the community relocated in an area central to the community, refurbished, and opened for the use of adolescents who would like a place to "hang out" with there friends. Supervised by citizen patrol participants, it is reportedly a welcome addition to the community.

During these projects officers and residents of all ages and backgrounds worked side-by-side. They had an opportunity to get to know each other on a personal basis. And shared the satisfaction of seeing an immediate and dramatic improvement in the area. Residents praised the officers for their lead and hard work and officers took pride and developed a stake in the community.

> "I'm the police officer for this neighborhood — this neighborhood is like my home. I'm glad to have people visit, but since it's my home, I need to keep an eye on what's going on... and if people aren't behaving right, I ask them to leave. You understand that, don't you?" — COPS officer interviewing a shifty-looking loiterer

Cooperative agreements with landlords While COPS officers could take the lead in organization projects involving public property, privately owned property required different approaches. Eureka COPS officers implemented their NOP nuisance abatement approach. The approach, which incorporates the principles of problem oriented policing (POP) is coordinated with other city and county departments and draws on similar components previously developed in Portland, Oregon, and Oakland and San Diego, California. To refine their problem-solving skills, officers from Eureka have visited the San Diego Police Department, one of the first cities to apply the POP model.

The Eureka Police Department produced and published a Nuisance Abatement Guide, *Community Solutions for Community Problems,* that described steps landlords and property owners could legally take to prevent drug dealers or other offenders from moving into their housing units, the (SARA-model) for solving problems that were occurring, specific information relevant for problems involving illegal drugs, and laws and codes that could be used by landlords and other property owners to take actions against people creating community problems, and a list of 24 contacts and their telephone numbers in state, city, and county departments for advice and cooperation in problem solving.

Cooperative COPS projects with the business community Individual members of the business community also took part in many projects described above. In addition, COPS officers called on and received their active support for many other projects. Not surprisingly they appeared especially willing to cooperate in projects that resulted in reducing youth vandalism and promoting business. Two innovative projects carried out in California are the Burney Halloween egg throw and the Redding COPS-dollars incentive program.

The Burney Halloween egg throwing event was initiated by deputy sheriffs/COPPS officers to redirect the destructive egging of stores, houses and public buildings by community youth on Halloween. The deputies who are assigned to work in that part of the county (and required to live there) pulled a number of community organizations together to clear a tract in a nearby forested area, bus kids to the site, provide helmets, divide them into teams, and provide them with dozens of eggs to pelt each other. The egg toss is followed by a bonfire and refreshments including hot dogs and hamburgers. All funds and materials, including eggs, are provided by local businesses and fraternal organizations. Since the event became an annual option for the youth, reports of Halloween crime and vandalism were dramatically reduced, homeowners in Burney (including the deputy sheriffs) and business owners no longer have to spend the week after Halloween scrubbing dried egg off their buildings. And, at the site where the egg toss is held, the trees and other plants appear to be thriving.

Redding Neighborhood Police Unit "COPS dollars" were an incentive for youth to contribute rather than vandalize. Groups of youth who complete neighborhood improvement projects such as painting fences or cleaning out streams are rewarded with COPS dollar certificates. Endorsed by local merchants, COPS dollars can be redeemed at restaurants and other businesses popular with community youth. As a result, boys in formerly blighted areas who use to hang out and get into trouble and now helping adult residents maintain an attractive environs.

Local businesses have also been persuaded by COPS officers to provide materials and incentives for improving neighborhoods. In many communities, businesses have been providing paint for graffiti removal and for assisting elderly residents keep up the appearance of their homes. In Rapid City, to persuade residents in a deteriorated

neighborhood to improve their properties, the COP-on-the-Block officer held a community meeting and invited real estate agents to attend. Once the agents explained the increase in home values that were realized from fixing broken porches, cleaning up yards, and planting trees and gardens, the neighborhood literally began to bloom.

Cooperative COPS projects with faith organizations Previous to implementing COPS most departments in the LINC consortium had strong ties to faith communities. Many officers were active participants and lay leaders in local religious congregations. Many departments had volunteer clergy programs. For example, in Rapid City, a number of clergy did ride-a-longs for several hours each month conducting outreach to arrestees and their families and counseling officers who were coping with personally or professionally stressful events. As COPS progressed, clergy were called on to participate or take the lead in projects to address community problems as COPS officers became aware of them.

For one example, In Redding, a COPS officer worked with one church to productively employ vagrants in exchange for meals and services. The project was reported on by the local paper and became a source of pride for all involved.

> **Salvage:** Police, church clean up 'hood
> Neighborhood Police Unit officers have joined forces with a church pastor to cleanup the Parkview neighborhood and to provide free lunches.
>
> ...homeless people arrive regularly at the church to pick up trash. At noon, they shed their orange vests and tools provided by the Redding Police Department and head inside the gray church building for lunch. ...Supervised by D.C. Wright, a former transient who works for the church, the cleanup crew has covered the entire neighborhood — ridding it of nearly all discarded items on streets and alleys. Candace L. Brown, Page 1. Feb. 27, 1996

Rapid City Police called on their clergy to address one important barrier to domestic violence victims suffering silently. As an outcome of the locally-initiated policing research methods (described above) designed to learn more about violence against women, the Rapid City Police Department officers found that one reason victims were not reporting being battered was based on their perception that clergy placed a higher priority on family loyalty and preservation than on their own personal safety. Beginning with the clergy attending a meeting of the Rapid City ministerial union, officers conducted an outreach to almost all clergy serving local congregations to come together and address this problem. As a result, many clergy were trained along side police officers for domestic violence response. And most, although not all, clergy coordinated a "super-Sunday" victim outreach preaching from their own pulpits that women who were victims of domestic violence should seek help and not remain silent.

Cooperative COPS projects with nonprofit service organizations In the past, most of the departments in the LINC consortium had established firm ties with fraternal community service organizations; as COPS innovative projects proliferated they, as in the past, supported the efforts of officers providing small sums of money and turning out to lend a hand. Many of the departments also had ties to organizations serving boys in the community such as Boy Scouts; several departments sponsored their own Boy Scout Explorer Posts and officers, former boy scouts themselves, led the Posts.

However, for many departments, cooperative projects with nonprofit organizations serving girls and women was new. The primary exception was in Rapid City and Pennington County, where the police and sheriff's departments had at various times cooperated with Girls Clubs of Rapid City. COPS projects presented opportunities for strengthening this relationship and in other areas of the country forging new alliances.

One such partnership was formed between the Pocatello Police Department and the YWCA. Funds created by the Violence Against Women Act and provided through the state grants administered by the Office of Justice Programs was used to create teams of police officers and volunteer advocates who responded to incidents of domestic violence. The involvement of these volunteers was applauded by officers who appreciated the immediate intervention and follow-up provided by the advocates. According to the YWCA Executive Director who recruited and trained the volunteers, the team effort led to a significant increase in the number of women victims who received services. And based on observations and reports from officers, the team approach resulted in an increased understanding by officers of battered women and the need for referrals to multiple agencies. However, once the federal grant disappeared, there were no funds to maintain the professional staff who coordinated and trained the volunteers. Much to the dismay of the volunteers, the officers and the professional service providers, the effort came to a halt, as did many of the innovative projects.

Project Cooperative projects that were generally most enduring and held most potential for developing into longer term and sustained programs were those formed with field staff in other public agencies and educational institutions with a steady stream of funding.

Cooperative COPS projects involving other criminal justice agencies Although criminal justice agencies are often envisioned as parts of a system, in practice cooperation is not commonplace. The focus on community services helped bring these agencies together. In Humboldt County, the probation department was one of the first agencies to attempt to refocus from management of individual offenders all over the county to community-based supervision of offenders living in the same areas. One of the communities that was most vulnerable to crime by repeat offenders, in many cases was the Hoopa Valley community on the Hoopa tribes reservation.

In California, tribes have extremely limited authority for law enforcement including the many cases where Indians were victims of white residents, and the probation department realized that a concerted effort of community probation and policing would benefit all. An alliance to reach out to the Hoopa community was formed between county criminal justice system agencies and agencies on the Hoopa tribal lands that were largely staffed by Indians. These included the Hoopa Valley Tribal Division of Human Services, and the Hoopa Valley Department of Public Safety (police with limited law enforcement responsibilities), the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office, and the Humboldt County Probation Department. Key to this alliance was the Sheriff and the Police Chief in the Hoopa Department of Public Safety, who previously was a Humboldt County Deputy Sheriff. As an important step in empowering the community and increasing the ability of the Hoopa police to serve and protect their community beyond the restrictions created by federal and California law,[20] the Sheriff cross-deputized the Hoopa Chief of Police and his officers. Initial COPS "Take Back Your Community" meetings were planned with long term hostility taken into account — hostility aggravated when shortly before the meeting the (former) California Attorney General announced that "Tribal police are not federal police officials of any kind, nor are any tribal police in California recognized as peace officers under state law[21].

> *.because many tribal members distrust "outsiders", particularly law enforcement, our role was one of set designer/scene painter, and maybe, to receive credit for part of the "play"...the meeting was productive — people formed committees and future meetings will include progress reports on specific issues — over 180 people attended.* — Hoopa Valley Team. 1995. Report provided to LINC in 1996 by the Humboldt Valley Department of Probation

Enough trust had been established between the county criminal justice agencies and the Hoopa community to continue the effort — and to eventually win the right for the tribal police to be trained along with the Sheriff's deputies and cross-deputized. And the alliance among the Hoopa-based agencies and the criminal justice agencies eventually carried forward into longer term plans for addressing chronic problems — including domestic violence. While the Sheriff made a major role in this development, the emerging emphasis on community-focused services on the part of the Humboldt County district Attorney and especially the Humboldt County Probation Department was the driving force in the formation of the team.

Eureka Police Department COPS efforts too greatly benefitted from the developing stress on community probation and the number of long term problems jointly addressed by officers in both agencies multiplied. As in the now famous Boston effort, officers in the Eureka Police and the Humboldt County Probation worked shoulder to shoulder to address the precipitous rise in youth violence including drive-by shootings that the city, as many others in the country, had experienced. Together team identified the most serious offenders, warned youth in areas experiencing the most violence about consequences of subsequent incidents, and took immediate and coordinated action including home visits and frequent curfew checks when incidents occurred. As in other

cities in which this form of coordinated community police/probation community action took place, most youth responded the way youth naturally do when given clear rules and clear consequences — the violence diminished. A few who persisted to be violent offenders were removed from the community.

Cooperative projects with schools Although several of the departments in the LINC consortium continued to view the primary function of their school-based COPS officers as delinquency and violence deterrence through onsite patrol, many officers formed partnerships with schools administrators and guidance counselors to reduce truancy and other problems that harmed the development of children and adolescents. For example, in Redding, in addition to the officer who devoted full time to truancy reduction, COPS officers and principals together visited homes of children who were chronically absent. Often, the appearance of the principal and a uniformed officer was a sufficiently strong message to parents of the seriousness of their child skipping school and immediately resulted in more regular attendance. But in a number of cases, the home visits revealed serious problems that warranted connecting the family with community service providers; these problems included mothers' ultimately diagnosed as being clinically depressed, previously unreported domestic violence, and extreme cases of child neglect.

In such cases the principal, officer, and guidance counselors worked together to create a larger team of service providers to bolster the families ability to provide the care and support the students and their families needed.

> *Sometimes the parents were not even home, food was inadequate, living conditions were unsanitary and illegal drugs were present.* Robert P. Blankenship, Chief of Police, Redding

In California, one forum for addressing complex problems affecting student attendance is through meetings of multidisciplinary student attendance review boards (SARBS) at which a team of educators, social service providers, child advocates, and other representatives from youth services meet with parents or guardians and individual students who have been chronically absent. The objective of the team is to come up with a formal plan to put the student back on a track to complete his or her education. The addition of the school-based COPS officers to these teams have added a component of legal authority to this process. Moreover, in Eureka, at the suggestion of the youth/ethnic liaison officer, SARB meetings were relocated from the schools to the police department; since this change, there reportedly has been a significant reduction of parents and students who fail to show up for SARB meetings scheduled to discuss their case.

Other problems COPS officers identified as a cause of truancy were more commonplace but also difficult to address. For example a recurrent problem which came to the attention of school-based officers was head lice. School staff were

convinced that certain groups of neglectful families were to blame for not following specific instructions about steps to take get rid of the lice. Some suggested that the children be removed from their homes. School officers who had frequent contacts with families as part of their community policing efforts were not convinced that these were really cases of neglect. Communication between officers in the LINC consortium (described in another report) helped confirm this impression. The school officers realized that the problem was not confined to a specific population in their own city. On the contrary this was problem experienced by many different groups of children across the country. Some suspected that the instructions provided to families were not effective solutions. LINC was asked to find out if research provided any insights.

Findings of epidemiologic research confirmed the officers' suspicions. Strains of lice had developed that are resistant to medications schools recommended for use. Other research showed that more effective medications were highly toxic and not advisable to use. Once provided to the officers who requested the information, the findings guided the officers to seek problem-solving measures without long-term negative consequences for the health and mental-health of the children and their families.

In addition to addressing violence that had escalated in public places, in Eureka, the police and probation joined the school administration and other youth serving agencies to address problems of violence, weapons use, chronic truancy, a growing number of "wannabe gang" misbehavior, and other forms of delinquency occurring in and around schools. One of the first efforts was the collaborative production of two brief but cogent pamphlets to address parental fears about their children becoming involved in gangs. One pamphlet, *How to Discourage your Children from Joining Gangs,* provided common sense advice about steps a parent could take — most involved developing good parenting skills that have long fostered positive childhood development. The second provided more information about large city California gangs and neo-Nazi groups whose behavior was being imitated by Humboldt youth, the consequences of this gang like behavior, and a list of a spectrum of resources available for these young people and their concerned parents.

Realizing that misbehavior, such 'gang' conflict or fights over girlfriends or boyfriends, that occurred during the school hours often had implications for misconduct that followed in the before- and after-school or weekend hours and vice versa, Eureka started cross-agency weekly meetings very early on Monday mornings to review incidents of delinquency that had occurred and the status of students who were involved. The team quickly realized that, for most youth, a "talk" with a police officer and school counselor and in relevant cases, also a probation officer, was adequate to prevent continued misbehavior. However, they also found that some students were dealing with learning disabilities, disruptions at home, and a complex of problems that required coordinated community services. The effort had obvious results. Expulsion offences which had quadrupled between 1990 and 1994, were reduced by more than half by 1995; and expulsions for assaults in particular were more than five times less frequent.

Stage 4: Police focus formed within cross-agency/community-wide coalitions; priority for collaboration for longer-term programs to prevent crime and delinquency

> *Knowledge of the law can help you better understand your rights, more easily meet your reponsibilities and make your life more meaningful* — Youth Guidebook: A Student & Parent Guide to Juvenile Laws and Juvenile Services in Shasta County

In virtually all departments in the LINC consortium, individual COPS officers were more or less encouraged to develop and carry out short-term projects in partnership with groups of citizens and with staff in other organizations who laterally were in analogous positions (for example first-line police officers with first-line probation officers), forming citizen and cross-agency coalitions for carrying out longer term and more complex COPS approaches appeared to take place when the following factors were in place.

- The Chief or Sheriff was convinced that the long-term benefits outweighed the costs in fiscal terms as well as in public relations benefits.
- Primary decision-makers in collaborating organizations were also convinced that their investment of resources also would have long-term fiscal as well as other more immediate benefits
- Citizen and civilian participation were grounded in ongoing positive social incentives as opposed to negative reactions to a highly publicized crime.
- The relationship between key decision-makers was one of mutual respect as opposed to intense personal or partisan dislike.

In several cities and counties, these factors were realized in part as outcomes of short-term projects. For example, in Rapid City code abatement projects reportedly were found to benefit the Police Department in reduction of complaints involving specific properties, the city in terms of an increase in fines collected, the citizens in terms of an increase in property values and neighborhood pride, and an enhancement of an already good relationship between the city council and police department. As a result, the city hired a "code officer" whose job was devoted to working with the police, other agencies, and community residents on an ongoing basis to monitor and when necessary take action in regard to property owners responsible for blight.

Graffiti removal too has become collaborative standard operating procedure in Rapid involving the Police Department, in particular the Gang Task Force (who identify types of graffiti), the Criminal Investigation Unit (who keep records of vandalism), and the Cop-of-the-Block officers who take photographs and then obliterate the graffiti, community organizations who paint over the obliterated graffiti on public property, and when graffiti is on commercial property, business owners who either repaint or provide paint for community groups. The officer designated to coordinate the effort was appointed by the commander of the Rapid City Gang Task Force (with the approval of the Chief of Police) and works in close coordination with the Rapid City Department of Parks and the Coordinator for the Rapid City Volunteers.

Very similar results accrued from projects involving abandoned vehicle abatement in many of the LINC consortium cities and counties. These approaches generally began as short term projects taken on by one or two committed volunteers or para-professionals and have become part of standard operations. In Shasta County, for just one example, vehicle abatement is now carried out by a paid (non-sworn) community service officers. After a brief training about abatement laws and procedures to follow in having the vehicles removed from public and private lands, the abandoned vehicle abatement project directors have achieved remarkable results in the numbers of unsightly discarded cars and trucks they have had towed away at the owners' expense. Abandoned automobiles are no longer a common sight in Shasta County an improvement much appreciated by many in the county.

In addition to projects addressing quality of life issues that have become continuing long-term COPS approaches, several cities and counties in the LINC consortium have built on initial projects and instituted long-term COPS approaches for dealing with complex crime-related community issues. They have devoted time and resources to cementing relationships with a spectrum of agencies to reduce crime and delinquency and support opportunities for residents to improve their lives. The factors that seems to be most important in sustaining such programs go well beyond the factors mentioned above that promote the initial implementation of long-term programs. These are described in the two next examples.

Factors that help sustain longer-term COPS approaches: two examples of COPS approaches for reducing the costs of delinquency and failure to thrive

While school-based officers are enthusiastically welcomed additions in virtually all cities and counties where LINC consortium departments are based, two departments, the Bannock County Sheriff and the Redding Police Department, have made extraordinary progress in collaborating with schools and other youth serving agencies to implement relatively comprehensive long-term COPS approaches for reducing delinquency and promoting wholesome adolescent development. The basic principles that have guided their approaches are essentially the same.

- Collaborate with community organizations to speak with one voice and provide adolescents with clear rules, clear rewards for following the rules and clear consequences for breaking the rules. Together, provide immediate rewards and consequences that have been promised.

- Coordinate with community organizations to provide a series of safety nets and support for adolescents who are having difficulty following rules and achieving normal stages of development

Both agencies cooperated with their school and other community organization to spell out in a youth guidebook in simple terms the laws that apply to juveniles and services available to help them meet legal expectations.

Both departments worked hand in hand with their communities to learn where, when, and why students were most likely to get into trouble. And both departments found very creative ways to redirect youth from these pitfalls. Given the differences in the size of the departments, the communities they were policing, and the resources available to them, although the principles and intents were the same, aside from publishing clear rules and resources, their practices were not at all the same. As in earlier stages of COPS, Redding Police Department used approaches that relied on teams of COPS officers working together with the community to solve youth problems and promote healthy development. While in Bannock County individual deputies took the lead for the department in a spectrum of sustained collaborative efforts — calling on other deputies and the Sheriff himself when needed.

An exemplary approach for cementing COPS relationships

In the Bannock County (Idaho) Sheriff's Office, Deputy Howard Manwaring, among other officers, was given the green light by the sheriff to develop a position and role for collaborating with other agencies in addressing an issue in which he personally had deep interest and commitment: reducing youth problems and delinquency. Given this goal, the Deputy works closely and productively with other deputies, Pocatello police, the courts, probation, schools and other youth serving agencies — as well as the kids and their families. As described below, his activities encompass a range of delinquency prevention approaches including coordinating on a day- to- day basis with the juvenile court, schools, and juvenile probation to make sure that youth who have committed delinquent acts receive prompt attention and consequences for their actions, directing diversions programs for first-time juvenile offenders and their parents for clarifying expectations for and responsibilities of youth , and directing the "Sheriff's Camp" that provides a frequently first opportunity for adolescents to face and meet challenges with the support of officers and other adult mentors. The factors that foster his ability to do so — both departmental and extramural — are essentially the same as those that help promote productive COPS approaches by other officers in the Bannock County Sheriff's

Department and by officers in the other partner departments.

Extramural factors that promote community change for the better through community-oriented policing

Fiscal arrangements in which two or more agencies provide support for officers. Manwaring's position, Juvenile Court Deputy, is funded by the courts as well as the Sheriff. As in positions jointly supported by police/sheriffs and schools, this arrangement seems to:

- Diminish "turf" issues between the participating agencies, such as access to records
- Increase implementation of "seamless" services such as, in Manwaring's case, literally following kids from arrest to detention to adjudication to disposition; and as a result
- Prevent people from "falling through cracks in the system."

Physical arrangements which increase officers' ability to continually communicate with people being served and staff in other agencies providing related services. All of our partner departments have realized the need to get officers out of their cars and into the community. However, most still spend a large fraction of time in areas accessible only to other officers. Manwaring's "office," shared by a member of the court staff, is in the court's reception area with a glass partition overlooking the security gate; he can see everyone entering and leaving through the front door. In addition to increasing security for the building, this arrangement allows him to quickly coordinate all activities planned for that day with the court staff, remind attorneys and other practitioners about interagency and community meetings, and discuss informally with the kids arriving for court, where they were when they got into trouble, with whom, who supplied them with alcoholic beverages (if that is the case), and what they need to do in the future to stay out of trouble.

Assignment of important responsibilities rather than mundane tasks. Before Manwaring was assigned to his positions, there were reportedly long delays — at times months — between kids being arrested, detained, adjudicated, and sanctioned. The process was thought to be neither fair nor effective. Manwaring was assigned the responsibility for working with Judge Brian Murray to correct this situation. Manwaring and Judge Murray created a job for him that included routine tasks, so as to assure that kids' are given immediate consequences for breaking the law. Rather than a supervisor assigning a series of record keeping, scheduling, court room preparation, and other tasks which officers normally abhor — these routine activities always get placed by Manwaring on his own daily "to do list" but in the context of his larger and more

important responsibilities. For a specific example, on a daily basis Manwaring checks the status of kids who are in detention and their status *vis a vis* the courts. Rather than just getting "body counts," Manwaring makes sure kids who have been brought in during the previous night are added to the court calendar for that day. He also checks on whether specific kids are receiving services they need and, if not, what can be done to make sure they do. Sometimes this is as simple as arranging for a guardian to pick up a youngster who was scheduled to be released but is still detained. At other times follow-up involves more complex steps such as those needed to place a juvenile in a treatment facility.

Partners other than police or sheriff deputies When Manwaring gets in his car to respond to an incident involving a youth, his partner is commonly a probation officer. The time riding to a school or other area is productively spent reviewing what each knows about the incident and the young person and how best to deal with the child and others at the scene. The exchanges are evidence of the respect each has for their partner's position, yet the good-natured bantering between Manwaring and the more experienced probation staff also make clear the comfort level they have established. The pay-off of their coordination is the response from school staff, others in the community, and the children themselves. Their combined presence most immediately appears to dispel hostility that is common during an arrest process and allays concerns about delinquent youth suddenly becoming uncontrollably violent or fleeing. These partnerships also send a strong signal to the kids, their families, and others in the community that actions are being taken not simply as punishment but in the best interest of the juvenile.

Regular and active participation in frequent cross-agency meetings for *coordinating ongoing activities.* Manwaring attends weekly meetings convened by Judge Murray including SROs, school administrators, student representatives, Pocatello police officers, juvenile probation, a representative from the DA's office, court staff, and representatives from the Department of Health and Welfare. During these meeting those in attendance provide an update on their actions involving youth and the rationale for these actions, alert each other about any issues that are interfering with their ability to provide effective expedient services and decide how to deal with these issues, and to assess whether or not previously established practices or policies are having the intended impact. For example, a new high school was built in Bannock County and the building but not the grounds around it was annexed by the city. The Pocatello PD assigned to be the SRO in the new high school alerted the group that these jurisdictional arrangements prevented him from taking action when he saw kids breaking the law outside the high school building. Manwaring immediately suggested that he take the matter up with Sheriff Nielsen and see if the SRO could be deputized by the Sheriff's Department. Later that day, as I was meeting with the Chief Deputy, Sheriff Nielsen stopped in to tell him about the jurisdictional barrier and Manwaring's recommended solution. Before the end of the day the details had been worked out.

Readily available resources for implementing "task force" solutions to individual or community problems. Rather than exclusively drawing on his own considerable skills to solve problems involving individuals or community groups, Manwaring constantly and consistently considers others within and outside the Sheriff's department who have the authority and know-how to bring about long term solutions and arranges for team effort. Example include:

1) a quick hallway conference involving a delinquent child's probation officer and the family attorney to figure out how to convince the child's mother to attend parenting classes (the mother did attend after she was convinced by the attorney that the move was to help her).

2) several phone calls to help organize a joint effort including the regional drug task force and gang task force to take down a house from which, Manwaring heard, a growing number of kids were obtaining drugs and to deal with the group responsible for selling drugs.

3) strategic planning (during Judge Murray's weekly meeting) to address problems involving kids, kegs, and parties up in the hills. The strategy that was quickly decided on included a)at the students' suggestion, widely publicizing new laws requiring a lengthy suspension of driver's licenses of minors who have violated liquor laws, including articles in the school newspaper and Manwaring and the SRO's talking to the students at school assemblies; b)more strictly enforcing and prosecuting laws that prevent businesses from selling alcohol to minors (2nd infractions can be charged as and prosecuted as felonies) — Manwaring is sending letters to all businesses that kids in court say are places where they purchased alcohol; c)more follow-up by detectives in cases of adults who have reportedly bought alcohol for minors more than once; and d)possibly obtaining funds available from the state to pay for overtime for officers who will "look for keggers."

The development of critical support network of people who continually focus on process and outcome (what's working for whom) rather than formal procedure. Manwaring has developed his own support group — a network of professionals both inside and outside the sheriff's department who are able to set aside their egos, assess whether courses of action they have implemented are achieving valuable goals, and make mid-course correction when needed.

For one example, the procedures Judge Murray has established in juvenile court appear to impress young offenders that they are accountable for their own actions—both actions that led to their breaking laws and better consequential actions they can take immediately (for example, having court cost fees waived for appearing in appropriate attire) and in the future. When however, a youth appeared who did not have the basic skills for following the court procedures, Manwaring and members of the

court and probation staff immediately conferred with Judge Murray and decided on a different course of action to help him understand the consequences of what he did and could not do.

On the other hand, since Bannock County is a place where law enforcement officers often interact with the residents as part of their private lives in off-duty hours — in church, during sports activities, and in other settings (as do officers in all our partner departments), Manwaring is not uncommonly pressured by family members of juveniles to take actions resulting in young offenders avoiding accountability. In such circumstances, the support network once again plays an important role.

Departmental characteristics promoting community change for the better through community-oriented policing

A long history of continual self-scrutiny and increasing professionalism A relatively short time ago (20 years or so) according to long-term staff, the Bannock County sheriff's department was frequently operating more as a posse with questionable tactics than as a professional law enforcement agency. As in some of our other partner departments, a new breed of officers, including present-day senior administrators, joined the department with the strong belief in the mission to protect and serve. They had the determination to work for change and stamina to slowly recruit like-minded officers and discourage officers with less integrity from staying. Given limited positions to fill, especially positions outside the jail, they look for ways to bring in new staff who can professionalize duties that still lack good outcomes.

It was clear to the Sheriff and senior staff, as well as other officers, that the juvenile justice system was failing kids in many ways. Manwaring had the credentials and professional experience in past work with Judge Murray that made senior staff optimistic that he could help refine the process involving kids from time of arrest through adjudication.

Open doors and open communication between rank and file While the relationship Manwaring has developed with Judge Murray is highly visible and one key factor, less obvious but as important is the constant communication and rapid response he, *as other officers,* receives in the Sheriff's department on a daily basis. In a single day, for a few examples, these included 1)calling on and arranging with detectives to carry out targeted enforcement involving a place that kids coming to court had identified as a common site for underage drinking and other delinquent activity; 2)calling on and arranging with the jail custody staff to carry out activities as part of the "Short Stop" diversion program[1] planned for that night; and 3)calling on the Sheriff who arranged for

---

[1]Short Stop is a diversion program for delinquents and their parents designed to strengthen family attachment — a factor that growing body of research has shown to be key in

the Pocatello PD SRO to be deputized as discussed in the task force meeting. Each of these discussions took under ten minutes of Manwaring's time, including time spent in locating and contacting supervisors, discussing the problem to be addressed, discussing a possible strategy to implemented, answering questions about the problem and strategy, and receiving a decision and any steps Manwaring needed to take next.

Supervisors' trust in officers to know and to apply departmental priorities — to protect and serve As officers in all law enforcement departments, through out the day, Manwaring is contacted by dispatchers to respond to immediate calls from service — in Manwaring's typically services involving juveniles such as arrest and transport. However, unlike officers in many departments, officers in Bannock County have been given the discretion to prioritize calls and, in discussion with the dispatchers, make decisions about who will do what, and when. In Manwaring's case for example, alternative arrangements are made for another officer to transport if Manwaring assesses that his time is better spent on another activity.

The discretion granted to officers appears to be deeply rooted in supervisors' trust that their officers' process of prioritizing calls takes into account that their primary job is to protect and serve — and in fact, officers not infrequently referred to these priorities as integral to their decision making.

For the most part, supervisors' trust seems warranted. On the one hand, the top administration recognizes the steps they must to take to help maintain the integrity and focus of their officers — they work hard to assure that officers are fairly compensated for their jobs — both in terms of fiscal compensation and departmental and public recognition for jobs well done. However, when an individual officer corrupts fundamental departmental priorities, disappointment among the supervisory staff is deep, keenly felt and expressed, and severely reprimanded.

Open minds for promising ideas/better ways for accomplishing mission As in several of our partner departments, officers are actively encouraged to "think outside the box" "beyond the dots" of reactive policing, come up with innovative methods for preventing crime, discuss them within in the department including with supervisors and top administrators, and suggest how the ideas could be put into action. When Sergeant Tom Foltz came back from a LINC consortium departmental exchange visit to Redding/Shasta County, California, he returned with a notebook full of ideas to discuss within the department with the other sergeants, officers including Manwaring, and departmental supervisors. Manwaring, as other officers, sifted through the mass of materials and ideas that Tom brought home and discussed with them, selected those that appeared useful for enhancing services involving juveniles in Bannock County, proposed refinements to better fit Bannock County, and brought the ideas to fruition by

---

preventing delinquency.

involving local networks.

For one example, Sergeant Foltz brought back from Redding/Shasta County a compendium of resources that could readily be provided to youth and families. As a result, Manwaring now has available for youth, families and other community members a 50-page *Guide to Human Resources & Community Resources Bannock County 1999,* compiled by the University of Idaho and Pocatello Head Start.

Routine tasks and functions seen as opportunities for carrying out basic mandates and creating change for the better Throughout the department, rather than eschewing routine activities that could be assigned to lower-ranked officers or civilians, assignments are taken on as vehicles for accomplishing a larger mission. The Sheriff teaches part of Short Stop along with Manwaring — which can send a strong message to young delinquents and their parents that the program is meant to be taken seriously and is not just a slap on the wrist. (And judging by the reaction of one parent who was clearly and vocally annoyed that he had to spend time attending Short Stop — until the Sheriff appeared, when he settled down and stopped complaining — the message is heard). As a means of bringing new ideas into the department, the Undersheriff willingly takes on transport duties to or from jurisdictions carrying out exemplary approaches which he can learn about while on site. Manwaring, in turn, uses every minute with youth whom he is transporting or accompanying to and from detention and the court, to learn about them, their background, and their resources, and the circumstances in which they got into trouble to better plan a strategy with Judge Murray and others on how to deal with them or problems in the community.

Assignment according to individual strengths and talents. During a LINC consortium departmental visit to Bannock County, visiting officers immediately recognized that Manwaring is very good at doing his job. This is no accident. It is a result of the administration's willingness to assign him this position in recognition of his strengths including the ability to handle a myriad of details, excellent communication and collaboration skills, and a deep interest in youth.

Based on the reactions of youth and other officers who have attended Sheriff's camp, Manwaring also is very good at organizing this summer event involving officers and high-risk youth and followed by officer/youth periodic activities such as pizza parties during the school year. This again is no accident but a result of the administration building on Manwaring's skills and the experience he has gained in his position as juvenile court deputy.

Again, Manwaring is not an exceptional case of the right person for the right job. Throughout the department, officers are encouraged to recognize what skills they have to bring to the job and take on activities that they can do well. They have fine examples of doing this at the very top administrative positions. Their Undersheriff is a long term law enforcement officer and administrator who vocally acknowledges his strengths and

his weaknesses — and demonstrates that one can have a successful career by making contributions based on his strengths and drawing on the strengths of others in areas in which he is less talented.

The result appears to be a department where many officers have a sense of accomplishment of a job well done and where there is minimal turnover even though, compared to other law enforcement agencies, the pay scale is relatively low.

Job performance evaluation with focus on career development
Evaluation of law enforcement officers generally focuses on outcomes of incidents and cases — arrests, citations, crimes cleared, and other measures of reactive policing. However, Bannock County officers such as Manwaring and others who are carrying out COPS functions cannot be properly assessed in those terms.

Job performance of Pocatello Sheriff's officers and civilian staff is evaluated based on individual career development. Officers are encouraged to set goals and objectives, and evaluations incorporate an assessment of progress toward goals, barriers to achieving the goals, and ways in which the barriers can be overcome.

The bottom line, salary, however, is not in sync with the focus on goal attainment nor assignment according to individual strengths and talents. As in other law enforcement departments and other government agencies, pay is determined by rank, and rank is tied to the numbers of other staff supervised. Therefore the administration is constantly in search for other incentives to reward officers whose greatest talents lie outside the sphere of supervising traditional police work. To some degree, job satisfaction is in itself an incentive. However, in several of this study's departments, the top-level administrators would like to at least try an alternative pay scale system that rewards officers for effective crime prevention efforts.

All officers involved in selecting CEO, as in an employee-run company
One factor that helps cement relationships within sheriffs' offices is the participation in sheriffs' elections by deputies and civilians in the department. The officers know — and so does the Sheriff — that accountability to the concerns of staff, as well as those to be protected and served, is assessed on a regular basis on election day. More important, however, is the realization among the officers that — if they want to be Sheriff one day or if they want their partner to be Sheriff one day — they need to establish and maintain good relationships within the department and with the community. This reality sets a tone that is antithetical to a rigid military type of promote-and-protect-from-within relationship that prevails in some police departments.

For better and for worse, the department functions as family As in many departments, both sheriffs' and police departments, the relationships among officers are highly personal as well as professional — familial in nature. As in families, "sibling rivalry" can work for and against accomplishing goals. A certain amount of "bad

mouthing" can be seen as the outcome of jealousy when one officer gets more positive attention than another. But on the other hand, competition for achieving departmental goals to get recognition is helpful in reaching the goals. And when push comes to shove, the officers know that the others are there for them — in the middle of a fourteen-hour fully packed work day, Manwaring will not forget to pick up the phone and call an officer battling a life-threatening disease to say, "Hi Buddy, how's it going?"

Except for the facts that they are not directly involved in the selection of their CEO and have less immediate access to the Chief in a larger department, individual COPS officers in Redding receive very similar supports to those described in the Bannock County deputy's situation. Moreover, the Redding Police Department along with the city as a whole has moved toward a strategy for assuring that these supports — both departmental and extra-mural — will continue to be in place independent of changes in officers or heads of city agencies.

Stage 5: Police activities are developed as part of city/county strategic planning; The department formally places high priority on participating sustained, integrated community-based approaches for engineering more productive and economically-sound use of neighborhoods and redirecting situations and group activities that presented a high potential for harm to people or property

Soon after community-oriented policing was initiated in Redding, some of the City's leaders saw the potential of COPS as a strong component for increasing the economic vitality of the area, and the Chief developed a strategy for accomplishing this goal. In this Stage 5 level of community policing, the goal was to increase the attractiveness of Redding as place for major industries and businesses to locate by using COPS as a stimulus for creating attractive and active shopping areas and a system of strong services in residential neighborhoods for families with diverse backgrounds and income levels.

The city council, city manager, and Chief recognized that this goal could not be achieved overnight. The obstacles that had to be overcome included the reluctance of better-off citizens to recognize the advantages to the city as a whole in identifying the and addressing the primary problems being faced on a daily basis by people in neighborhoods with the least private economic resources, the resistance of many police officers to see that addressing these problems were integral to 'real police work', and the lack of understanding among both police and staff in other city and county agencies about the changes that could be brought about through active collaboration and coordination. Together they addressed these obstacles and made steady progress toward their primary goal.

The City of Redding: A concerted public-private venture.

The City of Redding under the leadership of the five-person city council and city manager had demonstrated a strong commitment to community-based services and problem solving from the early stages of the development of COPS. This was not left to chance. The Chief, who had been on the state-wide committee of law-enforcement representatives to promote COPPS, provided council members and heads of other agencies information about COPPS well before the department formed its NPU and kept them involved as plans for the NPU developed.

In 1994, as directed by the council, the city staff conducted a survey of neighborhood problems that were a priority for the residents. Distributed to 29,500 by the utility company along with the November 1994 utility bill, the survey results indicated the existence of "pockets within neighborhoods" where residents uniformly complained about the same code enforcement problems including "junk, weed, trash, and wrecked or inoperable cars in front of dwelling units."[22] The Chief made sure that elected officials as well as heads of other agencies recognized that these problems were a real blight on the city; more than one council member was given a personal tour of the areas

that were in most dire conditions.

These problems were among some of the first addressed by the police NPU. And as the neighborhoods began to respond to these efforts, the city stimulated continuing progress by successfully seeking funds for home and neighborhood improvements and economic development and by sponsoring events for literally promoting neighborhood pride. For example, The Neighborhood Pride and Awards program offered cash incentives and building materials to community volunteers who successful bring the private properties in their neighborhood up to code. The awards are provided by city merchants who are publicly praised for their participation in the endeavor.

The local media including the newspaper, the *Record Searchlight*, was also a key partner in bolstering COPS, by providing front page stories about successes. To avoid self-aggrandizement which would not have been appreciated by their fellow officers, the astute NPU officers helped focus the media coverage on the community groups and individuals who worked in partnership with them.

Once COPS had achieved their first recognizable success, the administrators and planners of the City of Redding began to advertise their police department and the Neighborhood Policing Unit as a corner stone of economic development and quality of life. For example, the authors of the "Redding Metro Report" stated with great pride that, "Redding was chosen as being among the nation's best by placing eighth in the nation and second in the State for cities of 30,000 to 100,000 population. The Neighborhood Police Unit takes the best aspects of Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS) and applies them directly to the streets and neighborhoods of Redding"[23].

The Chief, City Manager, and Council recognized that addressing external conditions of blight was only the first step in creating strong neighborhoods. Far more serious problems were caused by individuals and families who were chronically involved in criminal behavior — as victims, as offenders, or as both. While, as discussed above, officers began to focus on coordinated intensive supervision of repeat offenders who were terrorizing neighborhoods, they also recognized that longer-term measures were needed to break the generational cycle of crime. To do so they began to focus on ways to reduce delinquency, promote health childhood development, and support the ability of families to raise their children in crime free settings.

Breaking the cycle of crime: The Redding focus on youth development.

While the NPU's initial activities focused on enforcement, including targeting juveniles who repeated committed delinquent acts, once youth violence began to subside the officers shifted to a comprehensive youth development strategy carried out in tandem with schools, local colleges, community organizations including those representing new Americans such as the South East Asian Community Task Force, and victims

advocates.

Each school in target areas was assigned two officers. As described above, one of the first problems cooperatively addressed by the officers and schools administrators was habitual truancy; officers and principals began paying visits to the homes of chronically absent children. As a result, not only did they identify and help address problems faced by individual children and families but they also gained a deep appreciation for the difficulties many families were experiencing in bringing up their children to be responsible adults — difficulties that included being victimized by a spectrum of people including neighborhood bullies, corrupt landlords, adult criminals who had moved into the same apartment complexes, and, in more than a few cases, men living in the households who were battering women while the children had no option except to watch.

Gradually officers began to grapple with these problems. They shifted from a case-by-case basis to a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. They did not try to carry out activities by themselves, but in collaboration with a host of other agencies. And rather than simply forming alliances with individual staff in other agencies in analogous lateral positions, they initiated formal ties between their Chief and Department and the heads of other agencies and their organizations. Some of the many approaches they implemented were original ideas created in response to needs they saw in their own communities; others were unabashedly taken from other departments who had been grabbling with similar community problems. Many approaches were congruent with approaches that researchers have identified as proven or promising for reducing crime and delinquency; these included the following.

- **Providing opportunities for and rewarding youth for skill building, productive behavior. A hallmark of this approach is the Redding after-school program combining tutoring and recreational activities**. The first after-school program was carried out by COPS officers in tandem with students in the education department in a local college, Simpson College. Developed with the assistance of community liaisons, the first program primarily involved adolescents who had recently arrived from Southeast Asians countries and who were struggling to learn English, keep up in their studies, and fit into the often rough and tumble world of American adolescents. The liaisons convinced the parents of the benefits for their children. The officers enticed the kids to complete the first hour of tutoring by offering to teach them US sports after they finished their academic lessons. And the tutors, mainly students from suburban white suburbs, gained the experience of working in a diverse urban school setting.

  The program was designed to be expanded to more schools, to involve tutors from other post-highschool educational programs, and to serve a growing number of children and teens at each school site. It became clear to NPU sergeants that continuation of the program required ongoing collaboration with faculty at the college

to assure maintaining the active involvement of the tutors — fully realizing that the activities with the officers need to be the reward for finishing "homework" assignments.

Visits to these programs revealed that the activities led by the COPS officers continue to be a source of great delight to a majority of the children, that the officers encourage children who are shy about participating, and that rather than spending the hours between school and the end of parents' workdays in unsupervised settings where they often get into trouble, many of Redding's youth are enjoying activities for strengthening their minds and bodies and strengthening their bonds to school and to their community — bonds repeatedly shown by research to prevent delinquency.

Other programs provided by officers include more traditional youth approaches. The department has both a Young Marines chapter and a Boy Scout Explorer program. Several officers have volunteered to provide leadership for the productive activities carried by adolescents in both these groups. In keeping with the department's willingness to learn from successes of other departments, officers are also implementing constructive programs involving officers and youth from other cities, such as Spokane's Every Fifteen Minute program which essentially eliminated drunk driving fatalities among highschool seniors on prom night. And on a routine basis, officers search out and attend events in which young people are given an opportunity to shine and be applauded for their efforts. For example, officers keep informed about athletic events involving students at the schools to which they are assigned, attempt to attend as many of these games as possible during off-duty hours, and offer congratulations for individual achievements to students as they see them in school and the community.

- **Educating youth about expectations for behavior and the consequences for delinquency; providing immediate consequences for delinquency, coupled with an opportunity to redeem themselves.** Core elements of this approach are the *Youth Guidebook, the assignment of officers to high schools and junior highs, and the close working relationship with juvenile justice system and other youth-serving agencies.*

The *Youth Guidebook* published cooperatively by Redding Police Department, the Shasta County Sheriff and the Shasta County Probation Department explicitly spells out crime definitions and resources available to youth. Based on observations during ride-alongs, giving all students and parents copies of the handbook and using the handbook as a basis for in-class education on juvenile law appear to have curtailed two of the most common adolescent excuses for wrongdoing, "I didn't know it was a crime," and "There was nothing else to do." In fact youngsters who are discovered breaking laws may try to cover up for other friends involved, but they know they have been justifiably "busted."

Redding PD COPS officers assigned to schools work in close collaboration with the school administrators and faculty, school security guards, and juvenile probation and very importantly community members who live or work around the schools. This assures that youth are more closely monitored and more likely to be discovered when behaving in ways that are illegal and threaten their own well being. For example, on her way from one school to another, one officer noticed a group of boys off campus during the school day. As she drew closer, she saw that one boy had a cigarette tucked behind his ear. As she stopped to question the youth and bring them to school in her patrol car, a middle-age couple hailed her and led her over to a nearby low-growing evergreen in which was nestled a plastic bag of marijuana.

Given their law enforcement training and powers to issue citations and make arrests, the officers assigned to schools are better positioned to provide immediate sanctions and other consequences for delinquent behavior than the school staff. For examples, youth who are caught smoking are typically presented with the alternatives of a citation with a $75 fine or attendance in a program designed to prevent continued smoking; youth who get into fights are presented with the alternatives of working out hostility without use of physical violence or being led away in handcuffs.

In addition to officers assigned to schools, other officers, especially NPU officers assigned to specific neighborhoods, also incorporate the same approach of educating youth about laws, providing immediate consequences for infractions, and providing alternatives. For example, skate boarders are repeatedly reminded to use the park set aside for their use and warned that citations will be issued to those who persist in using sidewalks and streets in the down town area. These reminders are followed with citations to violators.

A second problem involving skate boarders arose when someone started "tagging" the area set aside for skate boarding. The tagger remained unidentified and active in spite of 'stake outs' by patrol officers and the attempts of gang enforcement officers to figure out who might be defacing the park with unsightly graffiti — but the ardent skateboarders who had taken "ownership" of the area discovered the identity of the tagger, notified a school officer who in turn notified the NPU officer for the community. The officer immediately came up with appropriate consequences for the tagger: community service — including removing all the graffiti and keeping the area graffiti-free for a set period to be determined by the judge.

- **Operating as part of team for catching kids in danger of falling through cracks in the system.** Some of the children most at risk of failing to develop basic life skills and failing to achieve economic independence as adults are those who easily fade into the background at school and in the community and are in danger of being unnoticed until some dire incident occurs. Redding officers have become an integral part of the teams of school administrators and other youth services

providers who are tracking truancies, school absences, and other signs of failure to thrive, trying to figure out what is going wrong in the lives of these children, and coming up with a plan to assist them. As in other partner departments, Redding officers take part in the School Attendance Review Board (SARB) process involving chronically absent children and their parents. However the Redding PD effort goes well beyond that formal participation.

Not infrequently, written requests for conferences with the parents of these children go unheeded. And while school administrators are willing to pay home visits on their own in most places in the city, they are realistically apprehensive about visiting homes of many chronically absent children in seedy complexes that have not yet been cleaned up and made crime-free.

Home-visit teams that include a school officer not only protect the school member of the team but, since officers are more likely to recognize criminal activity and the presence of people on conditional release, also can more completely assess the conditions in a home that may be placing children at risk. Moreover, given other Redding PD approaches for assisting families in poverty, the visiting **school** officers are positioned to let parents know of channels to get help.

Officers who respond to domestic violence calls also are fully aware of their responsibility for determining whether there are children present and have been well prepared to respond to the immediate needs and invoke a spectrum of longer term services for children who have been witnesses to battering and other forms of domestic violence. Their training for this response was been developed by the Domestic Violence Coordinating Council of Shasta County chaired the Shasta County Undersheriff and Redding Police Department Commander of Field Operations. Working with representatives from a spectrum of local agencies, organizations, and community members, the Police Department actively participated in preparing a videotape made available for law enforcement agencies to train their officers in the appropriate way to deal with children traumatized by domestic violence, a checklist for law enforcement officers who handle domestic violence calls that included steps to take when children are involved in such situations, and community contacts, including the local shelter, for

> We recognize children of domestic violence are substantially impacted by living in a violent environment. Even though a child might not be physically abused, the trauma of witnessing the parent's emotional and physical abuse against the other parent is detrimental to the child's well being.
>
> Therefore, children who witness domestic violence are in a separate crisis and must be addressed as separate individuals with special needs. Let it be recognized, in our society, every child is entitled to food, shelter, and a non-violent environment in which to live. *Domestic Violence Coordinating Council of Shasta County 1996 Year End Report*

assuring that involved children will receive counseling and other needed services.

- **Increasing the number of children living in crime-free environments by collaborations to improve the well-being of people causing problems as well as those affected** One of the remarkable developments in Redding is the growing number of officers who are bringing about long-term solutions to problems by improving the lives of formerly chronic offenders. In addition to several already described, some major, ongoing efforts have included:

    - A major undertaking that transformed previously run-down high-crime apartment complexes into crime-free housing

    - Systematic coordination that resulted in mentally-ill street people having necessary services for regulating medication and re-establishing more healthful ways of living

    - A city-wide effort that resulted in relocating families living in cramped, stressful housing for transients into long-term affordable housing

In addition to these very visible successes, more and more officers are routinely bringing about positive changes in the lives of residents that are not likely to come to public attention. For example, one patrol officer realized social isolation was the underlying reason one elderly resident frequently called to report essentially nonexistent crimes. A brief call to her on a regular basis and an occasional visit helped her overcome her fears and loneliness and her need to call 911. This outcome was achieved by a well implemented strategy, described next, for converting the department gradually to a COPS mode of policing.

Converting officers to community-oriented policing

Many of the same factors described as fostering COPS in Bannock County were also at work in Redding. For example the Chief long encouraged officers to learn about innovations in policing by visiting other departments, attending national and state-wide academies, training courses, and conferences.

However, one of the earmarks of COPS in Redding which seems to have served the officers, department, and city well is the way in which COPS has consciously been developed as part of an overall strategy for city progress not only by the city administrators including the Chief, but by first officers and their supervisors as well. When considering implementation of some approaches developed in other cities and counties, officers themselves learned to assess whether or not current conditions in Redding were conducive for implementing a similar approach, and if not, placed considerations on a "back burner." .

For one example, during a LINC consortium exchange of officers, Redding officers considered but placed on hold for a time when conditions are ripe (perhaps in the near future) the safe place for children in the non-school hours provided by firefighters in Pocatello between calls for service. The decision was made during the visit to Pocatello as a part of ongoing process carried out by Redding Police Department Lt. Leonard Moty and Sgt. Dave Mundy for assessing innovations in policing. More specifically they rapidly assessed what specific problems and long-term goals the approaches were addressing, approaches already in place in Redding for addressing similar problems and achieving similar goals, basic ideas and concepts integral to the approaches, and the feasibility of introducing these ideas and concepts in Redding in a manner that is consistent with overall department and city management and vision. As a result, although they were involved in importing relatively few specific approaches they observed in Idaho, they *brought back fundamental ideas and concepts for shaping approaches that meet Redding realities in the long term.*

Other factors that help understand why COPS took root and grew in Redding include departmental leadership, priorities, and strategic decisions.

Departmental leadership Police departments that have implemented the most advanced forms of community-oriented policing services around the country have chiefs of police and sheriffs who not only bought into this form of policing but actively promoted the involvement of their officers, civilian staff, and community members. Chief Blankenship is an excellent example.

Based on discussions with the Chief, Redding officers at every rank, and community leaders, the Chief's ability to lead the department in implementing effective community-oriented policing had less to do with personality than administrative skills. In fact, the Chief made clear that he had to curb his natural inclination to get involved in nitty-gritty everyday departmental decisions. More specifically, he took these important steps to initiate and propel the department toward acceptance of the COPS/problem-solving mode of policing.

- Unlike some departments that initiated COPS primarily because funds were available, Blankenship attended conferences and meetings to learn about COPS strategies in general and specific results of COPS in other cities, and, based on this information, assessed whether implementation of COPS could be beneficial for the department, the city, and specific communities within the city.

- Once having decided that COPS could be beneficial, the Chief set the goal high — converting the entire department to a "COPS mentality" — but he formed his course of action with realistic expectations that there would be serious resistence to this change and that this conversion was going to take a major effort on his part and the part of the top-level administrators over time.

- The Chief "zeroed" in on the ranks where major changes in thinking and acting needs to take place to implement COPS — first-line supervisors and field officers — but at the same time he brought mid- and top-level supervisors on board by making clear that initiation of COPS was not an option: it was going to happen in Redding and there would be rewards for doing COPS well and supporting line officers' ability to carry out COPS.

- Blankenship set out his priorities and strategy for bringing about a departmental change and then set an example for the department's captains and lieutenants — top-level monitoring of COPS developments but — unless a disaster in the making was evident or support was needed from other top-level administrators — hands off. He developed a form of macro- (rather than micro-) management of officers working within the community to solve problems, so that when problems are solved *the field officers who brought about change and people in the community who worked with them are publicly credited with the solution.*

Departmental priorities There is strong evidence that community-oriented policing and problem solving was been given a high priority throughout the Redding Police Department. Administrators and officers were encouraged to creatively and collaboratively address complex city concerns by formally integrating community problem solving into the departmental mission, by building community problem solving and enhancement into a "pay for performance" ongoing evaluations of officers at and above the rank of sergeant, and by focusing public recognition on the officers, staff in other agencies, and members of their communities who have carried out successful approaches.

These actions sent a strong signal both within the department and throughout the community that Redding police stand ready to work for community progress as well as to enforce laws. As a result, officers at every rank came to realize that arresting offenders is not the most important function of Redding PD officers, but rather, an important tool for assisting other agencies and community members to create a city with a high quality of life.

Departmental strategy for implementing COPS Several dimensions of the department's strategy for implementing COPS appear to have been instrumental in bringing about progress toward the goal of shifting the entire department toward COPS: beginning with a small number of officers assigned to a Neighborhood Policing Unit (NPU), initially assigning officers to the NPU who were long-term, experienced, and well thought of by other officers at the same rank; keeping the NPU as part of Field Operations/patrol, and building on NPU developments and experiences.

- *Beginning with a small NPU* The expectation about the reaction of field officers and their first line supervisors to COPS was right on the mark. As among officers in our partner departments when the LINC consortium was first formed,

most Redding officers considered community policing to be nothing more than the latest academic rhetoric — a politically-motivated fad that would soon fade away. They were basically unconvinced that much could be accomplished by policing activities that did not involve traditional patrol and investigations. They went along with the first steps "because the chief says we have to."

Since Redding began with a small number of officers, they could be "packed into a car"; five officers and their sergeant were sent to visit and do ride-a-longs with officers carrying out COPS and problem solving in Sacramento and other California police departments. According to these officers, based on this experience they became less skeptical and more willing to try some of the same strategies and tactics for working with the community.

- *The selection of long-term experienced well-liked officers* who were sent to other cities and assigned to the NPU seems to have promoted departmental COPS in at least two ways. They, as other long-term officers, knew the areas of the city where chronic crime and other problems took place, and they were exasperated with the failure of traditional policing — patrol, investigations, and arrests — to make a dent in the problems. Once they began to "think outside the box" and to apply creative approaches collaboratively with other agencies and community members, they began to see visible changes in previously chronic problems that long seemed unsolvable. Given these results, they became converts to community-oriented policing — and because they were known to their fellow officers to be regular guys — when they pitched community-oriented policing, others listened.

- *Keeping the NPU as part of Field Operations/patrol* appears to have paid off in several ways. First, it allowed officers initially involved in the NPU time to reconsider approaches that constitute real policing. In the beginning NPU appeared to be a special tactical "weed and seed" patrol unit with some investigative functions. Early in the LINC consortium, officers saw vigorous enforcement to drive criminals out of specific neighborhoods as a primary component — and their "real" job. The other component, the after-school program carried out in conjunction with Simpson College, they saw as a good way of keeping kids off the streets — but not necessarily activity that they should be doing. Until the after-school activities started to spin off other benefits including more willingness of the kids to work with the officers to solve chronic problems in their communities, several NPU officers were looking forward to the day when they had rid the communities of persistent offenders and could turn the after-school program over to "people who should really be doing this".

  Second, as a part of patrol, the formation of the NPU was less resented than separate COPS units in other partner departments as a draw on resources needed to do "our real job — catching the bad guys." Most officers in the

department, including some of the NPU officers, spoke about the NPU as a short-term project — not a bad thing to do as long as the NPU officers pulled their own weight as part of patrol in responding to calls. Three years later, the reverse attitude was beginning to prevail; patrol officers outside the NPU were being co-opted to work with the NPU officers on problem-solving approaches and willingly joined in or initiated their own COPS activities.

Third, NPU officers as patrol officers were considered to be on the same career track as other first-line officers — not a elite unit that was on a fast track to higher level assignments. Now, many officers and almost all officers who have served in the NPU have realized that the unit acts not only as a training ground for a new way of policing, but the unit also helps *sharpen skills needed for more effective traditional methods of policing such as investigations.*

- *Building on NPU developments and experiences.* One of the central developments in NPU was the collaboration with other city, county, educational and nonprofit agencies. This collaboration was given a jump-start in the early stages by arranging for NPU officers to take elected and top-level officials from other agencies on ride-a-longs to see some of the worst areas in the city and point out specific problems that needed joint attention to solutions. As in other cities, the collaboration between police and city code enforcement was one of the first collaborations to make a visible and dramatic impact on the quality of life in the city. But over a period of four years many city and county departments and private organizations were at least temporarily brought into a problem solving approach by an increasing number of officers.

The common understanding among some chiefs of police and many police researchers is that separate COPS units are not a good idea; special units confine problem solving to a small fraction of officers, while the vast majority continue to carry out reactive policing which in the long term is ineffective. However, this conclusion has been based on research in some of the largest cities in the US and abroad where a small special unit can function virtually independent from "normal" operations. The progress made in Redding by using the NPU to shift toward a department-wide problem-solving paradigm is likely to challenge the validity of this notion in small- and medium-size cities. The evidence of this success is reflected not only in the decreasing rates of crime in the city but also in the changes in the departmental culture, the growing number of exemplary approaches that have been implemented, and the response of the community to these approaches.

Changes in departmental culture Over the years of the LINC consortium, there was an observable shift in culture among officers at every level of the department. One major change was the softening of the "we and them" perspective on people in the community, especially those in neighborhoods with relatively high crime rates, and the "hook'm and book'm" perspective of their policing mandate. More than a few officers

have developed a tenacious, "can do," long-term prevention perspective focused on addressing types of problems in Redding that also are concerns in virtually every medium-size and large city in the nation. The complex problems officers have tackled in collaboration with other Redding agencies, and in a growing number of areas have solved, include: high rates of situationally-caused domestic violence in substandard housing complexes; relatively high rates of juvenile delinquency in the after-school hours; and deteriorating use of business areas due to the high visibility of adult chronic alcoholics/drug users and groups of out-of-control kids.

By the time our partnership began, a small number of officers were pretty well convinced that COPS approaches had at least as much merit as more traditional policing approaches. In general these "converts" were NPU officers who previously had become disenchanted by taking offenders off the streets and seeing them back again or seeing them replaced by other offenders in a very short time. They were justifiably proud of their accomplishments which they pointed out during early partnership visits. But these officers were then in the minority and, while they enthusiastically discussed community-oriented policing with our researcher team, it did not appear to be a common topic of discussion among groups of Redding officers.

Since then, there has been a visible shift in paradigm. Many officers are continually grappling with concerns that go way beyond individual offenders. In meetings they bring up complex problems such as chronic truancy and its immediate and long-term consequences for the city, and they brainstorm about solutions. Even more telling are the hallway and break-room conversations that take place about specific problems and solutions that involve officers throughout the department and other agencies. The current sergeant for the NPU has an increasingly intricate job of coordination as officers he supervisors take on efforts that involve a spectrum of approaches and agencies. He is not alone. Since former NPU supervisors have rotated back into patrol and traffic, they have motivated officers to take on equally complicated problem-solving approaches.

Part of the changes that became more evident in the Redding Police Department are: *the greater willingness of officers to take risks to achieve long-term objectives* — not just personal physical risks — that form of bravery has long been demonstrated by Redding officers — but the risk of looking foolish in public, inept to their supervisors, or "too elite" in the eyes of their fellow officers. These are real risks as they practice new skills such as public speaking, if an innovative approach blows up — as a small number of worthwhile experiments always do — or if they, as individuals, are heaped with praise within or outside the department for the results of their efforts.

Officers both within and outside the NPU have developed ways of countering these risks. Individual NPU officers who are individually lauded by community members in greatly improved neighborhoods always stress that the results are due to a team effort — not them individually. Immediate supervisors sometimes have a rapid negative

reaction when a well-intended approach turns sour — but they spend time helping the officers assess what went wrong, what could be done in the future to avoid similar negative results, helping repair any damage including damaged community relations, and very importantly within the department going to bat for the officers who had the effort fail. And, while good-natured ribbing is still part and parcel of officer interactions, line officers are receiving ongoing support and encouragement from their fellow officers to try new approaches and carry out activities that involve these kind of risks.

Supervisors are taking the same types of risks. First-line supervisors appear increasingly willing to take possible flack for a low priority request for service that goes unanswered, to free the time of their officers for problem-solving and COPS, and to step in and mend fences when individual community members object to actions carried out with the backing and approval of a large segment of community members. Higher-level administrators appear to be carefully weighing the possible political fallout from nontraditional policing approaches and put their own advancement at stake by frequently giving innovative officers the nod and benefit of any doubt.

Officers also appear to depend less on traditional forms of police authority and more on trust based on performance. At the beginning of our partnership most field officers, including those in the NPU, appeared most comfortable in their cars or in situations outside their cars when they were exercising legal authority backed up by ready access to weapons and other armed officers. They considered a wave to and from residents in the NPU neighborhoods a form of progress in community relations. They dutifully showed up at community activities but many didn't appear comfortable.

Today a growing number of officers both within and outside the NPU appear comfortable dealing with community members, including in situations in which traditional forms of police authority are not only inappropriate but are counter to the objectives of problem-solving strategies. They have developed relaxed ways of dealing with a spectrum of staff in other agencies — including for examples, school administrators and private security, managers of hotels, social services staff in nonprofit organizations, and owners of bars. Even when they enter establishments that were formerly hot spots of crime, it is now obvious that many staff, residents, and clients respect them based on past positive interactions; and although they still must exercise care and keep an eye out for trouble, they have many other eyes also watching too.

As of late 1999, some officers still were unconvinced about the value of COPS and problem-solving. But they can no longer hope that the emphasis on these approaches will go away. Rather than ignoring these changes, they are now openly questioning officers who are deeply into problem-solving about the appropriateness of these approaches for police officers — and getting some very cogent responses in return. "Look, would you want your doctor to put a band-aid on a really bad infection and hope it will go away? Well, when we arrest one bad guy, that's all we're doing. We're putting a band-aid on a really bad problem."

OVERCOMING COMMON PROBLEMS AND PITFALLS IN COMMUNITY POLICING

While this report focuses on positive steps taken to advance community policing, the departments faced, and more or less successfully overcame, many barriers that confront departments of all sizes across the country. These problems and pitfalls included both internal barriers (such as seasoned officers' resistance to change in standard operating procedures, and first-line and mid-level supervisors' concern about losing control as field officers were given more discretion) and external barriers (most notably, citizen apathy). Departments with administrators who incorporated community policing as part of an overall departmental strategy, who recognized these potential barriers at the very start of their initiatives and who addressed them head-on were more likely to reach advanced stages of community policing. In departments whose administrators who took a more tentative approach to community policing, progress was typically limited in stage, scope, and numbers of officers who bought in to the process; within four years, some departments' community policing approaches began to unravel.

Addressing potential internal problems and pitfalls

The overarching internal barrier to community policing was resistence to change — change in organizational structure, change in department priorities, change in amount of immediate supervision and discretion of officers, and change in activities officers considered "real policing." While this report has already described some of the steps taken to win over officers throughout the ranks, two of the most important keys to overcoming this resistence were overall top-level managerial approaches based more on sound corporate practices than on military practices.

Managerial approaches

While all the chiefs and sheriffs in the participating departments had come up through the ranks, some were more adept than others at switching gears from leading the troops to championing their departments among local officials and oversight committees. In the face of local tax limitations, diminishing county and city budgets, and decreasing rates of crime, virtually all the chiefs of police and sheriffs and their departments were increasingly under pressure to justify expenditures in terms of sound fiscal policies and results. As in many law-enforcement departments, budget-related negotiations (and in some departments, union negotiations) required a major chunk of top administrators' time. During these negotiations, the chiefs and sheriffs who continued to lead their departments using the quasi-military mode of direction they had learned coming up through the ranks typically felt as if they were under siege by civilians (or, in the case of union officials, outside agitators) who simply didn't understand policing. They tended to view community policing at worst as another fly-by-night distraction thrust on them by local and federal officials; at best, they saw it as a label for a source of federal funds that allowed them to assign one or two officers to

respond to projects that were outside the real work of police officers. They were willing to keep these assignments as long as federal funds were available and as long as they themselves didn't have to attend to the projects.

Chiefs and sheriffs who directed their departments as modern corporations rather than military establishments were more likely to view interactions during the budget process with local officials as an opportunity to air their department's accomplishments and productivity in creating or maintaining attractive business and residential areas; community policing was presented as an important part of their strategic plan to continue that process. Addressing many of the issues and using many of the techniques taught in business schools to private-sector CEOS and in management education for law enforcement administrators at Harvard's Senior Management Institute for Police[24], these chiefs and sheriffs tended to have better outcomes for their departments in terms of total annual budgets, monies provided by other departments and agencies for officers assigned to cross-cutting functions such as school resource officers, and local government support for positions initially created with federal funds.

Economic motivation also played a large part in overcoming internal resistence to organizational change. By drawing the line between fiscal support for their department and accomplishments beyond arrests, the chief executive officers were also more likely to motivate officers at all ranks to shift willingly to community policing. Chief Blankenship in Redding and Sheriff Nielsen in Bannock County, for example, realized that community policing could be a cornerstone of strategic change needed in their departments to meet the realities and expectations of their cities and counties, particularly elected officials and city administrators who came from the corporate world or were versed in advanced public management techniques.

The CEOs in turn selected and depended on community policing administrators who had a firm grasp of the strategic import of community policing and of methods for motivating innovation among officers. Chief Blankenship appointed Lieutenant Leonard Moty, who previously had earned an MBA; Moty was familiar with corporate techniques for motivating innovation and organizational change and was always on the look-out for other techniques with demonstrated effectiveness. The Undersheriff in Bannock County, who worked closely with Sheriff Nielsen in stressing the need for officers to "serve" as well as "protect" the community, took every opportunity available to educate himself about modern policing administration and practices implemented by other departments. They were able to convince their officers of the very real connection between departmental budgets and salaries, client satisfaction, and community policing; simply stted, community policing achieved visible results that satisfied the voters and demonstrated to budget committees that officers were earning their pay.

In Redding, the connection was drawn in concrete terms by being tied to individual salaries of officers at and above the rank of sergeant; "pay for performance" meant that supervisors who successfully guided field officers implementing community policing

approaches received higher evaluations and higher pay. In Pocatello, the connection was somewhat less formal — but since the Sheriff himself connected performance evaluations, officers were well aware of the professional and economic incentives for community policing.

Time

Among the departments that most successfully overcame officers' resistence to change, time played a vital role. When the implementation of community policing was part of a long-term strategy for organizational change, adequate time was allowed for the following processes to overcome officers' resistence:

- *The promotion of field officers who had developed and demonstrated skills in community policing.* When assigned as Field Training Officers or supervising sergeants, these officers tutored, guided, and honed the skills of seasoned officers who were initially resistant to community policing. As could have been expected from a fundamental principle of social-psychology (that attitudes change after behaviors change), when formerly resistant officers began to practice community policing, their attitudes gradually became more favorable.

- *Selective attrition among top- and mid-level officers.* Over time, the implementation of community policing influenced career decisions of officers who had completed long-term service. After years of "chasing bad guys," many of these officers had reached a stage of potential "burn out." For some, community policing inaugurated an exciting new phase in their careers — they began once again to enjoy their jobs and accomplishments, and decided to remain on the force. Others found the shift to community policing distasteful and demeaning and decided to pursue careers outside policing while they were still young enough to begin new occupations. Gradually, these individual career choices shift the balance of resisters to adherents among mid- and top-level officers.

- *Recruitment of new officers who actively support community policing.* Officers at all ranks who proved to have the strongest community policing skills were not uncommonly hired from outside the department. At the top and middle ranks, they were drawn from other departments and selected in part because they had previously demonstrated skills in devising innovative methods for solving community problems. New recruits for field positions who became exemplary community police officers were mature hires who had demonstrated an ability to work well in the community, in one case as the manager of a large supermarket. The infusion of these officers also helped shift the departmental balance of resisters to proponents of community policing.

In addition to being a key factor in overcoming internal resistance to community policing, time was also important in forming and maintaining community support.

Addressing external barriers: "citizen apathy"

Community policing without community participation is a futile exercise. Yet more than a few police departments represented at recent national conferences on community policing described the assignment of a patrol unit to a defined neighborhood, or the creation of a substation within a particular area, or the redeployment of all patrol officers into new discrete beat areas as the cornerstone of community policing. These forms of deployment were utilized effectively by some of the departments as a first step — but only a first in reaching out to community members and involving them in keeping their neighborhoods safe. The following processes worked equally well in winning over residents who were formerly distrustful of police or diffident about getting involved and in maintaining the active involvement of community members.

Listening and learning rather than teaching and preaching

Officers most effective in gaining and maintaining community support were good listeners and good consumers of information. When patrolling in cars they stopped, rolled down their windows, and chatted with neighbors about their concerns. When responding to a non-emergent call, they encouraged callers to talk about neighborhood issues other than the immediate cause for contacting the police. They privately often expressed surprise about the concerns and priorities of community members — such as speeding cars taking precedence over burglaries, thefts from local businesses, or unruly kids. However, they quickly learned that such problems could be solved more or less rapidly with the help of other local departments —.for example, by adding a bicycle lane or judiciously-placed concrete planters to slow down cars, or by creating an attractive supervised basketball court and play area in a formerly vacant lot that had been filled with refuse and weeds. By addressing these "quality of life" problems, they found they could win the trust and cooperation of the people in the neighborhood for controlling more serious crimes such as drug distribution or domestic violence.

Leading activities rather than meetings

A common experience among officers was that residents and business people were much more willing to turn out for work details in community projects than for meetings to discuss crime control. While it was possible to get relatively high attendance Immediately after a highly visible crime occurred within the community, most meetings convened for the purpose of preventing crimes resulted in a few people showing up — often just a core group with ongoing specific "gripes." However, people turned out in droves when the purpose of the gathering was to improve the neighborhood — assembling a playground set in a local park, cleaning up a field used illegally as a dump, clearing weeds and debris from a river front, or renovating an abandoned shack or trailer to use as a teen-center. Officers also found that if they involved staff from other city and county agencies in these work projects, lines of friendly communication were established with residents.

Working with community developers, liaisons, and traditional leaders

While a few officers have natural skills in building and maintaining community participation, they are the exception. Yet many officers succeeded in establishing good working relationships with people who have the training and status needed to maintain active community support for problem-solving, peace-keeping, and crime control. These have included community-developers hired by other government agencies such as the federal departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Agriculture (especially county extension agents) and those who work for local departments of community development.

For communities of new Americans — especially those immigrating from countries where the police are rightly viewed with great suspicion — community liaisons have been a valuable resource in acting as organizers, translators, and interpreters. With their assistance, officers have come to recognize important foci that brought the community together in their native country and how to create similar centers for community cooperation, such as playing fields for other nations' traditional sports. In communities of both new Americans and American Indians, officers have learned to greatly respect the elder leaders and draw on their advice and expertise in bringing the community together to further the common good.

Co-opting young and retired residents

As officers gained experience in involving the community, they recognized the existence of two readily available pools of active support and cooperation — teens and retired people. While many departments had already involved teens in Boy Scout Explorer Posts, they realized that there were many other adolescents who were looking for a way to make a mark on the community, whether good or bad. By working with groups already serving youth in community, such as Boys and Girls Clubs or Girl Scouts, or forming their own independent activities such as the Bannock County Sheriff's Camp, they turned idle youth from potentially destructive activities to activities that benefitted the community and gained public praise for the teens.

Retired people willingly became the ears and eyes of the community, patrolling, carrying out checks of people's homes when they were away on vacation, conducting surveillance and recording information about houses where drug trade or other illegal activities were emerging, as well as organizing cookouts and other events that brought the residents and officers together. Others brought their career skills into mini-stations or police headquarters, organizing records and extracting data for analysis, providing public information to walk-ins, and recruiting other volunteers for community events. Still others took on special projects to solve problems that particularly annoyed them, such as ridding streets and by-ways of abandoned cars. Once organized, they commonly became a self-sustaining active constituency, recruiting other participants who retired or moved into the community.

BOTTOM-LINE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major advances in implementing COPS has taken place in small- and medium-size cities and rural counties. Four years of experience with COPS by heartland departments in the LINC consortium suggests the following:

- Large cities have just as much to learn about COPS from small- and medium-size cities and rural counties as the converse. Officers in the LINC consortium departments have grappled with and successfully addressed problems that are identical to those facing officers in large cities. Large departments might consider adapting some of their approaches for implementation in their own neighborhoods.

- As with any innovation in policing, if the Chief or Sheriff is not committed to change, the change is not likely to occur. However, for sustaining COPS, elected city or county officials must also be convinced of the need for change from the onset and be kept personally apprized of the benefits on an ongoing basis.

- Launching COPS with a small cadre of officers can ultimately result in as large an impact on a department's mode of policing as restructuring the entire department for carrying out COPS — providing a strategy is in place for gradually converting the whole department. Rotation and promotion of officers who have become adept in developing COPS to successfully address community concerns is one way of fostering this transformation.

- While formulas for limited problem-solving projects can be taught to officers in classrooms, experiential on-the-job learning with guidance from officers who have developed their own COPS approaches is much more valuable in the long-run for first-line officers and supervisors — and for the communities they are policing. Exchanges of officers between law enforcement departments have provided an excellent resource for this type of learning.

- There is no one right way of implementing COPS. Approaches can be as diverse as the communities in which they are implemented and the teams of officers, staff in other agencies, and community members who develop and carry them out. A very important role that the federal government can play is to enable interchanges so that community policing teams can share ideas, concepts, goals, and experiences and shape these to meet the realities of their own neighborhoods.

COPS has been a national experiment that has resulted in major changes. Although researchers will long argue about whether or not COPS played a part in reducing crime and delinquency, there is no doubt that COPS can and has resulted in:

- Visibly cleaner and more attractive residential neighborhoods
- Transformation of commercial districts from areas of urban decay and frequent incidents of disorderly conduct to attractive downtown blocks
- A higher quality of life for residents who are among the least affluent
- People including business owners, educators, and residents who say they feel safer
- Officers who take deep satisfaction in solving difficult community problems and openly grapple with new and effective ways for ongoing improvements
- A growing recognition among many residents of the innovative roles and leadership law enforcement officers can provide.

ENDNOTES

1. The research for and writing of this report was funded by the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice. Grant 95IJCX0047.

2. Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1999. *Local Police Departments, 1997.* Washington DC: US Department of Justice

3. Goldberg, Andrew L. and Brian A. Reaves. 2000. *Local Police Departments, 1997.* Washington DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice

4. Hickman, Matthew J. and Brian Reeves. 2001. *Community Policing in Local Police Departments, 1997 and 1999.* WashingtonDC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice

5. Stages reached by the participating departments are not explicitly mentioned in this report. The report was not designed to be and is in no way intended to evaluate individual departments.

6. Chaiken, Marcia R. *Catalytic Policing Research Partnerships.* Final report for Grant 95IJCX0047 submitted to the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. March 3, 2000.

7.The Chief of Police from Rapid City, South Dakota, had (successful) surgery at the time of our meeting. He was represented by his Chief of Staff.

4. Moore, Mark Harrison. 1992. "Problem-solving and community policing," pages 99-158 in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris (editors) *Modern Policing.* Crime and Justice Volume 15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

9. Campbell Delong Resources Inc. 1998. *Portland Police Bureau 1998 Community Survey.* Page 16. Portland OR: City of Portland Police Bureau

10. Lee, David. 1994. *1993 Quality Assurance Study for the Rapid City, South Dakota Police Department.* Rapid City: Rapid City Police Department

11. Lee, David. 1994. *1993 Quality Assurance Study for the Rapid City, South Dakota Police Department.* Rapid City: Rapid City Police Department

12. Berg, Patty. September 29, 1995. *Memorandum* Eureka CA: Board of Supervisors of Humboldt County

13. Talley, Richard A. 1995. *Rapid City Police Department's Cop-of-the-Block Program Community Policing Guidelines.* Rapid City SD: Rapid Cityu Police Department

14. Kelling, George L. and Catherine M. Coles. 1996. New York: Free Press

15. California Department of Justice. 1993. COPPS: Definitions and Principles. Sacramento: Author

16. See for example, Reiss. Albert J., Jr. 1992. "Police Organization in the Twentieth Century," pages 51-98 in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris(editors) *Modern Policing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

17. Berg, Patty. September 29, 1995. *Memorandum* Eureka CA: Board of Supervisors of Humboldt County

18. Methods used at these meetings are documented in Byrd, Dewell, Antoinette Martin, and David Lehman (undated) *Building Community Climate for Change Through Neighborhood Meetings; The Humboldt County Experience: Creating a Climate for Strengthening Families and Preparing Youth.* (Unpublished, Available through authors)

19. Neighborhood Police Unit. 1995. *School Survey Results.* Redding, California: Redding Police Department

20. Describe Public Law 280 here.

21. Daniel E. Lungren. January 1, 1996. *Information Bulletin No. 96-01-BCII Sacramento, CA: California Depatrment of Justice.* (Sent to: All California Law Enforcement Agencies)

22. City of Redding Planning and Community Development. January 5, 1995. *Report to the City Council C-110-100-400.* Redding CA: Author

23. Page 90. Draft report provided to LINC by the city manager's staff.

24. According to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) the SMIP course is designed to give participants "a clear understanding of general management theory, policy development, planning processes, and organizational structure and behavior. Among the topics covered [are]... diversity, political management, organizational strategy, performance management, organizational change, leadership, managerial problem solving, labor relations, problem-oriented policing and implementation strategies, process analysis, budgeting, media relations, and new policing strategies and innovations."

Box to be added to *COPS: Innovations in American Heartlands*

------BOX------BOX ------BOX------BOX ------BOX------BOX ------BOX------BOX

For more background information about community-oriented policing

The following books and reports are recommended for the reader who wants to learn more about the key elements of community policing and problem-oriented policing, the history of community policing in the United States and elsewhere, examples of innovative community policing practices in various law enforcement agencies, or results of evaluations of community policing. NCJ numbers refer to the catalogue of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service — at its web site http://www.ncjrs.org you can download documents that are available in electronic form, order paper copies of government publications, or obtain details for how to purchase commercial books.

The New Blue Line: Police Innovation in Six American Cities, by J H Skolnick and D H Bayley, Free Press, 1986. NCJ-101361. This book contains one of the earliest presentations of police departments adopting innovative policies characterized by strong police-community cooperation, command decentralization, more foot patrol, and the civilianization of selected policing operations. These approaches are described in six diverse cities: Santa Ana CA, Detroit MI, Houston TX, Denver CO, Oakland CA, and Newark NJ. The book analyzes the critical role of visionary police chiefs and shows how the "old cop" versus the "new cop" attitudes and police bureaucracy affected reform in each city.

Problem-Oriented Policing, by H Goldstein, McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1990. NCJ-122899. Herman Goldstein was one of the original thinkers who proposed that policing should move beyond response to individual incidents and instead focus on resolving community problems. This landmark book presents the concept of problem-oriented policing, which many leaders in law enforcement still consider a central element of community policing, and specifies the steps that are taken in identifying, analyzing, and resolving community problems. Goldstein describes the early experiences with problem-oriented policing in Madison WI, Baltimore County MD, Newport News VA, and the London Metropolitan Police. The book discusses a wide range of specific kinds of problems, such as landlord-tenant disputes, spousal abuse, shoplifting, and street prostitution. It concludes with a description of the structural and management changes needed when implementing problem-oriented policing.

If you are interested in more historical background, you will also want to read Goldstein's **Policing a Free Society**, Ballinger Publishing, 1977, NCJ-40518.

New Policing: Confronting Complexity, by H Goldstein, National Institute of Justice, 1993. NCJ-145157. To illustrate the complexity of community policing, this Research-in-Brief examines the changes that occur in refining the police function and public expectations, involving citizens in the substance of policing, redefining the relationship between the police and the criminal justice system, searching for alternative law enforcement responses, and reformulating the police working environment.

Modern Policing, by M Tonry and N Morris (eds.), volume 15 of *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, University of Chicago Press, 1992. NCJ-138798. In the third chapter of this book, **Problem-solving and Community Policing**, Mark Moore draws a distinction between problem-oriented policing and community policing, which he defines as establishing working partnerships between police and communities to reduce crime and enhance security, but he also describes how they are overlapping concepts: "A commitment to problem solving leads quite naturally to the invention of solutions that involve the broader community." Moore discusses the goals of policing, how to evaluate problem-solving and community policing, and criticisms of community policing such as the loss of central accountability for the actions of law enforcement officers.

If you are interested in more historical background about community policing, you will also want to read other chapters in this book, including **Police Organization in the Twentieth Century**, by A J Reiss, Jr., and **History of Urban Police**, by E H Monkkonen.

Problem-Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work. Police Executive Research Forum (PERF, http://www.policeforum.org). Volume 1 by T O Shelley and A C Grant, eds., 1998. NCJ-176142. Volume 2 by C S Brito and T Allan, eds., 1999. Volume 3 by C S Brito and E E Gratto, eds., 2000. PERF annually holds an international conference on problem-oriented policing. These books reflect the latest knowledge shared by law enforcement practitioners and academicians at the conferences. They describe approaches for handling problems such as hate crimes, stalking, and crime in public housing.

Community Policing, Chicago Style, by W G Skogan and S M Hartnett, Oxford University Press, 1997. NCJ-175951. In describing successes and limitations of community policing in Chicago IL, this book traces the community policing program from its inception to its application in the field and examines the roots of community policing and its implementation in the context of political, racial, and fiscal realities. The book describes some of the obstacles to making community policing work in practice and the details of the planning process and the eventual deployment of police officers. The authors conclude the community policing program resulted in substantial benefits for most Chicago residents. Updates on the Chicago experience are provided in four reports published by the National Institute of Justice: **Problem Solving in Practice: Implementing Community Policing in Chicago**, by Wesley G. Skogan, Susan M. Hartnett, Jill DuBois, Jennifer T. Comey, Marianne Kaiser, and Justice H. Lovig was published in April 2000. **Public Involvement: Community Policing in Chicago** by Wesley G. Skogan, Susan M. Hartnett, Jill DuBois, Jennifer T. Comey, Karla Twedt-Ball, and J. Erik Gudell, was published in September 2000. Two additional reports are slated for release in late 2001.

The Journal of Community Policing. Published bi-annually since 1999 by the Oklahoma Regional Community Policing Institute, 3701 SE 15th Street, Del City OK 73115. Contains articles that encourage law enforcement, community members, and educators to engage in cooperative efforts to increase safety in the community.

Community Policing, Community Justice, and Restorative Justice: Exploring the Links for the Delivery of a Balanced Approach to Public Safety, by C G Nicholl, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (http://www.usdoj.gov/cops), 1999. NCJ-181245. A review and assessment of community policing, with a look to a future in which community involvement with criminal justice is even greater than it is under community policing.

Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure, and Function of the

Police, by J R Greene, National Institute of Justice, 2000. NCJ-185533. In Volume 3 of *Criminal Justice 2000*, "Policies, Processes and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System." This chapter reviews the rise of community- and problem-oriented policing as major vehicles to improve the effectiveness of police efforts in communities and as means of reforming police organizations; included is a discussion of the historical development of various models of policing. The article reviews research on the impacts of community policing on communities, police organizations, police work, and police officers and suggests that police officers' conception of their roles and their attachment to police work are improving with the adoption of community and problem-oriented policing roles.

The COPS Program After 4 Years: National Evaluation by J A Roth and J F Ryan, National Institute of Justice, 2000. NCJ-183644. An independent process evaluation of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program.

Problem-Oriented Policing: The 2000 Herman Goldstein Award Winners, National Institute of Justice, 2001. NCJ-185279. Includes **Graffiti Prevention and Suppression** and **The Question of Independent Living** in San Diego CA, **Gas Thefts at Service Stations** in Kansas City MO, **Showdown at the Playground** in Vancouver BC, **Homeless Men's Shelter** in Charlotte-Mecklenburg NC, and **Repairing Neighborhoods with Partnerships** in Joliet IL. See also the 1999 award winners, NCJ-182731.

Problem-Oriented Policing: Reflections on the First 20 Years, by M S Scott, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (http://www.usdoj.gov/cops), 2000. COPS reference number e112k0781. Summarizes the latest views of problem solving, problem-oriented policing, and community-oriented policing, with reflections on the changes that occurred since 1980 and the relationship between problem-oriented policing and the whole police mission.

Community Policing in Local Police Departments, 1997 and 1999, by M J Hickman and B A Reaves, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001. NCJ-184794. Factual information about nationwide patterns of change over two years, including personnel assigned to community policing, training, community-based activities, and computers and information systems.

Crime Mapping and Analysis by Community Organizations in Hartford, Connecticut, by Thomas Rich, National Institute of Justice, 2001. NCJ-185333. An assessment of how community organizations in Hartford used the Neighborhood Problem Solving system, a computer-based mapping and crime analysis technology.

------END BOX------END BOX ------END BOX------END BOX ------END BOX